



American Planning Association

Making Great Communities Happen

APA Board of Directors – Committee & Task Force Report

BOARD MEETING

DATE: April 26, 2014

TO: APA Board of Directors

FROM: APA Emerging Issues Task Force
Armando Carbonell, AICP, Co-Chair
Diana C. Mendes, AICP, Co-Chair
Mitchell J. Silver, AICP, Co-Chair

SUBJECT: **APA Emerging Issues Task Force Update**

ADOPTED POLICY:

No

TYPE OF REPORT:

☐ Action

☒ Information

CONSENT AGENDA

☐ Yes

☒ No

FISCAL NOTE:

All activities will be funded from the FY 2015 and future budgets.

Related to Development Plan Goal/Strategy:

- 1.4 Generate the big ideas to sustain our communities. Educate the public and community leaders through documentation of best practices and identification of next practices, to be used by planners, citizens and elected officials.
- 1.5 Highlight opinion leaders' work through our publications, education and research. Develop forums for "big ideas" to engage practitioners, academics and students and global partners.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board accept this informational report.

ACTION REQUESTED OF THE BOARD:

None.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As planners, we continue to face new opportunities and challenges emanating from the emerging trends affecting the future of our communities. These trends influence our priorities, our role as planners and the need to develop and implement viable solutions. To help shape the profession's thinking and exchange ideas, in October 2012, APA announced the appointment of a task force of thought leaders from a diverse array of backgrounds to address emerging trends in the field and the future of planning. The inaugural activities of that task force included requesting APA members and non-members to submit their "big ideas" to address the emerging trends listed by the task force, as well as other issues and trends not identified by the task force. This year's task force has leveraged the previous insights gained to continue the conversation and provoke additional debate.

Building on the work of the previous task force, this collection of brief essays, or "perspectives," has been prepared by members of academia and practicing professionals to stimulate thought on key emerging trends facing our communities, the profession's response, and how these trends impact the future of practice. As such, these opinion pieces represent the start of an exploratory conversation. Authors have addressed a wide range of issues, including:

- The ability and effectiveness of planners to rise beyond the constraints of traditional planning frameworks to tackle macro-scale societal and environmental issues;
- The increasing importance of cross-boundary strategic development planning in realizing planning solutions;
- The particular challenges inherent in planning for the impacts of climate change;
- The ways in which technology is fundamentally transforming planning practice; and
- The potential to better leverage connections between academia and professional practice.

Our inquiry into emerging issues starts with the proverbial "elephant in the room" – a provocative essay by Branden Born questioning the ability and effectiveness of planners to be relevant in addressing the "societal and environmental grand challenges" and how we should recalibrate our expectations and philosophy to focus our work. Critical to this

recalibration is the right balance between incremental progress on day-to-day micro-scale issues and transformative efforts outside of the existing framework. His call to action is profound - how can we as a profession and as individuals effect a transition from planning for the probable to planning for the possible?

Our next emerging issue is articulated in the piece by Vincent Goodstadt, exploring the increasing challenges of cross-boundary interdependence, and the accelerating extent to which the future of independent communities are inextricably linked to regional and global forces. He challenges professionals to recognize that "real communities of interest lie cross-boundary" and that "if the aspirations of local communities and the United States as a whole for greater, equitable and sustained well-being is to be realized, existing arrangements for strategic planning through joint working need to be strengthened and applied generally to all areas." This call for action requires our profession to draw on international and national experience to realize how better linkages among the federal, state and local levels may be operationalized.

Dealing with uncertainty is not unfamiliar ground to planners, but dealing with the extent and magnitude of uncertainty associated with climate change is the subject of William Butler's paper on planning for climate change. The potential effects of climate change permeate all aspects of planning practice and of developing economic, social, spatial and environmental strategies for the future. The pervasive and elusive nature of blending technical analysis while navigating shifting social values and perceptions presents unprecedented challenges to our profession and to the future of our communities. He challenges us to navigate this new terrain by not only through technical analysis, but also by facilitating "scenario processes, communities of inquiry, and monitoring for adaptive management."

