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Update from the 2016 National Planning Conference

Since the initiation of APA’s new executive director Jim Drinan, and election of the most recent national APA board, a number of new and exciting things are happening at APA National! Here are just a few that most directly impact you as a member:

1) The rollout of the new www.planning.org website! If you haven’t logged CM credits or otherwise used the new website, check it out. This website is mobile friendly and easy to navigate. It is much easier to log credits, search for information about National APA and Divisions happenings and initiatives, and overall a more visually pleasing site. This is truly a feather in the cap of the national group.

2) Revamping Certification Maintenance. APA is reexamining policies that have been on the gripe list for many years. These policies include allowing chapters to review their own CM submissions for local conferences, considering amnesty for AICP members who have lapsed in the tough economy, and reconsidering lifetime and retired AICP dues.

3) Emerging Professionals/Student Programs. After a few years with the new emerging professional program, the APA staff and board are considering changes to the program to reduce the cost of membership for students, and making the program easier to understand and follow.

4) Long-term planning. For the first time ever, the APA board adopted a 20 year Development Plan. This is intended to track initiatives over time and through board changes so that APA can have more stability in their strategic direction. This also allows all the components (which includes divisions, chapters, staff, AICP Commission, and the Board) to align around similar values.

These are just some of the exciting changes going on at National APA. I encourage you to get more involved in APA, either by considering joining the APA-MN board (nominations are open NOW), or by getting involved in one of the topical Divisions at APA. Divisions are a great way to enhance your network and perspective to the national planning arena, and bring ideas to your communities from around the country.

Breanne Rothstein

APA MN President
The Orfield-Goetz Debate

By Karl Schuettler

The University of Minnesota is the home to two high-profile housing scholars who are highly articulate, impassioned advocates, and hate each other’s guts. In one corner of the great housing debate is Ed Goetz, a professor at the Humphrey School of Public Affairs and head of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs. His sparring partner is Myron Orfield, a law professor who served in state congress for twelve years who heads the U of M’s Center on Race and Policy. I’m the sort of person who can be entertained by high academic drama, so I’ve spent a chunk of the past year exploring their dispute, from participating in an abortive effort to get them to debate in person to settling for taking both of their classes at once. Today, Goetz’s class finally fleshed out their debate in full, giving me a chance to be accused of being a “closet integrationist,” among other things. (We were assigned sides, and being myself, I was trolling pretty hard.)

In its simplest form, the Orfield-Goetz debate boils down to this: Orfield’s acolytes believe that the most effective way to create opportunity for low-income populations and people of color is to scatter more affordable housing throughout a metropolitan area. An agenda of full-scale desegregation is the most effective way to improve educational and economic outcomes, and policies that further concentrate low-income people in center cities or declining suburbs only reinforce cycles of poverty. Goetz’s backers, while not opposed to scattered-site housing, believe it is overly paternalistic to speak of moving black people to white neighborhoods so that they can benefit from living around white people. Goetz claims there is an affordable housing crisis in all parts of cities, and that we can’t be too picky about the siting; abandoning work in currently distressed areas will only make them worse.

The main point of contention appears to be Orfield’s treatment of community development corporations and other affordable housing developers that do the bulk of their work in already distressed areas. He calls out these developers for perpetuating inequalities, marshaling social science data to show the clear improved outcomes for low-income individuals living in “neighborhoods of opportunity.” Goetz counters by noting the extreme political obstacles to desegregation, a lack of evidence demonstrating success when programs are implemented, and the troubles left behind when investment pulls out of areas that are already struggling. He also questions the data and methods Orfield uses to arrive at his conclusions.

I can posture easily on either side, and it’s easy to toss about charges of racism or segregationism here and there. In this blog post, however, you’re stuck with me, so you’re going to get an unsatisfying and complicated answer. In writing this, I’m making some gross over-simplifications to reflect general perspectives in a debate; both scholars are considerably more complicated than this. Goetz in particular seems to appreciate a good argument wherever it comes from, and just finds Orfield’s lacking.
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Orfield is something of a persona non grata in the urban planning program, but I’m still glad I sought out his class this semester, and doubt my planner colleagues would be as dismissive of him if they heard his in-person pitch. His perspective is a unique one, and he brings in new dimensions, such as schools. Urban planning, for reasons I do not entirely understand, rarely discusses education policy, and yet it is perhaps the biggest driver of residential choice out there. Case in point: both Orfield and Goetz, along with a whole host of U of M academ-ics, live in Southwest Minneapolis, the one corner of the city with strong public schools. As someone who spends a little too much time over-thinking how I’ll handle this sort of decision when I have kids of my own, I can’t fault them at all. One’s own children are often where ideals go to die.

Goetz won’t dispute education’s potential, though the two can wrangle over the details. Still, one of the most striking things about this argument is the amount of common ground that these two share. Both seem to have fairly similar politics, are well-versed in the major literature and court cases around the issue, and infuse plenty of nuance into their arguments. They know housing policy doesn’t operate in isolation. In their debates, they tend to agree on 95 percent of things. And yet somehow that other five percent has become deeply personal, to the point that they won’t appear on stage together.

Both make the argument that the other side wants to limit choice, with the Orfield vision forcing people out into suburbs they may not want to live in and the Goetz version preventing people from any access to the potential perks of higher-income communities. (Neither one will work alone; both acknowledge this.) Both views appear overly idealistic in their own way, as Orfield puts his faith in the glacial tide of Fair Housing Act enforcement to create meaningful anti-segregation measures, while Goetz’s side would like to think that investment in long-suffering neighborhoods will somehow flip trends that have seemed so intractable for so long. (Fair points on both sides.)

Goetz’s most powerful counterpoint to Orfield’s skepticism of focus on already distressed areas has its roots in history: the current situation in inner cities is the direct result of decades of disinvest-ment, both public and private, and pushing people to leave will only further the decline. These places aren’t going away, and people will continue to live there. The only response here is deeply cynical: how can anyone in the housing world, knowing what has happened over time, trust that politics won’t continue to reinforce these divides? Better to hedge one’s bets and build things where wealthy white people will continue to live, as these areas will continue to do well, say Orfield’s people. The courts, at least, can push through a pro-integration agenda while being somewhat shielded from public opinion. The dreams of serious investment in distressed areas won’t work barring a political revolution, and even then, it threatens to degenerate into an us-versus-them dynamic that ends poorly for everyone.
Orfield is perhaps at his most radical when he attacks self-segregation by people of color: in his view, an all-Somali school in Minneapolis that seeks to empower its students is an unacceptable obstacle to integration. The question, then, is whether the right to self-determination and the bonds built by such concentrated schools and neighborhoods trump the social science that shows questionable outcomes. What’s the real goal here, the freedom to choose one’s own way, or a cohesive and fully integrated nation-state? As Orfield would ask, can separate schools and neighborhoods truly be equal? Or are we content to measure “success” on each community’s own terms, with no relation to the other?

The trouble here is that the “black community” (or any other racial or ethnic group, including white people) is not a monolith. Some people want to live around people who look like them, some actively want to live in diverse places, and plenty of people outside of academia or in certain chambers that react directly to it (where racial issues are always lurking under the surface even when not explicit) don’t care a whole lot. We have results from racial preference surveys that show that, for example, blacks and whites have different ideal “racial mixes” for their neighborhoods, and these dynamics, barring outside forces, will trend toward re-segregation. Still, all of this seems a horribly crude way to think about public policy and the people involved. Goetz points out that we often blur the line between whether housing policy focuses on places or people, and how one deals with that has serious implications.

