

A newsletter for alumni and friends of the DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING  
University of Wisconsin–Madison

### FROM THE CHAIR

*Stephen M. Born*

I've stressed the topic of "change" in these columns over the past few years, but generally focused on change within URPL. As I write for this edition of *Connections*, I can't help but reflect on how profoundly the world has changed since my last communique. The events of September 11 and the inevitable retaliatory attacks against terrorists abroad and security concerns at home have dramatically altered the world's priorities and landscape. The collage of events again illustrates the imperfect world we live in and the challenges humanity faces in addressing disparities and injustices in the human condition. At a time when we might be investing in education, health care, communities, environment, and economic and social justice, we find our resources diverted to military and security spending.

Here in the department, we've been discussing some changes in our concentrations, including the possible establishment of a new international development planning concentration that capitalizes on the skills and experience of our faculty (and colleagues across the campus). Recent events may make such a change particularly timely – one senses that simply exporting free-market business models worldwide – the globalization of capitalism – will not by itself address the great regional economic and social disparities extant around the world. International development planning assistance to build social capacity and address complex problems and inequities in the developing world is a critical complementary strategy, and there may well be an important role for URPL and other units at UW–Madison.

Closer to home, change continues within URPL. Professor Herman Felstehausen retires in January 2002, after a long career at UW–Madison (the last three years at URPL). We are currently recruiting for three new faculty, including replacements (if such is possible!) for Jerry Kaufman and Ben Niemann. The September Conference, summarized in this issue, was a marvelous success – both substantively and in terms



*Steve Born and Jerry Kaufman celebrate planning in the 21st century at the Monona Terrace.*

of URPL "karma"! We are pleased with the launching of the Jerry Kaufman Scholarship Fund, and appreciate the generosity of the many alumni and friends who contributed. Contributions are still welcome from alumni that haven't yet had the opportunity to honor a dedicated teacher and mentor.

*continued on next page*14

### CONTENTS

From the Chair	1
Looking Ahead: Major Planning Challenges in the 21st Century	2–12
Planning in the 21st Century: What's New?	7
Panel on Central City Health and Revitalization	9
Panel on International Planning	10
Kaufman Scholarship Fund Established	12
Career Development Pathways—Roads Traveled	13
Alumni Spotlight: Christine Thisted	14
ACSP 2001—Highlights and Impressions	15
Visiting Scholar from Yogyakarta	16



*Jerry Kaufman reflects on his career at URPL.*

## LOOKING AHEAD: MAJOR PLANNING CHALLENGES IN THE 21ST CENTURY

---

Jerry Kaufman  
Professor Emeritus  
Department of Urban and Regional Planning,  
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Keynote Address  
Urban and Regional Planning in the 21st Century Conference  
September 28, 2001

Monona Terrace Community and Convention Center  
Madison, Wisconsin

---

In 1954, I began my graduate studies in planning. What was it like almost a half century ago? The Korean war had recently ended. Cold War icicles were lengthening and thickening. The odious smelling flower of McCarthyism was in full bloom. Television, computers, big discount retail stores. Holiday Inns and the now ubiquitous arches of McDonald's were all in their infancy. The birth control pill had recently been invented. The Kinsey Report had just come out. The Supreme Court ended school segregation in its unanimous *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision. Rosa Parks was arrested in Montgomery, Alabama when she refused to move to the back of the bus, and Martin Luther King moved into a leadership position for the first time in the nascent civil rights movement. And Beat writers like Jack Kerouac and Alan Ginsberg were having fun beating up on the establishment.

Planning was becoming more recognized as a discipline. Congress had passed the 701 program as part of the 1954 Housing Act providing support for trained planners to help smaller communities, many of them suburbs, prepare comprehensive plans. Compared to today, with more than 80 graduate planning programs in the U.S., less than 20 such programs existed then. Two years after the 701 program was enacted, Congress created the interstate highway program, the start of the most massive expressway building program of any country—55,000 miles of expressways, 12,000 of which were in the country's 212 metropolitan areas. More demand for planners was triggered by a steady stream of federal funds pouring into cities for urban renewal programs. The dream many families had of owning their own homes was being realized in the wake of the successful Levittowns which represented the first signs of significant suburban

sprawl. The one car family was increasingly becoming the norm. Southern blacks were continuing their trek to northern cities in their search for jobs at the tail end of the greatest internal migration in the history of this country. The federal government was surprisingly active in supporting planning in cities, suburbs, and metropolitan areas. In retrospect, the 50's was the decade that launched a sort of golden age for planning and planners; that is, jobs were literally hanging on trees for planners coming out of planning schools.

Fifty years later, of course, the times are obviously very different. In 2001 we are solidly into the era of global capitalism, very rapid advances in information technology, the promise and ethical quandaries of the genomic revolution, the scourge of AIDs, a plethora of tense regional conflicts around the world between ethnic and tribal groups within countries and between countries (almost like waves of volcanic eruptions), global warming, the European Union becoming even more like a United States of Europe with the imminent conversion to the Euro dollar, and even the unthinkable- terrorist attacks on the U.S.

In planning circles, talk now centers on managing growth through Growing Smart programs, multi-modal transportation systems, the new urbanism, sustainable communities, public-private partnerships, high rise public housing projects being torn down and replaced by mixed income residential projects, planners as facilitators of citizen discussions about community goals, opening up the planning process to more diverse groups, takings legislation and the continued strength of the private property rights movement.

With this context, let me now turn to the subject my colleagues asked me to address today—major planning challenges of the 21st century. What you'll hear from me is tainted in the sense that I'll be drawing on my almost 50 years of experience in the field of planning. But I'll also be drawing on values that have motivated me throughout my career as a planner: social and economic justice, protecting and enhancing the public realm or what Garrett Hardin called "the commons", sustainable communities, being fair, being honest, and encouraging diversity. So, if anyone of my URPL colleagues were up here today and asked to speak

about major planning challenges of the 21st century, you'd obviously get a different spiel. But since this grand event is in honor of me, you'll have to listen to the Kaufman-filtered version of major planning challenges. Call them Brand X Kaufman's challenges.

I've chosen to focus on six major planning challenges, some which some of you may find old hat, others provocative, and still others a bit off-beat. Three are ones that have been around for a long time, that I think will continue to be around for the next 10 to 20 years at least. The other three are emerging challenges that I hope will be around for awhile.