Patrick Phillips asks us to imagine how rapid changes in technology will drive fundamental changes in the way people use cities and the spaces within them, and force us to rethink many longstanding urban planning assumptions. New technologies will impact urban social, economic and environmental systems, including transportation, the production of goods and materials, retailing, water and food, upending traditional correlations between economic growth and demographic change. The pace of innovation and the potential for technology to disrupt historical relationships and patterns will drive fundamental changes in how we plan. His call to action requires that planning "must become more continuous, and less periodic; less prescriptive and more performance-based; less about singular vision and more about alternative scenarios and outcomes."

In making the case for tapping into university research to improve linkages between academia and professional practice, Charles Hoch encourages consideration of new and improved alliances that would better enable professional planners to "enjoy the benefit

of ongoing integrated intellectual exchange with academic researchers and educators in their respective regions and locales.” This closer integration would enable both researchers and academics to be more connected to emerging practical problems, and practitioners to benefit from real time research. He challenges us to reconsider our current organizational models in exchange for a more responsive institutional environment that would foster improved research for planning policy and practice.

And so the conversation on emerging issues continues, spurred by these thought provoking contributions from this year’s task force. The challenge now lies with us to answer the fundamental questions and themes raised in the essays, both individually and taken in the aggregate:

- How should we as planners to approach issues beyond our immediate purview but that are the drivers of the challenges we face on a day-to-day basis?
- What can we do better as individual practitioners and as a profession to deal with increasing uncertainty, and the risks inherent with that uncertainty as we strive for real-time solutions?
- Can we build more effective means to facilitate the full range of collaboration needed to succeed in increasingly dynamic environments – to break down boundaries, be they based jurisdictional, disciplinary, institutional or affiliation silos?
- And, most important, how can our roles as planners evolve to rise to the challenges and opportunities of our changing professional aspirations?

REPORT

Solving Capitalism's Wicked Problems

The existential question we don't want to discuss: can planning actually be expected to do any of the things we want it to do? If not, what should we do?

by Branden Born

Planning's Challenge

The current political economic environment in which planning in the United States is embedded is one that is defined by the neoliberal philosophy. In this environment, the state is not charged with providing social safety nets, jobs, environmental protection, or representing the underprivileged, many of the things that planning attempts to do in one way or another. In the neoliberal case, the state's role is very different. David Harvey provides a succinct summary: "neoliberalism... is a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices."

Without challenging the validity of neoliberal thought, it is still clear that it calls on the state and state actors such as planners to act in a very different way than the Keynesian model that preceded it, and within which many of our current planning practices were developed. The idea that the state is beneficent, that one of its purposes is to control industry through regulation (or that it could), is outdated and misplaced. The state and industry, or capital, work hand in hand, and planners are deeply engaged in this – think of our coveted public-private partnerships as examples. On a more practical level, the electoral model that ostensibly provides a government willing and able to do the work of governing in a manner that represents the interests of the populace is clearly failing. Gridlock is a defining term in our statehouses and in Congress, and money has become speech, as corporations became people. The combination of *Citizens United* and the recent *McCutcheon* case deals a near-fatal blow to campaign finance control of the post-Nixon era, with the effect of closing electoral politics to anyone but the very rich or very connected. Again, without making value judgments about these, it is still clear that the political, economic, and electoral world is currently functioning in a certain way. And it is not a way that respects the planning function, inasmuch as planning is a function of the state.

With that as a background, planners seek to address climate change, poverty, housing, food and water crises, and other pressing societal problems. Some of these problems are due to an unsustainable view of the planet and its natural resources, others come from

an inequitable distribution of wealth; both types are either caused or exacerbated by the insatiety of capitalism. Yet planners still seek centralized, state-based, policy and plan-based solutions in an era in which the state is tied directly to the system causing the problems. Do we not see the professional irony here? I suggest we do not. This speaks to the division of procedural versus substantive planning or theories-of-planning versus theories in planning. The 2000 National AICP Prep Course Guidebook suggested that both planning traditions “have always existed, but movement seems to be away from philosophy and toward science.” Unfortunately, the easily measurable and quantifiable things are not necessarily the most meaningful or important things, or at the very least might not be the right things to examine based on the goals of the field. We must embrace both traditions. We need scientific understanding combined with an ethical directive for societal development.