When a couple of students discussed the debate with Goetz at the start of the school year, he expressed discomfort with two white men in their respective ivory towers deciding the fate of residents of low-income housing. It’s a fair point, and one consistent with his broader argument: the people who live in these places should be driving these decisions. For Orfield, on the other hand, higher ideals overpower the choices of individuals, which may on the whole create collective action problems as everyone acts in their own sorry self-interests. It’s an ancient debate, one that hearkens back to Aristotle observing the world around him while Plato looked to the sky in search of the perfect vision.

I started planning school because I was pulled by the instincts that guide Goetz: to build communities from the ground up. I still tend in that direction, though I’ve rediscovered some sense of ambition and a few crosses worth dying on, to say nothing of disgust with the bureaucratic morass that has pulled out my inner Robert Moses at times. My decidedly unsatisfying conclusion is to preach patience: collect more data, run more studies on what works, let different places experiment with different approaches to see what they can achieve. And whichever direction we go, invest more, period.

I’m glad both Goetz and Orfield do what they do, because these questions don’t have easy answers, and this sort of honest debate is exactly what future planners need to wrestle with. As proud as we may be for seeing the light and coming to this program with our visions of how the world could be better, we still should be in awe of our own ignorance and inability to “solve” things with a few easy ideas. That ignorance should not inspire sadness at our smallness in the face of the world, but relish: we have a problem to attack here, and we need to get to the bottom of it. This is what graduate school is for, and these are the debates I hope we continue to have even after we head out into the world and become real people. This is the challenge to which we’ve devoted our careers, and it won’t get any easier beyond the halls of the academy. We’d better learn how to enjoy the ride.

**Editor’s note:** Karl Schuettler is a student with the University of Minnesota’s Humphrey Institute. This article has been reprinted with permission from [https://apatientcycle.com/2016/04/12/orfield-v-goetz/](https://apatientcycle.com/2016/04/12/orfield-v-goetz/)
Carolyn's Corner: Unintended Consequences

By Carolyn Braun

The law of unintended consequences, most often talked about in terms of economics, is that actions of people—and especially of government—always have effects that are unanticipated or unintended. I would like you to think about this ‘law’ in terms of planning.

Are you requiring things just because you can? Do your recommended conditions of approval serve a purpose or are they just added as a matter of practice? Does your ordinance require items that have no effect yet add cost for the citizen/applicant? Are provisions added with the understanding that they will not be administered or enforced?

Here’s one example where zoning may have produced unintended consequences. In St. Paul, there is a significant student population. To address this issue, the zoning ordinance allows no more than four unrelated people (students) in a home. Many of the existing single family homes have been converted to rentals. However, the homes tend to be large homes that can easily accommodate more than four people. Now, limited to four people, with increasing rents, the owners of the large homes simply divided their single family home into two or three family dwellings. The result—the number of students increases in the neighborhood—instead of the intended result which was to decrease (or perhaps maintain) the number of students.

As the planner, one of your duties is to help your appointed and elected officials think about proposed regulations in a way that anticipates the end results from that regulation. But don’t be afraid to suggest an amendment to a recently adopted ordinance if you find a flaw, which often happens when administering a new code. When adopting a new topic for the code, I often tell the Council that they will likely see me again—with an amendment to the new regulations, once the ‘bugs’ have been worked out.

One way to address unintended consequences from adopted codes is to have a bi-annual or annual code review. During the time leading up to the review, you can compile a list of items that need to be changed or at least reviewed and then bring forward a package of changes. You can include minor changes along with more substantive items. This is an efficient, cost effective way to make changes—one publication, one hearing (well, hopefully) and one set of documents. If you have citizens who want to see some changes to the code—and you have to add that to your already busy work schedule—this process would at least give them a timeline for when their issue would be considered.

So, the next time you are working on an ordinance, policy or process, ask yourself—What could be the result? Will this work as intended?

Thanks for reading!!
Hamline Announces New Certificates

To already rich offerings in Economic Development, Public Works and Public Safety, Hamline University has added new certificates pertinent to planners. These certificates start in September, but there are still openings. Visit hamline.edu/cpal for more information and to register.

Infusing Sustainability in the Workplace

This is a cross sector certificate for professionals in the public, private and nonprofit sectors that work in sustainability, planning, management, operations, environmental services, public works, energy planning and economic development or corporate sustainability. Participants will be able to assess where their organizations are now and how to make a difference in the area of sustainability. They will learn to be change agents and to build capacity within themselves and their organizations.

The instructor is Richard Strong, Senior Research Fellow at the Center for Sustainable Building Research at the University of Minnesota. Rich was one of the initiators of the Minnesota Sustainable Design Guide while a project manager at Hennepin County during the 90’s. He has taught sustainable design at Carleton College the last three years. Currently he is involved in monitoring the Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines and developing standards for the Sustainable Building 2030 initiative at the University of Minnesota, where he teaches in the Masters of Science – Sustainable Design in the College of Design, and he also teaches Sustainability at Drake University in Des Moines, Iowa.

Leadership Communication Skills

Communication is the basis for everything that leaders do in their role. This program is designed to help you or your management team hone leadership and communication skills through hands-on professional development. This certificate teaches a process for professional development to improve skills and builds communication abilities in areas like influencing, conflict management and relationship building. Students practice these skills and receive coaching from peers and instructors.

The instructor, Tom Kern, is currently a Senior Talent Development Consultant for Prime Therapeutics. Tom previously worked at Target Corporation where he was involved in the initial BCEM Emerging Leaders programs. He holds a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from the University of Georgia with a specialization in Behavioral Medicine.

Performance Evaluation & Measurement

This certificate helps to improve existing skills for staff for whom performance measurement and evaluation is a newly acquired duty, or for public agency leaders who are responsible for new evidence-based practice initiatives, evaluation, and measurement, and need an understanding of the processes and resources needed to make these efforts succeed. This includes internal data use to improve practice. The curriculum is intended to complement organizational strategic planning, emphasizing the use of information to enhance decision-making. Participants gain knowledge and tools for performing basic internal and collaborative performance measurement and evaluation activities in the context of planning and research in public organizations. Regardless of where organizations are along a continuum of evidence-based practice or evaluation maturity, students will leave equipped with tools and resources that will help them be catalysts in practical ways.

Instructor Anita Larson currently works as a Data Policy Manager at the Minnesota Department of Education. She leads the construction of the state’s first early childhood longitudinal data system for tracking short- and long-term outcomes and supporting research on public investments in children. She earned her doctorate in Public Administration from Hamline University in 2013. Anita has spent most of her time in planning and evaluation and conducting research using quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods.
Spring on the Parkway
Legislative Update

On March 15, 2016 the APA MN board approved the 2016 APA MN Legislative Policy Platform. The purpose of the platform is to guide committee and chapter advocacy for good planning principles in Minnesota.

The platform includes five planks:

**Sustainable Transportation** - Sustainable multi-modal transportation enhancing access and mobility

**Livable Communities and Housing** - Livable communities made up of affordable and inclusive neighborhoods.

**Comprehensive and Statewide Planning** - Fundamental planning principles which incorporate intergovernmental cooperation, effective planning tools, and excellence in citizen involvement.

**Integrated Resource Planning** - Integrated renewable energy, local foods, and resilient planning practices which support Minnesota's interdependent resources.

**Community Health** - Integrating public health into planning for equitable, sustainable and resilient communities.

APA MN plans to focus on one or two of these topics each legislative session, and will revisit the platform annually to set priorities for the session and make incremental changes to the platform language.

Click the link below for the latest from the Minnesota Legislature and the courts.