## A. TAMING SPRAWL

The first challenge is to tame sprawl, an issue with a long track record and a lot of staying power. When I worked in the 1960's for ASPO, a non-profit organization that serviced planning agencies throughout the country, one of the interesting reports we published had the bland title, "Toward a More Effective Land-Use Guidance System". It was an analysis of major reports produced in the 1960s by five nationally-based organizations (the American Law Institute, a federal Task Force headed by Senator Paul Douglas, the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, ASPO, and A Canadian Federal Task Force). Each report dealt in part with issues of sprawl and each contained some bold recommendations. Among these were-empowering local governments to intervene directly in the development process through *land banking* by purchasing land and selling or leasing it to private developers subject to conditions for their reuse; authorizing local governments to designate *holding zones* in which development would be delayed for several years; encouraging large-scale planned developments and new community developments to prevent many of the ill effects of urban sprawl such as monotonous and uniform developments; prohibiting the use of land use guidance techniques for exclusionary purposes; and allowing for a state planning and review agency to protect extra-local interests. I mention these reports simply to point out that sprawl was a prominent concern 40 years ago, and that it was being addressed then in creative ways before the current array of anti-sprawl measures moved to the forefront.

Growing Smart has become the catch-word, and a number of states, including Wisconsin, are moving ahead in different ways and at different paces to try to tame the stubborn beast. Coalitions in support of Smart Growth programs clearly encompass a wider array of interest groups than in the past. But what lies ahead will provide the real test.

The Census Bureau projects a population of 403 million in the U.S. by 2050. That's 128 million or 45% more than in the year 2000. What will happen to our settlement patterns to accommodate this projected growth? Will today's Smart Growth programs, or their successors, win out? Or will development continue in a more spread out, helter-skelter fashion consuming far more land than we need? Here is where my bias starts to kick in.

I, for one, am skeptical about licking this problem soon with the tools and resources we have at our disposal. Compared to western European countries, we lag behind in our approach to controlling sprawl. One might call the approach being followed in the Netherlands, a country my wife, Judy, and I lived in for two of the last seven years, as Smart Growth *Extra*. Traveling around tiny Holland, a third of the size of Wisconsin, it is obvious that major urban sprawl has not occurred. You see much sharper separation between urban and rural areas, where sheep and cows still graze languidly on the edges of new residential developments. You also don't see billboards cluttering up the landscape or strip commercial developments on the edges of urban areas or a lot of big shopping centers with massive paved parking areas. What you do see on the edges of Holland's mostly compact and still bustling cities are new residential developments, the advance guard of some hundreds of thousands of housing units planned to be built over the next 10 years. Most of the housing units are for sale, and laid out in compact, tidily planned complexes.

Why is that? For one, the Dutch have much less land to build on, so there is a greater consciousness about land as a scarce resource. But even more important is that the Dutch permit greater government intervention into the land market than we do in this country, even though the Netherlands in recent times is heading more towards permitting a greater role for the private market. The strong private property rights culture in the U.S., what Harvey Jacobs refers to as the post World War II suburban-Jeffersonian version of the yeoman farmer ("Making Sense of Making



### CONNECTIONS STAFF:

Co-editors:

Andrea Lasker

Dana Lucero

Kate Strom

Stephanie Weigel

Rick Chenoweth,

*faculty advisor*

Thanks to Ariel Kaufman for providing photos of the Urban and Regional Planning in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century conference.

Please send submissions of material for possible inclusion in future issues of Connections to 110 Old Music Hall, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Madison, WI 53706 or to [rclapiz@facstaff.wisc.edu](mailto:rclapiz@facstaff.wisc.edu).



*Standing ovation after Jerry's Keynote Address, which kicked off URPL's Fall Conference.*

Cents in a Changing Urban Form”, August 2001), has very little resonance in Holland. For 35 years, the Dutch have had a national policy of compact development as a way of containing suburban expansion. Their tax system is also different from ours since 85% of the funds for Dutch municipalities comes from the national government as it passes a portion of the income tax revenue it receives back to the municipalities. The average property tax payment by a Dutch household in cities over 100,000 people in 1997 was only \$500 a year (Van der Valk). Moreover, there is no such thing as unincorporated land in the country—every municipality abuts another municipality—so the presence of numerous, fragmented local governments in the U.S., which are more difficult to coordinate and often compete for property tax dollars, is much less of a factor in the Netherlands. Land policy also works differently there. In general, public agencies would develop plans for new urban developments after the land is acquired by municipalities. Sites are then prepared with infrastructure for new construction and then the land is dispersed to building companies and the private sector for development.

The Dutch system is obviously too much of a mouthful for us to swallow in the U.S. But remember that the Netherlands is still a thriving social

and civil democracy, with a social welfare safety net strung considerably higher than in the U.S., and with a reputation for having a more tolerant attitude towards certain groups in the shadows of society—e.g., gays and lesbians, prostitutes, drug users, those who want abortions, and terminally ill patients who choose the path of euthanasia.

I remain optimistic that more and more states and local communities in the U.S. will move ahead through Smart Growth programs to get a better handle on sprawl. But I remain skeptical about how much progress will be made in the face of the constraints that stand in the way. A brief example of the difficulty I envision in taming sprawl comes from contrasting experiences in the Twin Cities, MN and Portland, OR metropolitan areas, the two places in the country generally acknowledged to have developed and sustained the most effective growth management institutions, policies, and measures in the country. Although both regions expected their populations to increase by about 650,000 people between 1996 and 2020, the Portland Metropolitan Council added only two and three-quarter square miles to its growth boundary for future development in its region while its Twin Cities counterpart added from nine and a half to twelve and a quarter square miles to its growth boundary (Orfield). Clearly, the devel-

opment community had much more success in opening up more land for future development in the Twin Cities area than in the Portland area, with the likelihood that greater sprawl will occur in the Twin Cities region. The challenge of managing growth in metropolitan areas in the U.S. will continue to be a front burner issue. Will we succeed in taming sprawl? Only modestly in my opinion, given the cultural attitudes toward the use of land and structural and institutional impediments.

## B. REVITALIZING CENTRAL CITIES

Finding the formula to revitalize our central cities is another long-lasting planning challenge. It's also one that's especially dear to my heart, because ever since I came to the University of Wisconsin I have been teaching a class on central city planning. What has changed about central cities over the years is the context and some of the dimensions of their problems. In the 1950's, 60's and most of the 70's, central cities were very much a front burner issue on the public agenda. A wide variety of programs were developed to try to stem the hemorrhage of suburban flight, resuscitate central city downtowns, keep jobs in the city, and cope with the growing underclass population.

So, what now? The federal government has pulled back from older city support programs in a big way. From 1981 to 1993, for example, there was a 60% drop in federal aid programs for cities, with assisted housing and employment and training programs getting the biggest hits. The CDBG program is still around, but with reduced funding. Clearly, public-private partnerships are filling some of the gaps. But not enough in my judgment, and the priorities of most of these partnerships are geared insufficiently to equity and social justice objectives.