Instead, planners spend time on the immediate challenges of urban and regional collaborative problem solving, which makes some sense, but it is done to the exclusion of considering larger, long-term structural change. A recent conference announcement described it thusly: “As the profession has evolved and grown, however, planning has become increasingly ensconced within the routine administrative functions of local government. Somewhere in the middle of the 20th century a concern for predictability, risk avoidance, and conservatism impacted the very heart and soul of planning; we went from planning for the possible to planning for the probable.” The environmental and social justice oriented principles in our Code of Ethics, and the environmental and societal problems that confront us globally, require more consideration of structural change, and less consideration of incremental reform and day-to-day administrivia.

Planning’s Response

Planning needs to begin thinking on a bigger scale if it is to be relevant to societal and environmental grand challenges. And it needs to be cognizant of the limitations placed upon it by a connection to the neoliberal state. Practically, it needs to work on two fronts – incrementally within current state structures because that is what exists, and radically with groups outside of the state to move an agenda unfamiliar to neoliberalism, one of increased democracy, social justice, and environmental sustainability.

In recognition of the limitations of the current environment, planners must seek partners outside of it. They should, taking cues from an increasingly telemediated and information-rich society, become parts of networks of partners working to achieve these goals. They should find and support successful projects that reject the current paradigm and pursue a sustainable planet. They should document and share these successes, and empower communities and groups to take planning on for themselves. They should help develop the network alternatives to a non-responsive state. To be successful, planning needs to be removed from that state. It needs to be taken away from the experts, and become part of thriving communities operating in radically democratic



fashion. In this way, instead of planning becoming evermore a bureaucratic function serving a conservative status quo, it can become a vibrant and powerful transformative force in helping communities address contemporary problems. Does this mean the profession as we know it is sacrificed to capital, to be reborn in communities and organizations in service to democracy, social justice, and environmental sustainability?

Can planning do what we want it to do? At the very least, planners need to start having the conversation about what are reasonable expectations, and what we should be working towards.

Planning for Development: The Challenge of Growing Cross Boundary Interdependence

Planning requires a recognition that 'real' communities of interest lie cross-boundary if there is to be sufficient focus on economic, social and transport problems of core cities.

by Vincent Goodstadt

Although with their diverse geography, history and culture, the different metropolitan regions of the United States will need to find distinct solutions to their problems, they share a role as key drivers of economic growth, the backbone of American competitiveness. In terms of social issues, it must be recognized that major social needs are concentrated in the cities, reflected in such indicators as unemployment, affordability of housing, health standards, educational standards, or crime. Similarly, environmental sustainability is driven by the demands of urban living and patterns of development. Such factors as waste generation, energy consumption, and land consumption depend largely on the way our city regions are managed. Therefore the future of United States depends on meeting these common opportunities and challenges, which can only be effectively achieved through strategic development planning.

In this context the relationship of the core of the urbanized regions to their developed and rural hinterlands is critical. In terms of labor supply, water resources and transport systems, there is an overwhelming interdependence between the core cities and towns and the adjoining areas outside their metropolitan boundaries. Their current conditions and future prospects are interlocked. This relationship however is not just about economic and social dependency but also impacts on the quality of life in rural areas within the region.

These challenges will become acute over future decades. The patterns of work and social activities are becoming increasingly extended and cross-boundary; the levels of migration between regions and towns and suburbs is inexorable. The growth in demand on resources is becoming ever greater, putting shared and vital ecosystems at risk, especially watersheds and catchments. These two key pressures will become even more critical than they are now given the wider global context, for example, as the need for energy security requires fundamental shifts in the levels and forms of access and mobility which have the potential to transform the urban balances between and within cities and their regions.

Planning's Response

The great urban centers of the United States therefore require planning above the local level, working together to solve 'local' problems or in the case of infrastructure,

cooperating with state and federal agencies and business. On all levels, strategic planning is of key importance to link power and resources, especially in terms of transport and housing delivery.