**Legislative and Law Committee Update Report - March 21 through April 23, 2016**
Deregulation of Genetically Engineered Sugar Beets

Abstract

Fifty to sixty percent of refined sugar in the United States is derived from sugar beets (USDA-ERS 2015a). Sugar beet production is an important sector of the Minnesota economy; one-third of U.S. sugar beet production occurs in Minnesota (USDA-ERS 2015b). In 2003, the Monsanto Company, a multinational corporation specializing in agrochemical and agricultural biotechnology, petitioned the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to fully deregulate Event H7-1 (“Roundup Ready”) genetically engineered sugar beets and all related cultivars. This report is an analysis of the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) submitted by the USDA in response to Monsanto’s petition. Although the USDA ultimately recommends full deregulation, the agency does not provide a convincing case for its decision. Major limitations include a narrowly defined Purpose and Need, insufficient analysis of human and animal health impacts, and insufficient discussion of impacts on organic growers. These limitations, the legal pathway that preceded this EIS, and the lack of discussion of alternatives to full deregulation render the USDA’s recommendation questionable. The outcome of this EIS is nationally and globally significant due to its implications for the federal regulatory status of genetically engineered crops into the future.

Introduction

Approximately fifty to sixty percent of refined sugar in the United States is currently derived from sugar beets (USDA-ERS 2015a). Sugar beet production is an important sector of the Minnesota economy; fifty-seven percent of U.S. production of sugar beet roots takes place in the Red River Valley of Minnesota and North Dakota (USDA-ERS 2015b). In 2003, the Monsanto Company (Monsanto), a multinational corporation specializing in agrochemical and agricultural biotechnology, issued a petition to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) requesting that the USDA assign federal “non-regulated” status to Event H7-1 (or “Roundup Ready”) sugar beets and all related cultivated varieties. These particular varieties of sugar beets are genetically engineered to be biologically resistant to glyphosate (“Roundup”), an herbicide that is widely used for weed management in settings from home gardens to large-scale agriculture. Monsanto requested nationwide deregulation of H7-1 sugar beets in order to remove regulatory restrictions that prevented farmers from planting and transporting the beets on a large scale. The specific federal regulations that Monsanto sought to limit in its petition are specified in 7 Code of Federal Regulations part 340 (APHIS 1997).

This report is an analysis of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) submitted in May 2012 by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the USDA in response to Monsanto’s petition. Approval of this petition is a federal action likely to have a significant environmental impact. Because of this, the USDA is required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to complete an EIS in order to document these potential environmental impacts. NEPA, signed into law in 1970, requires federal agencies to complete an Environmental Impact Statement before taking major federal action “significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” (NEPA §102(2)(C)). The outcome of this EIS has national and global-scale significance due to its implications for the federal regulatory status of genetically engineered sugar beets and other genetically engineered crops into the future. Although the USDA ultimately recommends full deregulation of H7-1 sugar beets in this EIS, the USDA does not provide a convincing case for this decision.
Purpose and Need

According to the USDA, the Purpose and Need for deregulation of H7-1 sugar beets is to simplify weed management during conventional sugar beet production by offering beet growers the option to use the glyphosate pesticide in tandem with glyphosate-resistant sugar beets. H7-1 sugar beets are genetically engineered to include a new gene (from Agrobacterium sp. strain CP4) that renders the beets resistant to glyphosate. This allows farmers to use the pesticide “without concern for ancillary damage to the sugar beet crop” (APHIS 2012). Put simply, this means that if farmers apply glyphosate, it will kill weeds but leave the sugar beets unharmed. The Purpose and Need articulated in this EIS is extremely narrow, since it supports one weed management strategy dependent on the use of one chemical and one variety of sugar beet, both of which are owned by the same company. Narrowly defining the Purpose and Need can make it easier for a federal agency to argue for one alternative over others in an EIS.

A second purpose of this EIS is to address environmental and human health concerns about H7-1 sugar beets and genetically engineered crops in general. This EIS is the result of a complex landscape of litigation and contentiousness on the part of small and large-scale growers, environmental advocacy organizations, industries, and food safety specialists. The process began in 2005, when the USDA decided to fully deregulate H7-1 sugar beets based on an initial Environmental Assessment in which the USDA made a finding that full deregulation would have no significant environmental impact (APHIS 2005). In response, a coalition of advocacy organizations including the Center for Food Safety, Sierra Club, Organic Seed Alliance, and a business named High Mowing Organic Seeds sued the USDA for failing to fully consider potential impacts on the human and natural environment. In 2009, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California ruled in favor of the advocacy organizations, concluding that the USDA should have prepared an EIS prior to deregulating the sugar beets, in order to fully investigate potential impacts on the human environment. The EIS requirement under NEPA is intended to be a proactive measure; the process of completing an EIS should “contribute to the decision-making process” in federal agencies, rather than “rationalize or justify decisions already made” (Eccleston 1999). The order of events that preceded this EIS makes this EIS seem reactive rather than proactive.

Alternatives

The USDA describes three potential alternatives in this EIS: (1) No Action, (2) Full Deregulation of H7-1 sugar beets, and (3) Partial Deregulation of the sugar beets. Alternative 2, Full Deregulation, is the alternative recommended by the USDA.

Alternative 1 – No Action

The first alternative, “No Action,” would require the USDA to deny Monsanto’s petition to deregulate H7-1 sugar beets and related cultivated varieties. Under this alternative, the USDA would continue to require Monsanto to obtain a special permit or notify the USDA at each instance of planting or transporting these sugar beets. This alternative would result in the lowest quantity planted; the USDA expects production of H7-1 sugar beets under this alternative to total less than 1,000 acres per year, with the majority of this acreage dedicated to research production rather than market production.

Under the No Action alternative, sugar beet producers would be required to use alternative methods to manage weeds, including application of alternative herbicides or use of chemical-free techniques such as mechanical cultivation and tilling. The No Action alternative is likely to have the following environmental and economic impacts: (1) Little to no potential for unin-
tended gene flow from H7-1 sugar beets to conventional or organic sugar beets; (2) Very low cross-pollination rates; (3) Very low rates of selection and spread of glyphosate-resistant weeds; (4) Increased opportunities for agricultural workers; and (5) No negative economic impact to nearby growers of non-genetically engineered vegetable beet seed. This alternative clearly does not meet the narrow Purpose and Need identified in this EIS (to provide sugar beet producers with the option to manage weeds by planting and growing glyphosate-resistant crops). However, this alternative poses the lowest environmental and human health risk.

Alternative 2 – Full Deregulation of H7-1 Sugar Beets (USDA Preferred Alternative)

The second alternative is full deregulation of H7-1 sugar beets and all related cultivated varieties. Under this alternative, permits and notification would no longer be required upon planting or transport of the sugar beets. Under full deregulation, the USDA expects H7-1 sugar beets to replace more than 90 percent of sugar beet crops in the short run and nearly 100 percent in the long run. This alternative meets the narrow Purpose and Need identified in this EIS (because it allows sugar beet producers to manage weeds using the glyphosate herbicide in combination with glyphosate-resistant sugar beets). Because of this, it is the Preferred Alternative recommended by the USDA.

The USDA justifies full deregulation on the basis of (1) requiring less tilling, resulting in less soil disturbance, soil erosion, and runoff; (2) requiring fewer aerial sprayings of glyphosate than conventional sugar beets, which could reduce pesticide drift and reduced impact on non-target plants; (3) an assertion that glyphosate is less harmful to human and animal health than alternative herbicides; (4) increased overall economic return to sugar beet producers, especially outside the Midwest; (5) preservation of past research and development investments in H7-1 sugar beet seeds and incentives for future investments; and (6) lower emissions of certain air pollutants resulting from lower tractor usage for tilling and herbicide application.