Despite the hype about comeback cities, many cities are still ailing. Paul Grogan, the author of the recent book *Comeback Cities*, and also the founder of CEOs for Cities, writes with great optimism about cities, "Many are astonished at census reports showing that city after city had grown in population during the last decade." Yes, three of every four of the nation's largest cities gained population from 1990 to 2000. But when you peek under the blanket, what you still find are a lot of cities in the midwest and northeast regions still losing population. Consider that each of the following cities lost from 4% to 12% of their population

from 1990 to 2000—Milwaukee, Philadelphia, Louisville, Rochester, N.Y. City, New Haven, Albany, Cleveland, Detroit, Dayton, Washington, D.C., Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Syracuse, Buffalo, Baltimore, Gary, St. Louis, and Hartford.

For every NYC or Chicago, blessed with being global capitols, or Boston, blessed with its unique mix of economic, governmental, and educational amenities, or for that matter, Madison, there are a lot more struggling cities. Even Chicago, which gained population in 2000 for the first time in the last 40 years, still lost 15% of its white population. The pattern of white flight was replicated in many other older cities—Detroit fell below a million people in 2000 (its peak was in 1950 when it had over 2 million people) and it had the dubious distinction of losing more housing units—35,000—between 1990 and 2000 than any city in the country. Some parts of central cities now almost look like rural landscapes with vast stretches of abandoned vacant lands. Chicago has 70,000 vacant lots, Philadelphia 31,000, 18% of Trenton, NJ's land area (1.4 sq. miles) is vacant. High school dropout rates in poverty neighborhoods of many of these cities are as high as 50% to 60%. The pattern of poor people spatially concentrated in cities, with all the attendant problems associated with concentrated poverty, is still very much prevalent in the inner cities.

Even more sobering are the nearly 5 million young people in the 16-to-24 age group, most of them living in central cities, who are both out of school and out of work, vulnerable candidates for jails and other dead end institutions. Bob Herbert, a columnist for the NY Times, wrote recently (9/3/01) that "most lack basic job skills as well as solid literacy and numbers proficiencies. Yet this is the group that is most vulnerable and at-risk. Programs that used to provide support in the form of training and job placement for teenagers and young adults have fallen out of favor and been drastically cut over the past several years." Herbert concludes, "We have a choice. We can pay closer attention and choose to do right by these millions of youngsters. Or, we can sit back and ignore the growing problem and reap the long-term consequences."

The challenge is to make these ailing cities more viable. There are impressive things happening in many of these cities—e.g., downtowns are being revived; more people are living in, around, and

## CALL FOR E-MAIL ADDRESSES

Help us keep in touch with you, our greatest resource – URPL alumni! We'll be using email more often to update you on happenings at URPL. Make sure we have your email address, and as always, your current postal address.



Phil Lewis, Professor Emeritus of Landscape Architecture, talks about Jerry's career.

## KAUFMAN'S CAREER REMEMBERED

Participants of the recent URPL conference on Urban and Regional Planning in the 21st Century took special time out at a Friday evening reception to remember and honor the career of retiring Emeritus Professor Jerry Kaufman. With both ample tears and laughter along the way, former students and colleagues shared how Jerry had made so many positive contributions, in so many large and small ways.

near to the centers; cultural amenities are increasing; neighborhoods chalked off to blight are becoming habitable again through the efforts of public-private partnerships and community development corporations. But despite these signs of progress, many cities still harbor the great majority of their region's dependent population. I have a lot of empathy for the mayors of these cities. They have a very tough job. One win-win solution on paper would be to open up the suburbs, where most of the jobs are going to, and build more affordable housing in them where some central city lower income people could move to. This would lessen the burden on the central cities as more options became available for the poor to live throughout the metropolitan area. But, we all know there is strong resistance among many suburban communities to such a policy. Short of this solution, we need to zero in on what I believe is the critical policy issue for central cities—to make sure that the children of poor families in cities get a far better education than they are getting today. There are proven models of education, yet still not widely replicated, that work for inner city children. Consider the innovative work of the effective schools movement led by such pioneers as James Comer, Ted Sizer, Henry Levin, and Howard Gardner. Quality education is absolutely critically for these youngsters.

As the 21st century unfolds, there will continue to be winners and losers among cities. Although there are pockets of poverty in winner cities, it's the loser cities, with their much larger complement of poor people, where more targeted, sustained and effective action is vitally needed. These communities represent an imposing Gordian Knot problem for urban policy. They will continue to be a major planning challenge in the 21st century.

## C. IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE REGIONAL SOLUTIONS

Another recurring theme running through the history of American planning is the need to plan effectively at the regional scale for issues that transcend local government boundaries. The dilemma of metropolitan planning was characterized by one scholar in this way—"In the city, the whole governs while the parts advise. In the metropolitan area, however, the parts govern while the whole advises." Many institutions have been operating at the regional scale, some replicated widely; others having few imitators. In addition to the ubiquitous multi-county metropolitan and regional planning

agencies and councils of governments (COGs), there have been umbrella multi-jurisdictional organizations (UMJOs), quasi-metropolitan governments like the ones in the Twin-Cities and Portland, Oregon regions and now in the Atlanta region, inter-local government compacts, regional special districts, and city-county consolidated governments.

Looking as far back as the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, evidence of proposals pushing the envelope beyond what most metropolitan planning agencies or COGs have been able to do in recent times existed. In 1912, for example, the Massachusetts legislature created a three person committee (John Nolen, the well-known planner who left his mark on Madison, was one of the committee members). The state legislature charged the committee with studying growth issues in the Boston metropolitan area. The committee recommended creating a metropolitan planning board which would prepare a comprehensive plan for the entire metropolitan area. This agency would have power to review all plans of local governments in the region before they were carried out. If local plans conflicted with the area-wide plan, the metropolitan planning board could stay the execution of the local plan for a year (Gelfand). The Boston suburbs objected to this "strong" metropolitan planning agency and the recommendations of the committee never saw the light of day. An all too familiar story.

As people and economic activities have spread farther and farther out in metropolitan areas, communities should have developed a sense of greater interconnectedness, yet the reality was they retained less and less of such a sense. We know though that a strong regional community must see, think, and act cohesively. Finding ways of achieving that cohesiveness, that sense of common purpose and identity with the same regional place is the elusive element.

Myron Orfield and David Rusk are two of the leading proponents today calling for dealing with critical issues of growing instability and disparities at the metropolitan level. Rusk, in his book, *Inside Game Outside Game: Winning Strategies for Saving Urban America* (1999), sees the critical need for highly fragmented regions to "act as one". He calls for three policies to be implemented—adopting regional revenue or tax base sharing, requiring a fair share of low and moderate income housing in all suburban jurisdictions, and limiting sprawl through regional land use planning. Like Rusk, Orfield is big on the need for regional coalitions. In the conclusion to his book, *Metropolitica: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability*

(1997), he offers a number of lessons for building regional coalitions based on the Twin Cities Metropolitan Council experience. The premise both put forth is that metropolitan areas suffer from problems too massive for any city acting independently to confront alone.