Without this cooperation and shared strategic vision between authorities and agencies there will be an increasing disconnect between the power to plan effectively and the responsibility to deliver these plans. What is required is collaborative action if the challenges to the future of cities are to be overcome. These challenges include the need to promote competitiveness whilst ensure social cohesion/equity, the need to secure integration between and across the layers of government, and the need to take a longer term perspective in our decisions engaging all the communities of interest.

At its heart, planning is concerned with the interdependence of communities (whether neighbourhoods or nationally). Planning requires a recognition that 'real' communities of interest lie cross-boundary if there is to be sufficient focus on economic, social and transport problems of the core cities. Without it there can be no clear view of the relative role of each area and there can be no confidence about future infrastructure network development upon which economic investment relies, as it will inevitably underperform. If the aspirations of local communities and the United States as a whole for greater, equitable, and sustained well-being is to be realised, existing arrangements for strategic planning through joint working need to be strengthened and applied generally to all areas.

There is a vast level of international and national experience on how this might be operationalized. This includes:

- The identification of the key areas of community interest where the level of interdependence between local communities is in the vital interest of the federal and/or state government;
- The linkage of federal and state funding to the extent of collaborative working and to joint projects and programs;
- The creation of local dedicated technical capacities to support the necessary strategic working arrangements and enhance evidence bases of policies and programs;
- The development of clearer federal and state visions on the core infrastructure and resource frameworks that underpin local communities.

Planning for the Impacts of Climate Change: The Challenges of Uncertainty and non-Stationarity

Climate change impacts are being felt today and will be a growing concern in the future. Planners need to account for climate change and its myriad impacts as we orient economic, social, spatial and environmental strategies for the future.

by William Butler

Planning's Challenge

Climate change will affect all aspects of planning practice including how we approach hazard mitigation planning, environmental and natural resources management, and land use planning as well as health, transportation, and housing and urban development. With the potential for stronger storms, higher magnitude flooding, sea level rise, tropical cyclone intensity, changes in the duration and intensity of heat waves, droughts, and wildfire seasons, planners will be operating in a dynamic context that will pose threats on key infrastructure, natural resources, water systems, agricultural production and more.

Planners operate in a future oriented profession so uncertainty is a given, but the extent of uncertainty associated with climate change poses a new and evolving challenge to planners. Climate change is a reality, but specifying the magnitude, scale, intensity and timing of impacts remains rather elusive. The 5th IPCC report of Working Group II released March 31, 2014 continues to hedge on a range of issues related to planning concerns, particularly when seeking to predict what will happen, when and where at spatial scales meaningful to most planners—the local or sub-state region. Moreover, debates continue in communities along differing perceptions of the causes of climate change and the relative likelihood of specific impacts to occur in specific places. Social values and perceptions can shift over time with demographic changes, education and awareness, and exposure to perceived climate change related events. Building the social license to act, the political will and community commitment, as well as the capacity to adapt to climate change impacts will depend in part on the social values in a given place and time.

Weather variability associated with cyclic climate anomalies such as the El Niño Southern Oscillation that lead to changes in precipitation, temperature, severe storms, and extreme heat events has been taken into account in hazard mitigation and environmental planning and management practice for decades. In general, planners have operated within a defined “natural range of variability,” for example, with structural and land use planning responses to minimize exposure and/or vulnerability to the impacts of the 1% (100 year) flood or the storm surge of a particular category hurricane. We’ve dealt with variability by operating within relatively stable bounds of uncertainty

and developing policies and strategies to cover a level of risk deemed appropriate, for example, by building levees, elevating structures, or excluding development to reduce risks of loss of property or life in the 1% floodplain.

Non-stationarity, the idea that the range of variability of weather patterns will be less stable than in the past, requires a change in planning practice. Climate change is expected to amplify weather variability and alter the return frequencies of extreme events, adding to the uncertainty with which planners must contend. Our predictive capacity will be tested by the magnitude of change. Historical trends may become less relevant as the advent of climate change amplifies activities on the extremes.