The rationale for full deregulation rests on many questionable premises. First, the EIS states that total glyphosate use is actually expected to increase sevenfold upon full deregulation of the beets due to increased production (APHIS 2012). Second, no studies are cited confirming the lower negative effect on human and animal health associated with glyphosate as compared to alternative herbicides. Third, the argument for preserving prior investments in H7-1 sugar beet research and development should not influence the decision to regulate or deregulate the beets based on environmental impact. Fourth, incentives for future investments could instead be directed toward alternative sugar beet growing methods if full deregulation did not occur.

Alternative 3 – Partial Deregulation of H7-1 Sugar Beets

The third alternative, “Partial Deregulation,” would allow H7-1 sugar beets to be deregulated as long as certain required restrictions and conditions are met. Partial deregulation would involve a greater degree of permitting, regulations, and conditions than full deregulation, which may discourage some sugar beet producers from growing the crop. Partial deregulation is not a preferred alternative in this EIS.

Affected Environment Section

The Affected Environment section of this EIS is focused on “the practices related to weed control and the genetic environment that could be influenced by gene flow from the H7-1 sugar beet” (APHIS 2012). The production practices described in this section are grouped into four “resource areas”: (1) biological environment (wildlife and ecosystems), (2) socioeconomic environment, (3) physical environment (land use, air, water, and soil), and (4) human health and safety. The overall geographic scope of the Affected Environment is defined as the extent of counties where sugar beets are produced and where production of H7-1 sugar beet roots and seeds is expected to occur. In addition, a geographic area is assigned to each of the four “resource areas” based on the nature of the resource and the factors that interact with it. For example, the Affected Environment for “biological resources” includes the animals and plants existing in and around sugar beet fields, as well as animals that consume sugar beets or their byproducts as feed.

The USDA’s assessment of the Affected Environment draws upon scientific studies of sugar beet pollen dispersal and expected gene flow rates, evidence of endocrine-disrupting characteristics of pesticide chemicals like glyphosate, agricultural best management practices, and other factors. However, the USDA’s assessment does not acknowledge the developing body of literature demonstrating potential impacts of synthetic herbicides such as glyphosate on beneficial in-
sect species including pollinators and their habitat (Herbert et al. 2014, Pleasants and Oberhauser 2012). The USDA’s discussion of potential impacts on terrestrial invertebrates makes no mention of this literature in its extremely brief discussion of beneficial insects. Non-scientific sources, primarily Sugar Knowledge International and American Crystal Sugar Company, are also cited frequently in this section, somewhat undermining its scientific credibility.

Environmental Consequences or Impacts Section

The USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), the agency responsible for this EIS, is broadly charged with “protecting America’s agricultural and natural resources” (APHIS 2014). APHIS is required under federal law (7 CFR 340) to regulate the “introduction (importation, interstate movement, or release into the environment)’ of genetically engineered crops and products that meet certain criteria (APHIS 2012). To determine whether a plant should be regulated, the USDA must determine whether the plant poses a “plant pest risk” by completing a Plant Pest Risk Assessment. In order for a genetically engineered plant to pass this test, the plant must be found not to pose a greater environmental or health risk than its non-genetically engineered counterpart. In many ways, varying perspectives on what characteristics constitute a “plant pest risk” formed the crux of contention among agencies, producers, and the public in this case.

Discussion of environmental consequences and impacts in this EIS is organized under five topic areas: (1) production and management of beet crops, (2) biological resources, (3) socioeconomic effects on sugar beet producers, (4) physical environment, and (5) human health. The level of detail used to justify each alternative varies widely and the arguments, particularly those in favor of full deregulation, contain many inconsistencies. For example, within the topic of herbicide usage, the USDA notes the risk that glyphosate-resistant weeds could emerge as a result of full deregulation and widespread production. However, the USDA deemphasizes this risk by assuring that “Industry and growers are aware of this situation and will likely take proactive measures” to minimize the emergence of these weeds (APHIS 2012). However, no explicit requirement for these entities to engage in such proactive measures is mentioned in the document. Further, one proactive measure the USDA suggests to prevent the emergence of glyphosate-resistant weeds is the application of “additional herbicide chemistries” beyond glyphosate (APHIS 2012).

This strategy calls into question the effectiveness of a glyphosate-centered weed management strategy in the first place. Even more troubling, this strategy contradicts the USDA’s major argument for full deregulation – that continued regulation of H7-1 sugar beets will encourage the development and usage of new and potentially more toxic herbicide formulas.

Further, the full deregulation alternative would not require H7-1 sugar beet growers to engage in any mandatory recordkeeping or reporting to the USDA, which is surprising due to the very short history of genetically engineered sugar beet technology. The full deregulation alternative also does not require H7-1 sugar beet growers to maintain a minimum required distance from growers of other non-genetically engineered beet varieties (such as Swiss chard and vegetable beets), despite the fact that these plants are heavily wind-pollinated with large “clouds” of airborne pollen and despite citing research indicating a four-mile distance is necessary to prevent cross-pollination (APHIS 2012). Surprisingly, the USDA suggests that nearby growers of non-genetically engineered beets, rather than H7-1 sugar beet growers, are responsible for the costs “required to test for low level presence of the H7-1 trait,” because the purpose of such testing is “to satisfy the concerns of GE-sensitive customers” (APHIS 2012). This shifts the financial burden of testing from the H7-1 beet growers to nearby growers of non-genetically engineered beets.

Mitigation Section

Mitigation measures are discussed for each of the three alternatives. Mitigation refers to techniques that reduce the environmental impact of an action. For the full deregulation alternative, mitigation measures include the required Monsanto Technology Stewardship Agreement (MTSA) and Technology Use Guide (TUG), the voluntary Roundup Ready Plus program, and additional requirements set forth by sugar beet grower cooperatives. Mitigation measures for the partial deregulation alternative include the above, in addition to restrictions on planting locations determined by the USDA or another entity. Importantly, the stewardship practices included in MTSA would only be required during the H7-1 sugar beet patent period. When the patent expires, the USDA “assumes that there would
be no binding enforcement mechanism to ensure that farmers follow the TUG” (APHIS 2012).

While this section outlines possible mitigation strategies, it does not clearly identify agencies or entities responsible for mitigation efforts, particularly under the full deregulation alternative. The section does hold H7-1 sugar beet growers responsible for following Best Management Practices and for following the MTSA and TUG. However, no entity is explicitly identified as responsible for mitigation or stewardship efforts after the patent period ends and MTSA/TUG no longer applies, nor is any entity explicitly identified as responsible in the event that Best Management Practices and MTSA/TUG are not sufficient to manage unexpected and harmful environmental effects. Regarding human health impact mitigation, the USDA identifies the role of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in accurate pesticide labeling and communication about the importance of correct use of pesticides. The related potential for negative health impacts due to accidental misuse of pesticides appears to be wholly placed on agricultural workers.

**Cumulative Effects Section**

In the Cumulative Effects section, discussion takes place at three geographic scales: (a) the local (county-level) scale, (b) the regional (sugar beet growing regions) scale, and (c) the national scale. In this section, the USDA asserts that “all of the effects on the human environment are indirect effects of changes in agricultural practices associated with the adoption of H7-1 sugar beet,” effectively isolating the plant itself from scrutiny (APHIS 2012). Further, the USDA’s cumulative effects analysis is confined to only two changes in agricultural practices, “changes in pesticide use and changes in tillage and cultivation” (APHIS 2012). By drastically narrowing the scope of analysis once again, the EIS avoids discussion of potential cumulative impacts associated with growing and planting of the H7-1 sugar beet plant itself, as compared to conventional or organic sugar beets.