The need for viable area-wide planning institutions with the capacity to deal effectively with the multiplicity of issues and problems that cut across local jurisdictional lines will continue to be paramount in the 21st century. Can we retain the advantages of localism while at the same time develop widespread support for regional comprehensive institutions that have the capacity to really make some dents in the tough issues that confront and will continue to confront most metropolitan areas in this country? This is clearly a major planning challenge that will continue to face us as the 21st century unfolds.

## D. GLOBALISM, THE NEW FRONTIER FOR PLANNING

Twelve years ago, I was invited to attend a workshop at SUNY-Buffalo. Some 30 people were there, almost all of whom taught courses in the international planning area, mostly focused on 3rd World countries. The workshop subsequently led to establishing the ACSP Global Planning Education Committee. I was invited not because of my credentials as an internationalist—I had few at the time—but because I was then the Vice President of ACSP. The workshop organizers figured that having a link to ACSP made sense strategically, so why not invite Kaufman. Given my inquisitive nature, I came away from Buffalo with two clear insights. There was no question that the global economy was here to stay and we planners better get our ducks in order to figure out what role we should be playing, given the inevitable impacts globalism would be having on American communities and regions.

During the past 10 years, living for a period of two years in the Netherlands, traveling to the Mideast and China, and visiting other parts of Western and Eastern Europe, I've become more interested in and better informed about globalism. It's hard not to become more informed, even living in the U.S., given the increased media attention to NAFTA, GATT, the WTO, and fast track authority; recent demonstrations in Seattle, Quebec, and Genoa against world trade organizations and multinational corporations; more and more corporations downsizing and moving parts of their production operations overseas to less developed countries to take advantage of cheaper labor; and the

corollary effects on the struggling U.S. labor union movement — in 2000, the union share had dropped to 13.5% of all workers and 9% of the private sector, the lowest in six decades (D. Moberg, p. 11, *The Nation*, Sept 3/10, 2001).

Even the academic planning journals are paying more attention to globalism. In the 90's, the *APA Journal* carried several informative articles on the Global Economy. One of the most provocative pieces I've read recently was by Ed Blakely in the Spring 2001 issue of the *APA Journal*, "Competitive Advantage for the 21st Century: Can a Place-Based Approach to Economic Development Survive in a Cyberspace Age?" Blakely, who ran against Jerry Brown for mayor of Oakland and came in second, is a highly regarded planning scholar. Currently he is Dean of the Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy at the New School University of New York. Here are some of the main propositions he puts forth about the impact that globalism will have on cities and regions in the U.S.:

- ▶ Computer technology-based globalization is driving economic mobility and changing the location of work globally. It is clearly the new paradigm for local economic development strategies with global commerce being central

### PLANNING IN THE 21ST CENTURY: WHAT'S NEW?

Professor Rick Chenoweth asserted that one thing that is new in the world of 21<sup>st</sup> century planning is the emergence of mature computer-based, land-use planning decision support systems. In this world, information technology is seen as an important tool for providing the information infrastructure that facilitates social interaction, interpersonal communication, and debate that attempts to achieve collective goals and deal with common concerns.

Chenoweth described Planning Analyst, a decision support tool that was used to assist the Town of Verona, Wisconsin in updating their land use plan. The goals of the Verona Project were to facilitate citizen-based "reasoning together", allow for flexible exploration of information needed

for land use planning, and make it possible for citizens to evaluate the impacts of plan alternatives as well as visualize alternative development patterns.

Planning Analyst was described as a set of off-the-shelf, currently available software programs that have been woven together by faculty at the University of Wisconsin—Madison and combined with existing land records data to produce a system useful for land use planning with a significant degree of public involvement. The system consists of four modules that collectively allow local planning efforts to address elements of the comprehensive plan described in Wisconsin's Smart Growth Legislation while engaging citizens in the process.

## SMART GROWTH SESSION

Associate Professor Brian Ohm organized and moderated a panel session comprised of URPL Alumni from around the country entitled “Smart Growth: State Approaches.” The panel included Steven Butler, AICP (MS 1983), Director of Planning and Community Development for the City of SeaTac, Washington; Kevin Tyjeski, AICP (MS 1984), Chief Planner, Growth Management Division for the City of Orlando, Florida; Sandra Pinel, AICP (MS 1979), Senior Planner/Sector Representative for the Metropolitan Council in St. Paul, Minnesota. Leah Kalinosky (MS 1999), Smart Growth Project Coordinator for the National Neighborhood Coalition in Washington, D.C., was scheduled to attend but had to cancel at the last minute because of difficulties leaving Washington, D.C., due to the closing of National Airport following the September 11th tragedies.

During the session, Professor Ohm reviewed recent “smart growth” and comprehensive planning legislation in Wisconsin. Panel members offered their perspectives on recent “smart growth” activities in the context of existing state-wide or regional growth management programs in their respective states.

to even the smallest community’s job prospects (p. 133).

- ▶ In fields like insurance, finance, and graphic arts, the transition to a global work force will be evident soon. Retailing and similar face-to-face industries are not exempt from this trend as the Internet is increasingly used as a bazaar of enormous power, (pp. 136–37).
- ▶ Workstations for electronic migrants may be set up any place, from home to telework centers, and workers will be perma-temps.
- ▶ Since employers will not offer long term jobs, the best benefit will be the quality of life in the community in which the worker lives (p. 137). Local governments will need to increase the livability of ten communities to attract talent, the prime resource to generate new wealth and new firms (p. 139). A city’s outstanding cultural resources can become a central economic tool for the development of Internet distribution firms as well as for tourism....Local schools can create learning companies to sell their curricula to other schools around the world via electronic clearinghouses....Nontraditional health care and other community attributes can be magnified to world scale through regional cooperative governmental institutions.
- ▶ In this new environment, the role of government has to be totally rethought, (a) It is possible to imagine cities offering tax breaks to young talented workers-e.g. offering home loan programs-in the same way they lured firms. (b) Until now government has attempted to regulate and shape economic activity. This was an important role when land was the basic resource. As cyberspace becomes the economic backbone and prime resource of commerce, government will have to become a partner in the development of new technology resources, just as it was a partner in the development of spatial resources for the manufacturing economy. (c) Local governments will need to act as incubators for the creation of ideas that spawn new firms rather than to try to attract firms that may not fit the community’s human resource base. (d) Governments need to turn their attention to investing and away from tax incentives as a device to revitalize distressed communities (p. 139). (e) Local governments will need to form new regional institutional arrangements that build a region’s competitive identity to create and sustain networks of specialized expertise.