Planning's Response

Tools such as cost-benefit analysis, risk-benefit analysis, and heuristics such as "wait and see" or the precautionary principle, are somewhat limited in their ability to address uncertainties or effectively choose strategies that will not lead to over- or under-adaptation. A combination of scenario planning and adaptive management in an adaptive governance regime has the potential to redress social and environmental uncertainties and non-stationarity when planning over the long time horizons required in planning with climate change.

Scenario planning asks the question, "what if?" and allows communities to examine plausible futures and chart a course to address a range of impacts of climate change. Planners can use scenarios to assess community tolerance for risk, uncertainty, and the opportunity costs of over- or under-adaptation. Planners can then address a range of possible futures given the socio-political context in which they operate.

Adaptive management allows for action with imperfect information but creates mechanisms for monitoring and feedback so that changing conditions can inform future actions. It can redress uncertainty through triggers and indicators, monitoring environmental change, and enabling feedback of information to identify observed shifts in the internal and external drivers of change on desirable social, economic and ecological conditions.

Adaptive governance facilitates this planning process by engaging a "community of inquiry" involving citizens, technical experts, agency personnel, decision makers and others in a process of collective dialogue, social learning, and monitoring environmental change as well as changes in social and political values over time to adjust adaptation strategies. Time horizons for planning will have to be stretched. These are not one-off events of scenario planning and adaptive management, but rather an ongoing process of adaptive governance through which new scenarios are developed and vetted, indicators are monitored over time, triggers or other decision points are put in place, and multiple parties are engaged in a learning system.



To effectively navigate this terrain, planners will need to become not only capable of helping to shape the processes of technical analysis, but also open to learning and engaging in experimentation through scenarios, communities of inquiry, and monitoring for adaptive management. Humility more than hubris will have to guide planning in the face of climate change.

Changing Technology and the Practice of Planning

The pace of technology and innovation means planning must become less about singular vision and more about alternative scenarios and outcomes.

by Patrick L. Phillips

Planning's Challenge

Rapid changes in technology are changing the way people use space in cities, and are challenging longstanding urban planning assumptions. Traditional correlations between economic growth and demographic change are being upended, mainly in the direction of less space being demanded per unit of growth, but one can contend that disruptive technologies and the pace of innovation make the process of planning inherently more difficult by reducing certainty and increasing risk. This trend is durable. Planners must develop methodologies that confront this uncertainty head on and that recognize a broader range of potential consequences of public actions and investments.

Planning's Response

Some examples of this disruption and required shifts in the approach to planning:

- **Transportation:** Driverless cars will reduce traffic congestion and accidents; they will affect urban development by dramatically reducing the need for parking, freeing up valuable land for other uses. The prevalence of car ownership, already waning in urban areas with the rise of car sharing and alternative modes, will evolve further into a "use- as-needed" form of urban mobility, as driverless vehicles chauffeur humans from one place to another. As other travel choices to the single car occupant vehicles needed to meet changing demands such as improved transit, ridesharing, and bikesharing continue to evolve, land consumption for transportation purposes will be further reduced. Drones will be used to deliver packages to both businesses and consumers, expediting delivery times and curbing the need for street delivery vehicles.
- **Production of goods and materials:** Manufacturing will once again be a major economic engine for the U.S., with robots performing tasks ranging from clerical work to assembly. Three-dimensional printers capable of producing products ranging from dresses to building construction materials will become accessible to consumers, changing supply chains and remapping the industrial landscape of the nation.
- **Retailing:** the ongoing erosion of in-store retailing relative to online sales accelerates as new delivery systems and other innovations continue; suburban commercial corridors, with ill-suited parcel configurations, obsolete zoning

regulations, and scarce public funding, will face major challenges to redevelopment. Planners will also have to evolve their vision of vital urban cores to reflect reduced demand for retail space.

- **Water and Food:** Technology is being developed to purify salt water, which will help greatly in eradicating water-borne diseases and increasing the supply of usable water in formerly water-scarce areas. Shifting climatic patterns will redistribute agricultural productivity patterns and thus transport costs. New patterns of meat production will reduce the acreage required to feed, store, and slaughter animals.
- **Urban performance data are increasingly decentralized:** The internet of things means citizens will collect and access a wide range of data ranging from air and water quality to educational performance, mobility patterns, and public costs and revenues. Planning and policymaking processes must evolve to recognize the democratization of data, modifying the traditional role of the expert planner.