**Conclusion**

In this Environmental Impact Statement, the USDA synthesizes information on a variety of environmental impacts in order to assess the risk of harm to environmental and human health associated with full deregulation of H7-1 genetically engineered sugar beets. Major limitations of the EIS include a very narrowly defined Purpose and Need, an exclusion of new emerging research indicating impacts of glyphosate on beneficial insects, insufficient analysis of potential human and animal health impacts associated with a sevenfold increase in glyphosate usage, and a failure to sufficiently acknowledge potential impacts on organic growers and markets sensitive to genetic engineering. These limitations make it clear that much more could have been done to thoroughly research potential impacts of full deregulation of the crop. In addition, this EIS was written by the USDA in response to a legal mandate by a U.S. District Court, and would likely not have been written without such a mandate. Further, the final recommendation for full deregulation carries substantial economic benefits for a large private corporation who holds patents on both the herbicide glyphosate and the glyphosate-resistant sugar beets. The purpose of an EIS, as set out in NEPA, is to be a proactive document that ensures environmental impacts are “given appropriate consideration in decision making along with economic and technical considerations” (NEPA §102(2)(B)), and to inform future agency action rather than reinforce past agency action. The legal pathway that preceded this EIS, coupled with the relative lack of discussion of alternatives other than full deregulation, do not provide a convincing case for the USDA’s recommendation.


**Municipal Members**

We wish to recognize the Planning Commissions which have joined the APA MN chapter for 2016. These memberships are provided courtesy of the West Central Initiative.

City of Dilworth
City of Fergus Falls
City of Frazee
City of Glyndon
City of Hawley
City of Moorhead
City of Perham
City of Rothsay
City of Vergas
City of Wheaton
Upcoming Events

2016 Planning Webcast Series

Upcoming Webcasts – all at 1 p.m. ET:

May 6 – Private Practice Division – What I Wish I Knew – Speakers: Ralph Willmer, FAICP, Todd Ashby, AICP, Michael Jelen, Jenifer Corey, Deana Rhode-side. 1.5 CM Credits approved
Is it true that private sector planners earn more? Is it true that public sector planners have a greater degree of job security? Are you thinking of transitioning to “the other side” after working in the public sector for many years? Or are you now considering a public sector job as your next move after a time as a private planning consultant? You are likely wondering about the risks and advantages of these decisions, what will life be like in this new professional environment? Making this leap is an exciting yet scary process. Yet, once you decide to make the change, you must decide how to move forward. It is always valuable to get advice from those who have recently made these transitions. This webcast will feature planners who have recently moved between the public and private job continuum. Each will discuss their experiences through a series of questions generated by both a session moderator and the audience. The goal: to breathe reality into the conventional assumptions about public and private sector jobs, and to provide some “first step” advice and encouragement to those contemplating a career move.

May 13 – Sustainable Communities Division – Local Government Sustainability: Practices and Promises – Speakers: Dr. Mildred Warner, Dr. George Hom-sy, AICP, Leslie Ethen, Ed Marx, AICP. 1.5 CM Credits Approved
We all say we want sustainability, but what is actually being done on the ground? The recently released results of the 2015 Local Government Sustainability Practices Survey tell us about priorities, policies, and drivers of local sustainability across all three dimensions – environmental protection, social equity, and economic development. It looks at who is working on these issues and the barriers they face. The survey (which collected 1,899 responses) is a joint project of ICMA, the Sustainable Communities and Small Town and Rural Planning Divisions of the American Planning Association, Binghamton University, and Cornell University. This webinar will give an overview of the results of the survey and will begin to elaborate on how the results could influence how we plan. Representatives from two local governments will reflect on their own experiences with sustainability and discuss how they have moved their communities forward. Tompkins County, NY, has just released an Energy Roadmap to achieve a lower carbon footprint. The City of Tucson, AZ, has a Sustainability Program that works to advance the core priorities of livability and resilience, fiscal stewardship, and good governance. Join the webinar to share ideas and learn more about the current state of the practice!

A powerful new reality and a profound demographic transformation is an aging America. That baby boomers are swelling the ranks of older Americans is well-documented. This profound demographic transition is challenging communities struggling to maintain the status quo, and, is overwhelming to government and community policymakers at all levels. Preparing for this wave is viewed as a political and economic liability – impacting social security, healthcare costs and services and placing an added burden on the young. As the vast majority of older adults want to age in place, they are creating a demand for communities that are age friendly. Age-friendly communities are friendly to all ages, not just older adults. Ultimately, young and old want the same things: an environment that allows them to participate and thrive. Financing age-friendly initiatives do not have to be costly. Planners and local governments should give attention to multigenera-tional planning and the work underway in cities developing more age-friendly communities – from New York to Honolulu - who are taking creative steps to build their adaptive capacity, optimize opportunities and cultivate synergies for community change.

Click on the title links to register. You can see the current listing of all webcasts at www.ohioplaning.org/planningwebcast.

CM credits can be claimed by looking up the sponsoring Chapter or Division as provider

Distance Education – these webcast recordings are approved for CM credit for viewing throughout 2016:

Housing for People with Disabilities: A Civil Rights Lens - 1.5 CM LAW Credits (#e.9008313)
Upcoming Events (Cont.)

To locate this event for CM credit, click here or search by the provider, APA Northern New England Chapter
Ethics of Private Practice Consulting - 1.5 CM ETHICS Credits (#e.9016910)
To locate this event for CM credit, click here or search by the provider, APA Private Practice Division
Note that the DE CM credits have a different event number than the original live webcast, so the event number in the recording will not work for DE credit. Use these event numbers above to log your DE CM credits.

2016 Minnesota Planning Awards
Final Reminder for 2016 Planning Awards! Don’t miss this opportunity to gain recognition for a special project. Please note the deadlines.
The Annual APA-Minnesota Chapter Planning Awards offer a great opportunity to recognize outstanding projects and people who have contributed to the planning profession. The awards will be given at the Planners Conference in St. Cloud on September 28-30. The 2016 Conference Awards Committee is excited to introduce a new award category this year — Bridging the Gap: Advancing Equity in Planning. The award coordinates with this year’s Conference theme and will recognize projects that have utilized deliberate strategies to advance equity and fairness in a neighborhood or community. Examples could address: accessible design, workforce development, affordable housing, access to transportation and/or employment opportunities, enhanced generational and cultural agility in the field of planning, etc. We’ll also again recognize projects in the following categories:
- Innovation in Planning
- Excellence in Community Engagement
- Partnerships in Planning
- Success Stories in Implementation
- Planning in Context
- Outstanding Student Project
- Gunnar Isberg Scholarship Award
The attachment details each category, including the judging criteria. Note in particular the submittal due dates for the planning award categories, April 29, 2016, and the student project and scholarship deadline of June 3, 2016. This information is also available under Awards on the conference website, at www.plannersconference.com
If you have any questions, contact Melissa Poehlman at mpoehlman@cityofrichfield.org

AICP Reinstatement Amnesty
In an effort to encourage the retention of members whose membership may have lapsed due to the economic downturn, the AICP Commission is offering a special amnesty program. Members who lapsed between January 1, 2010, and December 31, 2012, may reinstate without having to take the AICP exam and with reduced fees.

Eligible members will have until May 31, 2017, to complete reinstatement. This will involve earning and logging up to 64 CM credits.

AICP back dues owed: $25 per year lapsed (to a maximum of $100) (unemployed AICP dues rate)
APA membership: If your APA membership lapsed as well, no back dues are owed. Also, you will regain your original APA join date which is beneficial when calculating the 10- and 25-year requirements for life and retired status respectively.

Reinstatement fee of $100: Waived
Free CM opportunities may be found here. Also, check your Chapter for free and low-cost options.
Eligible members may contact CMAmnesty@planning.org to initiate the reinstatement process for this special offer.