- ▶ The roles of planner and problem solver will be central for the creative governments in the next decades (p. 139).

Now one doesn’t have to agree with everything Blakely says in this provocative piece-e.g., I think that loyalties to place in the decentralized corporate environment are still intact and still growing-but his recent article highlights for me the need for planners to understand what is going on in this new age of globalism, and particularly how these changes are going to impact American communities and regions, not only their economies and job markets, but their environment, transportation, and land use systems, as well as equity issues, neighborhoods, and other aspects of community health.

The challenge for American planners is to get on board now and become important players in the inevitable policy discussions that will ensue. The alternative is to trail behind, even be left behind by continuing to play with the marbles we are all too familiar with. Whatever our political predilections about the global economy and the power of multi-national corporations, planners need to become much better informed about the way in which the changing global economy will affect the communities they serve and the diverse populations that live in them. The globalism train is clearly on the move.

## E. MOVING INTO THE FOOD SYSTEM

In my years at URPL, I’ve always had a yen to poke around in virgin, relatively unexplored territories. In the late 1970s, with my colleague, Beth Howe, we began digging into the uncharted field of planning ethics. Mainly through our publications, we played an important role in raising the visibility of ethics to the planning education and practitioner communities. The same curiosity bug led me to do research into other relatively uncharted areas-e.g., alternative dispute resolution, urban education policies, and corporate strategic planning and its application to public planning (with Harvey Jacobs).

Five years ago, I plunged into still another unexplored territory for planning. This one was the community food system. Ken Shapiro, the U. of Wisconsin College of Agriculture and Life Sciences’ Associate Dean for International Relations, asked me to direct a new project, the Madison Food System Project, one of the on-going

projects of the newly created Wisconsin Food System Partnership funded by the Kellogg Foundation. At the time my knowledge of the food system was decidedly limited, so I hesitated. But, after a bit of hard reflection, I accepted his invitation to head this new project. I did so in part because of the realization that here was one whopper of a hole in the planning field. Consider that planning as a discipline prides itself on being comprehensive in scope and distinguished by its focus on numerous functional systems—e.g. land use, housing, transportation, the environment, the economy—that make up the community. Consider also that food, along with water and air are the three essentials of life. Yet, for all intents and purposes, the food system was a virtual stranger to the planning field. It was absent from the writings of planning scholars, from the plans prepared by planning practitioners, and from the classrooms in which planning students are taught.

As I poked around this new turf, along the way I convinced a couple of first-rate young colleagues—Kami Pothukuchi, now at Wayne State U. and Marcia Caton Campbell, a mainstay of our current faculty at URPL—to join me in the search. But something else happened on my journey. As I became more and more knowledgeable about the food system—i.e. the chain of activities connecting food production, processing, distribution, wholesaling, consumption, and waste management—the links to planning became clearer and clearer. The food system affects the local economy, the environment, public health, and the quality of neighborhoods in significant ways. It also is closely interconnected with the community’s transportation, housing, and land use systems.

Consider the following connections and impacts:

*re: the local economy.* In 1992, 53% of all retail jobs in Madison were food sector jobs. Food sector establishments like restaurants, fast food places, supermarkets, taverns, and food wholesaling are an important part of any city’s economy and employment base.

*re: the environment.* Including food packaging, food wastes make up close to a third of the total waste that ends up in many city landfills. City water pollution problems are exacerbated when chemical fertilizers and pesticide used on farms in the region find their way into local water systems. The “Ghost Acres” phenomenon is an environmental externality rarely considered. The UK food system sucks in the food products of other people’s land and seas to the tune of 4.1 million hectares (9 million acres) (Tim Lang).

*re: public health.* Epidemiological studies show that poor diet is a more significant cause of cancer than smoking. In the U.K. the cost of diet-related diseases are immense—coronary heart disease, significantly affected by diet, costs the UK economy 10 billion pounds a year. (Tim Lang). Racial and ethnic minority communities concentrated in urban areas face a higher than average risk of diet-related health problems (obesity, heart, diabetes), because their diets are characterized by a higher fat content.

*re: quality of neighborhood.* As I noted, in many older cities in the U.S. there are vast stretches of abandoned land filled with weeds and bottle-strewn lots. Community-based urban agriculture projects—e.g., community gardens or projects that grow food for sale in farmers markets, to local food stores, and to local restaurants—makes food production a viable reuse option for such derelict lands. One positive outcome would be improvement of the environmental and psychological quality of some inner city neighborhoods.

*re: housing.* Because affordable housing is in short supply in cities, poorer residents are often at greater risk of hunger due to the lesser short-term consequences of reducing food intake over defaulting on rent payments.

*re: transportation.* Because many supermarkets have left poorer inner city areas and because the poor have fewer cars, the quality of a city’s transit system becomes a major factor affecting the ability of low income residents to access affordable food stores. Half of the fruits and vegetables that come to Wisconsin are transported from California, traveling over a distance of 2,000 miles; energy costs involved in transportation—sometimes referred to as

## PANEL ON CENTRAL CITY HEALTH AND REVITALIZATION

Lively and spirited presentations on three older American cities—Chicago, Baltimore, and Milwaukee—were given by three URPL alumni: Alicia Mazur Berg (MS 1990), Commissioner, Chicago Department of Planning; Zach Holl (MS 1995), Coordinator, Neighborhood Planning Program, Baltimore Department of Planning; and Welford Sanders (MS 1974), Assistant Professor, Department of Planning, UW–Milwaukee and Executive Director, Martin Luther

King Economic Development Corporation, Milwaukee. Each panelist discussed key issues, conundrums and challenges facing the cities they worked in as the 21<sup>st</sup> century unfolds. They also offered their views on some of the key strategies being pursued and speculated about what their cities would look like by 2010. Their assessments about older central cities in the metropolitan context ranged from sobering to hopeful.



*Kaufman and Alicia Mazur Berg, Commissioner, Chicago Department of Planning, share a moment at the URPL Conference.*

## PANEL ON INTERNATIONAL PLANNING

The panel “Globalization and International Dimensions of Planning” was organized by Profs. Victoria Beard and Harvey Jacobs. Presentations were made by Prof. Jack Huddleston, Prof. Harvey Jacobs, and Ellen Bassett (Ph.D. 2001, M.S. 1989, and currently a visiting assistant professor at Michigan State University). Harvey Jacobs focused on the global change since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, and the attempt by the western countries to internationalize the social institutions of democracy, market economies, and devolved decision making. He suggested there was good reason to be skeptical a decade later

about the success of this experiment. Ellen Bassett drew from her experiences in East Africa (Kenya and Uganda) to discuss the way international aid organizations establish and shift their priorities, and the difficulty of engaging in long-term planning for poverty alleviation in this type of environment. Jack Huddleston drew from his experiences in Sri Lanka and Indonesia to ponder on what the focus of development assistance really should be; like his panel colleagues, he worried that the focus of technical assistance and aid funds is too often far from the locus of the real problem.