The upshot is that planning must become more continuous, and less periodic; less prescriptive and more performance-based; less about singular vision and more about alternative scenarios and outcomes. Planners and planning processes have adapted before. A previous generation of planners, for example, paid much less attention to members of the affected community than we do today. Planners ultimately embraced community participation as a central element in the planning process, despite the additional uncertainty and complexity it brings. Large-scale uncertainties, including changing technologies and climate change, have to drive a new level of flexibility into the process. Rather than expecting planners themselves to become the ultimate forecasters, we might turn to crowdsourcing, for example, to help identify the forces of change. Planners become facilitators and guides, making sound planning choices within a broader framework of potential change.

Tapping University Research for the Planning Movement

Challenge the habits of the past to bridge the intellectual relevance divide.

by Charles J. Hoch

Planning's Challenge

The hard working leadership of the planning profession does not enjoy the benefit of ongoing integrated intellectual exchange with academic researchers and educators in their respective regions and locales. (There are faculty and practitioner partnerships all over the place, but not the sort of institutional integration that would make for more systemic exchange). The academic researchers do not benefit from close ties with the emerging problems and challenges of practice. Real time research tied to emerging practical problems among practitioners languishes. (This gap creates all kinds of unnecessary and often foolish stereotypes and conflicts between practitioners and the academics.)

At the national level the functional structure of the current APA in many ways reproduces the functional form of university planning schools. When ASPO was formed the research and education activity was undertaken because it was needed and there were not many institutions fostering planning relevant research. The massive expansion of the public university system after WWII and the explosion of urban planning departments changed that situation. The 1978 ASPO-AIP merger may have salvaged the fiscally weak professional institute, but it also tied the professionals to the historic infrastructure from the past. APA members continue to support a national APA office that does research and education – two activities that university departments of planning conduct. Could the profession accrue greater benefits from a more integrated approach?

We do not ask the question I think because the profession and the schools have diverged and developed a tacit division of their educational focus. I am not arguing that either APA or the schools do things badly, but the habits of the past do foster an intellectual relevance divide. The APA needs to insist upon the professional value of its research and education products to the members both to secure legitimacy and revenue. The schools must demonstrate their legitimacy to the university faculty as well as to the profession, but often filtered through alumni more than relevance to practitioners within their region and beyond. The PAB provides a vehicle for overcoming this divide, but works mainly to set and police baseline expectations (and outcomes) rather than integrate planning research into the fabric of planning practice.

Planning's Response



So what if practitioners were to develop an equivalent institution to the PAB, but instead of regulating the quality of professional education for planning it was organized to do research for planning policy and practice? The institution would foster short term and long term planning projects and answer to a board composed of practitioners and academics committed to research that improves planning not only for the profession, but for the wider planning movement in the US and abroad. I imagine a coordinating body with strong regional participation using clusters of university planning researchers affiliated with planning practitioners in state and local government. Examples range from the think tank type models at the high end to the volunteer-based California Roundtable.

Spheres of Influence: Attention to Equity

Planning secures its greatest validation when it advocates for and delivers a better world for all. Planners need to affect perception and reality, even when there is a disjuncture between the two.

by Jerold Kayden

Inequality is one of the thorniest challenges facing planners worldwide. When a significant proportion of urban dwellers feels that a city's productive output is unfairly, if not unequally, distributed, they can easily lose confidence in the public and private institutions partly responsible for guiding such productivity. The legitimacy of planning, so important to planning's effectiveness, suffers.

What is the evidence for perceptions and realities of inequality? It is obviously experienced by many city residents and employees daily in terms of job, housing, and recreational opportunities. Poverty remains stubbornly high. Unemployment persists. Housing costs are out-of-line with incomes. The best schools are often private and unaffordable. Parks in wealthy areas have wealthy benefactors, those in poorer environs must do solely with allocations from the city budget. The inequality list is well-worn, though no less disturbing. There is no reason to believe that inequality will decrease or disappear. Indeed, many would argue that forces producing inequality will gain strength unless actively contested.