CNT And TransitCenter Unveil New Tool To Measure Transit Quality
The Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) and TransitCenter have unveiled a new interactive tool that will allow users to map the quality of transit across the country and help cities identify their top transit needs.
AllTransit aggregates and maps data from 805 transit agencies, 15,070 routes, and 543,787 bus and rail stops nationwide, providing a source of unprecedented quality for information about urban connectivity, access, and transit service. The foundation of the tool is a combination of publicly available transit schedule data and new data created by CNT for more than 300 cities where it did not previously exist. This, combined with demographic data from the Census Bureau and
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elsewhere, allows easy comparisons of the quality and impact of transit service within an urban area or from region to region.

New Bike and Transit Guides Available
The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) has recently released two guides for multimodal planning.
The Bike Share Siting Guide provides guidance on why, where, and how to site bikeshare.
The Transit Street Design Guide is a design guide to help cities prioritize transit on their streets.

CHS Field Redevelopment Project & Lowertown Revitalization
APA members are invited to attend an event on the CHS Field redevelopment and Lowertown revitalization:
CHS Field, St. Paul, MN
2:30–6:30pm
Fee: $35 for members and non-members
Located on a site that was once on the top ten list for the most contaminated sites in Minnesota, CHS Field is now the home of the St. Paul Saints baseball team. This beautiful 7,000-seat facility is owned by the City of St. Paul and was constructed at a cost of $63 million, including $28 million from the State of Minnesota and $24 million from the City of St. Paul.
At this event, we will discuss:
• The redevelopment story of CHS Field, including the site selection, complex land acquisition and exchange, cleanup, design, construction, and financing structure
• Lowertown’s revitalization and economic development successes and strategies – including retail, commercial, housing, arts and culture - and why it is such an attractive place to live, work, and play
• The interconnectedness of CHS Field and Lowertown – how the ballpark and the neighborhood are an incredible combination
• How cities throughout Minnesota can learn from both the CHS Field project and the successes of Lowertown
• This event also includes a tour of the ballpark, and a networking opportunity to build high-value relationships.

Speakers include:
Tom Whaley – Executive Vice President, St. Paul Saints
Heather Worthington – Deputy County Manager, Ramsey County
Matt Kramer – President, St. Paul Chamber of Commerce
Jonathan Sage-Martinson – Planning & Economic Development Director, City of St. Paul
Monte Hilleman – Vice President of Real Estate Development, St. Paul Port Authority
Registration Link: http://www.edam.org/events/EventDetails.aspx?id=796527&group=

National Development Council Training
The National Development Council (NDC) is pleased to announce it will be bringing nine of its highly esteemed development finance courses to Minneapolis, Minnesota in 2016. Offered courses include the Economic Development Finance Professional (EDFP) and Housing Development Finance Professional (HDFP) Certification Programs, both of which are nationally recognized as the gold standard in economic and housing development finance training. These courses provide nonprofit and government professionals with the skills and knowledge they need to increase their development finance capacity to successfully facilitate housing and economic development in the states, regions and communities they serve.
“At the City of Saint Paul, we have found that the courses offered by NDC provide valuable technical tools and insight into business finance and real estate development for our staff,” said Jonathan Sage-Martinson, Director of the City of Saint Paul’s Department of Planning and Economic Development. “These courses help us perform better as a City and we are glad to have them offered in the Minneapolis – Saint Paul region so that they are accessible to our staff.” The City of Saint Paul currently has several members of its staff enrolled in NDC’s EDFP series. NDC created the nation’s first training program solely for economic, housing and community development
practitioners more than four decades ago. Since then, NDC has trained more than 70,000 individuals in the art and science of economic and housing development finance.

The nine courses, all approved through the American Planning Association’s Certification Maintenance Program, vary from three to five days in length and include:

- ED101 - Economic Development Finance
- ED201 - Business Credit Analysis
- ED202 - Real Estate Finance
- ED300 - The Art of Deal Structuring
- HD410 - Home Ownership Finance
- HD420 - Rental Housing Development Finance
- HD422 - Computer Spreadsheet Analysis for Housing
- ED502 - Low-Income Housing Tax Credits
- ED515 - New Markets Tax Credits

The trainings will be held at the Aloft Minneapolis, 900 Washington Avenue South, in the heart of Minneapolis’s vibrant downtown.

For more information on these trainings or to view the complete NDC training schedule, please visit [http://www.nationaldevelopmentcouncil.org/](http://www.nationaldevelopmentcouncil.org/).

**Nomination for APA MN Executive Committee**

Just a reminder, members!!

APA MN members may run for chapter office for any of the four positions on the Executive Committee---President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer. Nominees must be members of the national APA. Interested candidates must submit a bio (two to three paragraphs), the position for which they are running, contact information, and a photo with their nomination by June 3, 2016. Any nominee may request a copy of the position description by contacting the administrators at mnapa@buffleheadweb.net. Elections will be facilitated by National APA in August, with the results being announced in September. Successful candidates will have a web-based orientation in November.

Each position is a two-year term, and the new officers will begin their terms on January 1, 2017. The success of the chapter as a whole is dependent on having qualified leadership, so the current Executive Committee would like to encourage all members to consider running for one of these offices.

**Please submit your Officer candidacy for the 2017-2018 Board to the APA MN administrators at mnapa@buffleheadweb.net by June 3, 2016.**

The APA MN Board would also remind interested candidates to receive their employer’s support before committing to a two-year term. The full Board meets 6 times a year, and each Officer is expected to attend some of the other many events of the chapter as well. In addition, the Executive Committee meets 6 times a year.

If you would like to know more about these positions, please feel free to contact Breanne Rothstein, APA MN President, at 763-231-4863 or via email at brothstein@wsbeng.com.

On behalf of the APA MN Board, we hope you consider running for one of these rewarding positions.

**PlanIt: Survey from Met Council**

I’d like to ask for your assistance in completing a survey to help in the development of the PlanIt program. PlanIt is the comp plan educational program provided by the Met Council to assist local planners and planning consultants with comp plan updates. This survey will help in development of events, topic areas, and resources to be shared with planning professionals over the next few years.

The PlanIt program is really meant to provide technical assistance to you, so please help us by completing the survey below. Please feel free to forward on to others that will be assisting you in writing the comp plan updates.

The survey will remain open until May 6th.

[https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PlanIt_Survey](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PlanIt_Survey)

**Planning for Water Webinar and Speaker Series #1: ’Why Water?’**

Planners: Join us May 24 for the first of our Planning for Water webinar and speaker series!

Earn certification maintenance (CM) credits by viewing...
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the American Planning Association’s webinar, Environ-
mental Systems, Assessment, and Carrying Capacity.
Then, stay for a round of the Watershed Game!

- When: Tuesday, May 24, 2016, 8 a.m. – 11 a.m.
- Where: MWMO Stormwater Park and Learning Center, 2522 Marshall Street NE, Minneapolis, MN 55418-3329

Schedule:

- 8 a.m. – Continental Breakfast and Networking
- 8:30 a.m. – APA Webinar (1 CM credit)
- 9:30 a.m. – Watershed Game
- 10:30 a.m. – MWMO site tour (optional)

This is the first in a series of webinar and speaker events that will be held throughout this summer and fall that will include Building Green into Complete Streets, Green Infrastructure Zoning and Innovations in Urban Water Systems.

Twins Game

On Thursday, June 16, 2016, APA Minnesota will be going to Target Field to see the Twins battle the New York Yankees. There will be a gathering at the Loop Bar (see website below for location) beginning at 5:15 pm. We have tables reserved at the rear of the bar. At the Loop, you can pick up your tickets and have a drink and bite to eat prior to the game. As part of the price, APA Minnesota will spring for several appetizers. The ball park is only 4 or 5 blocks from the Loop Bar. Here is the information.