Harvey M. Jacobs

the food miles issue—are external costs that are rarely considered.

*re: loss of agricultural land.* The amount of agricultural land being converted to developed uses is steadily increasing. Between 1992 and 1997, more than 6 million acres of agricultural land in the U.S. was converted to developed uses. This translates to an average annual agricultural land conversion rate of roughly 1.2 million acres per year between 1992 and 1997, a 51 percent increase above the average annual rate reported for 1982 to 1992 (American Farmland Trust drawing data from the Natural Resource Inventory conducted by USDA and the Natural Resources Conservation Service).

Not only is the food system a big conceptual hole in planning, but I’m convinced that planners have much to contribute to strengthening local food systems and food system planning. Indeed, the emerging “healthy cities” and sustainability movements in planning have raised the importance of goals related to healthful food consumption and regional self-reliance in food. My hope is that the food system will become of more and more interest to planners. I’ll be doing my best to make this happen, even in retirement.

## F. RESURRECTING THE ROLE OF PLANNERS AS VISIONARIES

In 1954 when I became a planning student at the University of Pennsylvania, my recollection is that the faculty wanted its students to be capable of performing as first-rate planning analysts who would work for local and regional planning agencies, to be up on the latest social science methods, and to be able to do comprehensive planning integrating physical planning with the newly emerging fields of economic development and social planning. Since most of the students were left leaning in their political views, issues of poverty, social justice, and equity were prominent among us. Interest in environmental issues was moderate at best, since the environmental movement had not yet burst onto the public agenda. And the rational planning model had not yet come in for heavier bombardment from the emerging crop of planning theorists.

The 1960s was the decade when the attack on rational planning started to pick up a head of steam. One stream of critics was ideological. Planners were chastised for becoming, in the words of some of them, handmaidens to conservative politics (Alan Kravitz), bureaucrats who had sold out, and “soft cops” for their complicity in the sins of

urban renewal (Robert Goodman, *After the Planners*). First came the advocate planners, followed by the radical planners, then the transactive planners, and later the equity planners.

Criticisms of planners for their adherence to the deficient rational planning model, coupled with calls for planners to play other roles, emanated from other quarters. Among the plethora of roles for planners that came pouring out of the academy in the ensuing decades of the 20th century were for planners to be incrementalists, mixed scanners, educators, strategists, boundary spanners, facilitators, conflict resolvers, consensus builders, coalition builders, negotiators, mediators, coordinators, providers of timely services to citizens viewed as their customers, covert activists, overt activists, deal makers, and deliberative practitioners.

But one role was missing from the late 20th century discourse about planner roles. And that is the old-fashioned notion of planners as visionaries. As I age, I find myself having an increasing, albeit grudging respect for the bravura of some of the early planning visionaries who offered form and quality to the places in which we live. These were people like Frederick Law Olmstead, Daniel Burnham, John Nolen, and Clarence Stein. Later came Edmund Bacon (the imperious and commanding planning director of Philadelphia in the post World War II years of the 40s and 50s), Alan Jacobs (a similar kind of planning director for San Francisco in the 1960s) and even the current group of new urbanists led by Andres Duany. I would add Ian McHarg and Phil Lewis to that list among more contemporary form-giving visionaries. This change of heart, mind you, comes from someone who has been teaching a class over the years aimed at helping planners become more effective in the constrained decision-making environments in which they work. Being politically savvy, skillful as strategists, and adept in building consensus are some of the key attributes I've been pushing for planners. Even more so, I find myself gaining greater respect for the non-form givers, visionaries who provided clear paths leading to more livable, equitable, or sustainable communities. Among them are Lewis Mumford, Benton MacKaye, Rexford Tugwell, Paul Davidoff, Norm Krumholz, and Dale Bertsch.

Michael Brooks, a professor of planning at Virginia Commonwealth University, was one of the rare voices in the past few decades to champion a visionary role for planners in a 1998 *APA Journal*

article he wrote titled, "Four Critical Junctures in the History of the Urban Planning Profession". Brooks took contemporary planners to task for questing too much for things like political efficacy, private-sector validation, and academic respectability. In the conclusion of his article, he wrote:

"In my view, we sorely need to return to the Utopian tradition in planning. The urban planning profession *needs a new generation of visionaries, people who dream of a better world, and who are capable of designing the means to attain it*. That, after all, is the essence of planning: to visualize the ideal future community, and to work towards its realization. It is a much-needed role in our communities....Let us restore the planning profession to its historic mission....Ultimately, we must confront and deal with the *soul of the profession*. It is a soul enriched by the works of creative and dedicated figures in our history....It is a soul influenced immeasurably by those who have reminded us of the critical responsibilities we bear for the well-being of all who reside in the communities we purport to serve."

Brooks stirred up a hornet's nest when his article was published. He was criticized by some for being misguided, impractical, naive, and misreading planning history. I too had qualms about some of his contentions. But I admired him for reminding us of the reasons why planning attracted many of us in the first place, and I hope still attracts many of us who now enter the field. Sure, we all want good paying jobs and security. Sure, we all know that planners operate in a political context and that context places some powerful and formidable constraints on what we can do and accomplish as planners. And sure, we all know about the importance of real not fake public participation, where citizens of all persuasions play a key role in the planning process. But, more planners could still return to a place some of their forebears occupied with pride and without queasiness, by reasserting themselves as visionaries who can raise the public's interest in ideas that stimulate, inspire, challenge, even soar above what might be deemed practical and possible. In this way, some planners could return to a hallowed role that gets closer to the soul of our profession.

## CHECK OUT OUR WEBSITE

We invite you to visit the URPL website at [www.wisc.edu/urpl](http://www.wisc.edu/urpl). Now more than ever, the site provides the most complete up to date information about:

- ▶ Happenings at URPL – new positions available / projects, publications and research / academic programs and courses / faculty / students
- ▶ Alumni news
- ▶ History of the URPL Department (available in PDF format)

## URPL HISTORY PUBLICATION

A new publication, the History of the URPL Department, has recently been made available. This booklet presents the evolution of the Department from its formal establishment in 1962 at the University of Wisconsin – Madison to the current day, including contributions by faculty members towards the formation of the Department’s goals.

Check out this exciting publication!