Let's be clear. Planners need not seek fundamental change to the basic structure of a free market economy in order to achieve greater equality. In any event, it may be argued, it is the very productivity of market economies that creates the endowment for social redistributions assisting the less well-off. Planners also may fairly recognize that the levers of influence at their hands are inadequate for the task at hand. Planners do not control all the elements that trigger inequality. Education or health care are two obvious examples. But planners do operate within spheres of influence where heightened, thoughtful attention to inequality can influence outcomes.

For example, land-use controls can be crafted to foster greater equality. Planners increasingly zone for mixed densities and categories of housing. Why not zone for mixed incomes? Inclusionary zoning does just that, although its record of production nationally signals both its limitations and need for reinvention. Examples from California, Massachusetts, New York City, and Montgomery County, Maryland, can be studied for strengths and weaknesses. *Mount Laurel's* multi-decade up-and-down record makes one wonder about the efficacy of court-ordered approaches.

One principle for planning, however, can be asserted. At minimum, when developers receive approval for developments that exceed their existing entitlements, then it is not unfair to ask for a share of the increased value represented by additional development rights. As a value capture strategy, inclusionary zoning can redirect some of the extra money that would otherwise be captured by the private developer as profit. Recent calls to loosen zoning controls over bulk and height may be the right answer on an Economics 101 midterm and even in the field, reminding us of the costs of regulation. Planners need also take seriously, however, that these so-called loosening must take into account the full range physical planning goals in the context of neighborhood scales.

When government hands out public subsidies, sells land at a discount to private developers, or provides public infrastructure, planners need to apply financial analysis skills that allow them to negotiate with equal skill, guaranteeing that they secure for society the best deal forward. When a developer agrees to a deal, we know axiomatically that he or she believes it pencils out. What society needs to know is that the deal doesn't pencil out any more than it must to encourage the developer to enter the deal. After all, public subsidies that are necessary, sufficient, but not excessive ensure that scarce public resources are efficiently deployed rather than squandered.

Robust participation in the capital budget process by planners, contemplated so intelligently by the "Standard City Planning Enabling Act" of 1928, becomes even more essential when standards of equality are at stake. For example, physical access to jobs depends on well-planned transportation schemes with modal splits that neither demonize nor celebrate cars, buses, light rail, or feet except to the extent they get people, especially of lower incomes, efficiently, quickly, and affordably from and to points A, B, C, and so forth. Employed in New York City, fair share approaches evaluating the location of beneficial and harmful public facilities can help in moving toward equality.

Could planning benefit from a requirement, borrowed from environmental law, of "equality impact statements" measuring whether public actions affecting the built environment promote or diminish equality? Like environmental impact statements, they could surely raise awareness around the issue of equality and encourage the development of express metrics and benchmarks.

Planning secures its greatest validation when it advocates for and delivers a better world for all. Planners need to affect perception and reality, even when there is a disjuncture between the two. The most recent mayoral election in New York City highlights this issue. Fairly or not, the Bloomberg administration was perceived by many as focusing too heavily on wealth production and not enough on fair distributions, thus the electoral success of the "tale of two cities" narrative. As the new Mayor, Bill de Blasio, rolls out his



ambitious affordable housing strategies among other equality-based initiatives, at least the perception of expressly seeking equality will be felt more widely. The tension between the benefits of redevelopment and who wins and loses will never disappear. Ongoing debates about gentrification and the public reaction to the United States Supreme Court's *Kelo v. City of New London* case assure us of that. As Susan Fainstein convincingly writes in her book, *The Just City*, planning's call for the future must be founded on conscious application of existing and newly invented tools that make cities more equitable.

**APA EMERGING ISSUES TASK FORCE ROSTER**

ARMANDO CARBONELL, AICP, COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR

DIANA C. MENDES, AICP, COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR

MITCHELL J. SILVER, AICP, COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR

BRANDEN BORN

WILLIAM BUTLER

VINCENT J. GOODSTADT

CHARLES J. HOCH

JEROLD S. KAYDEN,

PATRICK L. PHILLIPS

JENNIE GORDON, AICP, APA STAFF