- Date: Thursday, June 16, 2016
- Time: Gathering at the Loop Bar is at 5:15 pm - first pitch is at 7:10 pm
- Cost: $25 (this includes ticket and delicious appetizers at the Loop Bar)

Location: 606 Washington Ave N (http://www.theloopmpls.com/)

Parking: We always suggest taking transit but if you drive, you are on your own for parking.

Reservations. Reserve your ticket by emailing Lisa Wittman at lwittman@goldenvalleymn.gov (50 tickets available)

Payment: Checks should be made payable (within one week of your reservation) to APA Minnesota and sent to Lisa Wittman, City of Golden Valley, 7800 Golden Valley Road, Golden Valley, MN 55427

If you have questions, please contact Lisa Wittman at 763-593-8095.

Job Opportunities and RFPs

Job Title: Planner Senior Transportation
Hiring Agency: MN Department of Transportation
Web Link: http://mn.gov/mmb/careers/
Deadline: May 3, 2016
Salary Range: $21.98-$32.24/hourly

Job Description
Contribute to the development of integrated transportation plans, studies, and investment programs; coordinating with and participating in state, regional and local planning efforts; and preparing and implementing a program of public involvement. This position carries out professional planning support and analysis in the preparation of statewide, district, modal, system, corridor, and project plans/studies and in the implementation and monitoring of investments in the transportation program.

Minimum Qualifications:
* A Bachelor’s degree in Planning, Geography, Urban Studies, Political Science or other related field AND two (2) years professional transportation planning experience at the local, metropolitan or state level; OR three (3) years professional transportation planning experience at the local, metropolitan or state level.

If you meet the above requirement, to be considered further for this vacancy, you must provide a summary of your experience/education in the following areas by the posted deadline along with your written expression of interest and resume.
* Working knowledge of the theory and practice of comprehensive regional and community planning, with the focus on transportation, land use, economic development and stakeholder collaboration.
* Working knowledge of the theory and practice of performance based transportation planning and investment management.
* Fluency in English language sufficient to communicate effectively with internal/external stakeholders and general public both verbally and in writing.
* Knowledge and applications in the use of Microsoft Office (Outlook, Word, Excel and PowerPoint).
* Knowledge in the use of GIS technology for planning, research and analysis.
* Valid Class D Minnesota Driver’s License.

**Application Instructions**
Go to [http://www.mn.gov/careers](http://www.mn.gov/careers). Apply to Job ID# 4135. If you have questions about the position, contact Christine Fisher at christine.fisher@state.mn.us or 651.366.3410.

**Job Title:** Planner Principal - State of MN  
**Hiring Agency:** Capitol Area Architectural & Planning Board  
**Web Link:** [http://www.mn.gov/mmb/careers](http://www.mn.gov/mmb/careers)  
**Deadline:** May 5, 2016  
**Salary Range:** $51,365 - $75,690 annually

**Job Description**
The Planner Principal provides interdisciplinary architectural, design and initiatives in the sixty block Capitol area, the Comprehensive Plan, and the Zoning and design rules. This person also represents the agency with the Legislature, City departments, other State agencies and legal authorities, while also serving as the Zoning Administrator for the area.

**Application Instructions**
Go to the State of Minnesota Career website to complete an application. The selection process is a resume-based, skill matching process. Resumes will be evaluated against the minimum qualifications. You will be contacted if your background best matches the selection criteria.

**Job Title:** City of Dubuque Comprehensive Plan Request for Proposals  
**Hiring Agency:** City of Dubuque, Iowa  
**Deadline:** May 6, 2016 at 5 PM CDT  
**Salary Range:** NA

**Job Description**
The City of Dubuque is requesting a consultant, or team of consultants, with expertise in facilitating and developing comprehensive plans to develop a new Comprehensive Plan for Dubuque. The project is expected to begin July 1, 2016 and be completed by November 1, 2017. The maximum budget for the project is $300,000. Proposals are due by 5 p.m. on May 6, 2016. Please see the entire RFP for specific requirements.

**Application Instructions**
An original and seven (7) copies of each proposal shall be delivered by 5:00 p.m. CDT on May 6, 2016 to the address given below:  
David Johnson, Assistant Planner  
Planning Services Department  
City of Dubuque  
50 W. 13th Street  
Dubuque, IA 52001
The proposals shall be sealed and be clearly labeled: City of Dubuque Comprehensive Plan Update. Provide the proposed fees and compensation under separate cover.

Each consultant assumes full responsibility for delivery and deposit of the completed proposal package on or before the deadline. The City of Dubuque is not responsible for any loss or delay with respect to delivery of the proposals.

**Job Title:** Planning Director  
**Hiring Agency:** The Greater Bemidji Area Joint Planning Board (JPB)  
**Web Link:** [http://www.jpbgba.org/](http://www.jpbgba.org/)  
**Deadline:** May 13, 2015  
**Salary Range:** $55 - 65K depending on qualifications and experience

**Job Description**
The Greater Bemidji Area Joint Planning Board (GBAJPB) is seeking an experienced community planner for the position of Planning Director. The GBAJPB is a joint planning organization of three local governments in northern Minnesota: the City of Bemidji, Northern Township, and Bemidji Township. This position reports directly to the GBAJPB. The board is comprised of four township representatives and four city representatives. The general responsibilities of the position are as follows:

Develop comprehensive plans and programs for land use and development of the City of Bemidji, Northern Township and Bemidji Township. Oversee planning and zoning for the Greater Bemidji Area, develop and maintain the policies and procedures for the operation of the GBAJPB. Oversee Zoning Administration, Zoning...
Enforcement, and Office Administration. Supervise three employees. Work directly with the Planning Commission and the Joint Planning Board. Develop community relationships with the public, the development community and a wide variety of agencies and community partners.

Minimum qualifications of the position are as follow:

Four year degree in planning, geography or related field. Masters degree and/or AICP certification preferred.

Four years experience in land use and zoning enforcement and administration.

Four years supervisory experience in a public setting.

Demonstrated ability to write and present effectively.

Demonstrated ability to exercise judgment in controversial interactions with the public and other governmental agencies.

Valid Minnesota Driver’s license or the ability to obtain one within 6 months of hire.

Salary is $55 - 65K depending on qualifications and experience. Benefit package includes medical stipend, mileage, PERA (retirement plan) and PTO.

Application Instructions
Please submit a complete resume and at least three references to:
ATTN: Planning Director Position
Greater Bemidji Area Joint Planning Board
P.O. Box 1100
Bemidji, MN 56619
Mayana.rice@jpbgba.org

Job Title: Planner (2 positions available)
Hiring Agency: Metropolitan Council
Web Link: http://agency.governmentjobs.com/metrocouncil/default.cfm
Deadline: May 20, 2016

Job Description
The Council’s Metropolitan Transportation Services (MTS) Division is responsible for regional transportation planning for all modes and develops the overarching transportation policy plan for the Twin Cities metropolitan area. MTS also serves as staff for the Council in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and for the Transportation Advisory Board’s (TAB) Regional Solicitation process, which allocates over $180 million in federal transportation funds on a bi-annual basis.

MTS is seeking to fill two Planner positions.

Position #1
This position will support transportation planning activities through in-depth analysis of both local and national data to identify emerging trends affecting the transportation sector. Will ensure the production of quality travel demand forecasts based on sound input data through coordination and cooperation with agencies and consultants producing project forecasts. Will work with other MTS forecasting staff in development of travel demand model updates, implementation of updated models, and preparation of travel demand forecasts in support of the Council’s transportation planning endeavors.