Available on our website at [www.wisc.edu/urpl](http://www.wisc.edu/urpl). To request a paper copy, contact the Department by email: [rclapiz@facstaff.wisc.edu](mailto:rclapiz@facstaff.wisc.edu) or telephone 608-262-1004.



Alumni Panel on Career Development Pathways

## CONCLUSION

As I was preparing this talk, I thought back to an editorial in the *American Society of Planning Officials Newsletter* (March 1965) written by Dennis O’Harrow. O’Harrow was the Executive Director of ASPO, the non-profit organization I worked for in the 1960’s that serviced planning agencies throughout the country. Taciturn by nature, with a keen sense of humor, one who suffered fools lightly, and at times was acerbic in his criticisms of planning and planners, O’Harrow was a first-rate writer who wrote terse, lively, highly readable prose about any and all planning subjects in his monthly editorials. The title of the editorial I recalled was “What Price Half-Life?” He wrote, “The ideas contained in books, speeches, articles, reports in planning (or any other field) are forgotten and tend to become useless very rapidly: they lose their value at a geometrical rate, best expressed through a measurement of their half-life.” He went on to describe the half-life concept in terms of the Curies’ discovery in 1898 of the first new radioactive element, which they named polonium: “Within six months polonium had lost half its radioactivity. At the end of the second six months, the radioactivity was halved again, down to a fourth of the original potency, and so on until the radioactivity is so minute that it can no longer be measured.” O’Harrow then mused: “The only proper way to measure the continued usefulness of ideas in a book is its probable half-life. In other words, how long will the ideas last?...The trick is not to judge a book by its cover, but by its probable half life.”

Well, I’ve given you my list of planning challenges for the 21st century. I envision taming sprawl, the necessity of resolving the problems of older cities, and finding the elusive key to achieving effective regional action as long-standing and continuing challenges. Each has had a long half-

life in my judgment, and that half-life will continue into the 21st century. Globalization will most assuredly join the ranks of significant challenges to American planners. It too will have a long half-life. Planning for the community food system is an issue that has barely peaked its head over the blanket. I’m hopeful that as this decade unfolds, its status will be elevated and its half-life lengthened. The visionary role for planners has been with us before. But it has been taking a long snooze as we planners have tried to fit ourselves into the mold of being useful and productive bureaucrats and responsive servants to the public. It is time to awaken from the slumber and get back in touch with what we stand for as a profession and discipline. By doing so, some planners, acting as visionaries in the 21st century, will be rewarded with a longer half-life.

## KAUFMAN SCHOLARSHIP FUND ESTABLISHED

A scholarship fund for Urban and Regional Planning department students has been established in honor of Professor Jerry Kaufman’s retirement after almost three decades of teaching and service to the community. The intent of the scholarship fund is to establish ongoing support for students in the department, using the interest generated from an established principal in the fund. To date, the fund has grown to almost \$7,000 via gifts from alumni, friends, faculty and emeriti faculty. Checks to the Jerry Kaufman scholarship fund can be sent to the department, made out to the UW Foundation referencing the Jerry Kaufman Scholarship Fund.

## CAREER DEVELOPMENT PATHWAYS — ROADS TRAVELED

Graduates from the Department have taken a number of very diverse career paths. Very different job markets and changing planning priorities have influenced some of these career paths. The conference planning committee tried to capture some of these experiences with an alumni panel that focused on Career Development Pathways. The panel included the following URPL alumni:

**Steve Butler** (MS 1983), AICP, Director of Planning and Community Development, City of Sea Tac, Washington

**Stephen Friedman** (MS 1971), S.B. Friedman & Company, Chicago, IL

**Elaine Harrington** (MS 1991), Executive Director, Rockford Park District Foundation, Rockford, IL

**Joy Stieglitz** (1994), Principal, Vandewalle & Associates, Madison, WI

**Kevin Tyjeski** (MS 1984), AICP City of Orlando, Growth Management Division, Orlando, FL

Many insights were shared during the panel discussion that should be of interest to present and future URPL students. Steve Butler talked about the importance of being able to communicate planning options with visual images. He emphasized the fact that planners need to know how to use graphics and pictures to tell a story.

While most people think of the for-profit sector as being competitive, Stephen Friedman talked about the ways in which they have partnered with other consulting firms in the Chicago area. While he entered the field of planning as a means of improving communities, he has often been described as being a salesman of good ideas. He noted that entrepreneurs need to find an environment that supports entrepreneurs.

Joy Stieglitz feels that a generalist background was very helpful and that her diverse backgrounds and interdisciplinary studies are

coming together at Vandewalle & Associates. She was heavily influenced by her family background in planning and architecture and still remembers her father saying, "Joy, you are going to save the planet." She regrets not having more design, site planning, and economic development training. It was available, but at the time she just wasn't interested. Her internship experience at the DNR and Vandewalle provided good practical work experience.

Elaine Harrington lamented the fact that it took nearly 10 years to finish college. She started out in Social Services with a focus on children and the elderly but became increasingly interested in systems thinking and building the capacity of communities, as opposed to building individual capacity. She is not directly involved in planning in her current job but is focused on land purchases for the Park Foundation as well as building major gifts (and recently received a \$3 million land gift).

The APA resume service got Kevin Tyjeski a job in Florida without him ever having applied for the job. He became immediately immersed in city planning issues. He highly recommends going to a small community for the first planning job. He feels that in a small community, you have to do everything. After receiving his MBA degree, he had a choice between a job on Wall Street or the job in Orlando. He has been in Orlando for six years and feels that the city has difficulties in finding enough planners with a planning degree.

Clearly there were many more insights shared by the group, but these comments help reflect the diverse work being pursued by URPL graduates around the globe.

Professor Andrew B. Lewis  
Community Development Specialist  
University of Wisconsin Extension  
Center for Community Economic  
Development



Christine Thisted

## ALUMNI SPOTLIGHT:

### Christine Thisted (M.S. 1995), Executive Director of the Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation.

#### *Interview by Dana Lucero*

Christine Thisted, a fifth generation Wisconsinite, grew up in Mukwonago where, with its proximity to the southern unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest, she learned about the wonders of hiking from her grandmother. In 1993 Christine received a degree in anthropology from UW–Milwaukee.

From there she began the Masters program at URPL. In her words, “I received a well-rounded education as an URPL student, thanks in part to excellent guidance provided by my advisor, Steve Born. My elective course work varied from small watershed engineering and limnology to water policy and regional planning, and although in unexpected ways they have all proven to be useful those that emphasized the role of partnerships – public/private and multi-governmental – in natural resource planning were immediately relevant and have remained so.”

After finishing the program in the spring of 1995, Christine worked for the both the River Alliance and the Lake Michigan Federation. In the fall of the same year she began to work for the Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation as a field coordinator where she worked to acquire land for the Ice Age Trail. Christine describes the 43-year-old Foundation as a “non-profit organization that works to build, maintain and protect the Ice Age National Scenic Trail. The Ice Age Trail is one of

only eight national scenic trails in the nation, an honor it shares with the Appalachian and Pacific Crest Trails. When complete, the IAT will meander for 1,200 miles among Wisconsin’s world-

class glacial features, connecting villages in the manner of the European walking paths and traveling through areas of the state wild enough to be home to wolves. The Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation works in partnership with the National Park Service; Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; other state and federal agencies; 31 counties; hundreds of cities, towns and villages; thousands of private property owners and over 5000 volunteers.”

Thisted now serves as Executive Director of the Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation. She also serves on the board of directors of the American Hiking Society and the leadership council of the Partnership for the National Trail System.

Christine and her husband Corry, who were married in July 2001, reside in Madison on the shore of Lake Monona. When reflecting on her experience at URPL, she gives the following advice to students. “If I have anything to suggest, it is that URPL students keep an open mind regarding professional opportunities that planners may consider less traditional. When charting your professional future, don’t overlook the non-profit sector – many organizations can use your expertise to do inspiring and substantive work, organizations where you can make a direct and immediate difference.”

---

## CHAIR

*continued from page 1*

The faculty is constantly reinvigorated by the success and contributions of our alumni. The URPL Alumni Advisory Council met after the Conference, and there is a broadly-based consensus about doing a better job of staying in touch with one of our greatest resources – our alumni. To that end, we’ll be using email more often to update alums on happenings at URPL (make sure we have your email address!), and will be devoting a portion of our website to alumni news (let us know about changes in your lives). We intend to focus on the Alumni Advisory Council’s efforts in our spring newsletter.

We’re anticipating a very busy year on campus. Our M.S. Planning Program will be reviewed by the Planning Accreditation Board Site Visit Team this winter. During the same period, the campus is reviewing our doctoral program. Both of these exercises will involve interaction with alumni and we will be looking forward enthusiastically to the results of these review activities. Finally, we’re looking ahead to the National American Planning Association Conference in Chicago in April 2002. In conjunction with our Chicago region alumni and friends, we’ll be hosting a reception at the Conference and hope to see many familiar faces there.

## ACSP 2001—HIGHLIGHTS AND IMPRESSIONS

The Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning met for its annual conference in November in downtown Cleveland. The theme for this year's meeting was "Building Bridges to Sustainable Neighborhoods, Cities and Regions." While the events mid-September seemed to dampen international attendance, more than 600 scholars of planning from across North America participated.

It is probably impossible to capture the essence of a conference as diverse as ACSP 2001. The conference now comprises no less than 14 'tracks' which range from 'analytical methods and computer applications' through to 'planning education and pedagogy' and 'urban design'. In between lie tracks—each running four days—on planning theory, environmental planning, housing and community development and international development planning. If at any particular time there was nothing on the program to sate the curiosity of an individual delegate, there was the delight of the hallway—where friend-

ships and acquaintances were constantly being affirmed and

created. Those venturing outside were pleasantly surprised with downtown Cleveland and, in particular, the newly renovated warehouse district, now home to a wide range of bars and restaurants.

Sharing some (highly individual) impressions of the meeting might be the best way to provide a glimpse of ACSP 2001. For this delegate, an important moment came in a roundtable on planning theory in which Bob Beauregard (The New School) and John Forester (Cornell) debated the communicative turn in planning theory. Beauregard lamented the dominance of the focus on micro-politics, best represented by Forester's work over the past decade, and called for a renewed discourse on the structural and institutional dimensions of the public sphere and their implications for planning. To some extent, this exchange echoed a broader, if insipient, discourse about the limits of communicative theory, perhaps inspired by a recent edition of the *Journal of Planning*

Education and Research devoted to this topic. One senses another major turn in our theorizing of planning is imminent.

This delegate was also impressed by the breadth and quality of the papers presented in the international development planning track. Indeed, if the environmental planning track occasionally disappointed, solace in the form of quality papers and spirited debate on questions of natural resource management could be found in the international track. Here, one could engage in critical dialogue about the new mantra of environmental planning: collaboration.

The Madison contingent was a substantial one. In addition to six faculty, a bevy of other Badgers, comprising current and former graduate students, some now teaching at other institutions, created a formidable presence. With three new hires in the offing, and a gaggle of new PhD students, URPL will no doubt make its mark on ACSP 2002 in Baltimore. Go Badgers!

Marcus Lane

---

## Keep Us Posted!

We will be creating an alumni database soon, and communicating via email more often. At this time, we have email for only 30%; WE NEED EVERYONE'S!

Have you moved?  Yes  No

When did you graduate from URPL? \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

New Address: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### MAIL THIS FORM TO:

#### connections

Department of Urban and Regional Planning  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Old Music Hall/925 Bascom Mall  
Madison, WI 53706

E-mail: rclapiz@facstaff.wisc.edu

## VISITING SCHOLAR FROM YOGYAKARTA

The Department was pleased to co-host Professor Mubyarto from Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta, Indonesia during the first months of the Fall semester. The visit was arranged by Assistant Professor Victoria Beard, financed by the College of Letters and Science and supported administratively by the Center for Southeast Asian Studies. Professor Mubyarto's visit is part of the Department's increasing profile and suite of activities in international development planning.

Professor Mubyarto has led a distinguished scholarly career in Indonesia and abroad, specializing in poverty alleviation, community-based planning, and the eco-

nomics of development. He also spent several years working for Indonesia's National Planning

Board (BAPPENAS) where he designed one of the country's most ambitious village-level poverty alleviation programs. During his visit he provided a series of guest lectures in a new graduate seminar dealing with decentralized planning in Southeast Asia offered by Professor Beard. Governmental and fiscal decentralization has emerged, in recent years, as the central 'development' agenda in many developing countries. Nowhere is the experiment in decentralization more radical than in Indonesia. Here, the decentralization agenda is simultaneously being promoted by multilateral aid agencies such as the World Bank and the Asia Development Bank on the grounds of enhanced functionality, and by

the central government itself as a means of coping with centrifugal political forces that are straining for autonomy and independence.

While on campus, Professor Mubyarto gave a number of seminars, public talks, and visited with UW-Madison colleagues and acquaintances, developed over a lifetime of international scholarship, in the Departments of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Political Science, the Center for Southeast Asian Studies, and La Follette. On her return to Jakarta over the winter break, Professors Beard and Mubyarto will resume their collaboration on a number of research projects. In addition, Professor Mubyarto is expected to return to URPL in April 2002 for a further visit.

**connections**  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Department of Urban and Regional Planning  
925 Bascom Mall, Music Hall  
Madison, WI 53706



place  
stamp  
here