Minimum Qualifications: A Master’s degree (by end of spring semester 2016) in planning, geography, engineering, or related field; -AND- some internship or work experience in local and regional transportation planning.

Desired Qualifications
Experience organizing/analyzing large data sets and presenting findings

Experience working on planning projects or teams

Experience using R and Python programming languages

Experience with travel demand forecasting and/or traffic simulation software such as Cube/Voyager, Avenue, Corsim, etc.

Position #2
This position will be primarily involved with policy development and planning work related to transit, transitways, and the relationship between transit and land use. Will be involved in general transportation studies and policy work that may cover a variety of modes including highways, bike, and pedestrian stud-
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ies. May be assigned as the Council representative to transitway corridor and transportation studies led by other regional transportation partners such as the counties, cities, the Minnesota Department of Transportation, or Metro Transit. Will be actively involved in the update to the regional Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) and other policy work and consultant studies being done to prepare for the TPP update.

Minimum Qualifications: A Master’s degree (by end of spring semester 2016) in planning or policy analysis, or related field with a transportation emphasis; -AND- some internship or work experience in local or regional transportation planning.

Equivalency: A Bachelor’s degree (by end of spring semester 2016) in city planning, urban studies, civil engineering, or related field; -AND- at least two years of experience in local and regional transportation planning.

Desired Qualifications

Master’s degree in planning or policy analysis, or closely related field; and relevant internship/work experience

Experience in transit, transitway, or land use planning, funding or implementation

Application Instructions

MUST submit the Metropolitan Council’s online employment application no later than MAY 20, 2016 - more information and application instructions at www.metrocouncil.org.

Job Title: Assistant Planning, Development & Sustainability Director

Hiring Agency: Johnson County, IA

Web Link: http://www.johnson-county.com

Deadline: Open until filled

Salary Range: $69,039.23-$81,222.20

Job Description

Johnson County Planning, Development and Sustainability (PD&S) department currently seeks a Assistant Planning, Development & Sustainability Director to provide administrative and technical services to the County’s PD&S department and to the general public. Manage the Planning division and supervise staff. Serve as Senior Planner. Assist in administering and enforcing the County’s Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan. Analyze policy alternatives and prepare and present policy proposals and implementation measures. Provide staff assistance to various County boards and commissions. Support sustainability initiatives to include sustainable land use policies. Manage the investigation of and respond to alleged violations of Unified Development Ordinance to include zoning code, subdivision regulations, and building code. Manage the Department during the absence of the Director.

Master’s degree in Urban and Regional Planning or related field AND three years of related work experience with progressively responsible tasks and one year supervisory experience.

Special requirements: Valid driver’s license. May also require use of personal vehicle for official business. Obtain American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP), Certified Floodplain Manager (CFM), and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Associate professional credentials within 2 years of hire.

Compensation: $69,039.23 - $81,222.20 plus outstanding benefits.

Application Instructions

To apply and learn more about this position please visit our website, http://www.johnson-county.com. Applications are accepted until the position is filled. Cover letter and resume required.

AA/EOE

Job Title: Assistant Planner

Hiring Agency: Hometown Planning

Web Link: http://www.hometownplanning.com/

Deadline: December 18, 2015 or until filled

Salary Range: $18-20/hour or higher depending on experience

Job Description

Hometown Planning, a private company providing contract land use planning and zoning administration services throughout Central Minnesota, is accepting applications for a full-time Assistant Planner (minimum 32-40 hours/week). Responsibilities include assisting in the development of comprehensive plans and ordinance updates, reviewing permit applications, preparing monthly staff reports for Planning Commission and other meetings, responding to public inquiries, assisting in ordinance enforcement, conducting site inspections and other duties as assigned. Some work may be conducted remotely, upon approval. A complete job description can be found at www.hometownplanning.com.

Qualifications: Bachelor’s degree or significant coursework in community planning, urban studies, public
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administration, geography or related field and demonstrated oral and written communication skills. Preferred candidates will have a Master’s degree/coursework and/or AICP certification.

Application Instructions
Please send resume/job history and cover letter explaining interest and qualifications to: Hometown Planning, 324 Broadway Street, Suite 101, Alexandria, MN 56308. Interviews will begin after December 18 and continue until filled.

Job Title: Planner-Land Use and Natural Resources

Hiring Agency: Winona County, Minnesota

Web Link: [http://www.co.winona.mn.us/page/2833/subcat/410](http://www.co.winona.mn.us/page/2833/subcat/410)

Deadline: Open Until Filled

Salary Range: $21.68 per hour w/benefits

Job Description
Provide outreach & educational activities, conservationist activities under the Clean Water Partnership Grant; administration of MPCA Feedlot Program & on-site sewage treatment & MPCA Septic rules. Applications & class description avail. at Personnel Dept., Winona Co. Gov’t Center, 177 Main St., Winona, MN 55987 (507/457-6352) and also on our website [www.co.winona.mn.us](http://www.co.winona.mn.us) (Personnel Dept./Career Opportunities).

Application Instructions
Applications accepted in Personnel Dept. until position is filled. Individuals who previously applied must resubmit application. EOE. Visit our website [www.co.winona.mn.us](http://www.co.winona.mn.us).

Negotiation Skills for Planners: 2016 Planning Seminar

Experience is not necessarily a great teacher when it comes to negotiation, because it is very easy to develop bad habits, and since there are no meaningful performance measures, it is virtually impossible to know whether you’re doing well or not. Data from controlled experiments show that it is not unusual for people who have done a great deal of negotiating to think that they’re great negotiators when, in fact, they generate outcomes that are significantly worse for them than what was possible. This workshop is therefore worthwhile for all planners, for the experienced and the novice alike.

The workshop design will allow you to develop crucial analytical, strategic, and practical implementation skills and to discover your personal “default” negotiation strategies. You’ll come away with an enhanced ability to prepare for negotiation, manage the negotiation process and generate good outcomes.

The Negotiation Skills for Planners workshop conducted by Mr. Zerkin is similar to a workshop he teaches at the yearly National APA conference.

Topics include:
- Conflict dynamics
- Approaches for generating good outcomes with all types of people
- Cognitive and emotional barriers to effective negotiation
- The secret to being persuasive
- Dealing with emotions and obstinacy
- How to think about your “bottom line”
- Advantages and disadvantages of team negotiating
- The negotiator’s dilemmas and strategic choices

Speaker Bio: Allen J. Zerkin, J.D.
Since 1988, Mr. Zerkin has been an Adjunct Professor of Public Administration at NYU’s Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service teaching very popular courses on negotiation, conflict resolution and public involvement. He is a Visiting Practitioner at the school’s Rudin Center for Transportation Policy & Management and is an experienced facilitator of public policy consensus building initiatives in New York State.

When: May 12, 2016
8 am to 5 pm

Why: Improve your negotiation skills!

8.0 AICP CM Credits (Approved Event #9028961)

Where: Eagle Valley Golf Club
Woodbury
2600 Double Eagle Lane, Woodbury, MN 55129
http://eaglevalleygc.com/Location.html

Fee: $83.10
*This price covers taxes and electronic service fees

How to Register: Click the link to register through EventBrite or search “Minnesota Spring Seminar”

http://2016apaspringseminar.eventbrite.com

Members of APA MN will be given priority for the first week of registration. Registration to non-Chapter will be open to any interested persons after the first week.

Via EventBrite, APA MN will accommodate the first 75 registrants on a first come first serve basis.

Workshop format: lectures interspersed with simulation exercises, discussion and Q&A

Additional questions: Patrick Boylan
patrick.boylan@metc.state.mn.us
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