Eminent Dominion: Rethinking the Legacy of Robert Moses
By Paul Goldberger

For a generation, the standard view of Robert Moses has been that he transformed New York, but didn’t really make it better. This view was shaped by Robert Caro’s epic biography “The Power Broker”—published in 1974 and in print ever since. Caro portrays Moses as a brilliant political operative who perpetuated his power by means of grand public works, filling the landscape with bridges and tunnels and parkways, heedless of people or neighborhoods that might get in the way of them. The notion of Moses as the evil genius of mid-twentieth-century urban design got a boost last spring in obituaries of and tributes to Jane Jacobs, a longtime antagonist, who was instrumental in defeating one of his most outrageously wrongheaded schemes, the Lower Manhattan Expressway, which would have destroyed much of SoHo.

Almost every article about Jacobs included a swipe at Moses, whose arrogance and lack of interest in the texture of the city seemed a harsh contrast to Jacobs’s love of neighborhoods, streets, and, by implication, people.

Jacobs’s book “The Death and Life of Great American Cities,” published in 1961, all but put an end to the idea that the way to improve old urban neighborhoods was to tear them down and replace them with towers and expressways. By the time Moses died, in 1981, his tendency to see public works as a form of machismo had fallen almost entirely out of fashion. Whereas he celebrated big things and his ability to build them, Jacobs changed the way people thought about cities by teaching them to focus on little things.

Moses—who began his marathon career under Governor Al Smith, in the nineteen-twenties, and was forced from power by Governor Nelson Rockefeller, in 1968—has been gone for more than a quarter of a century, and New York, which was decrepit and nearly bankrupt when Caro’s book appeared, is a different place. Moses is clearly due for a reevaluation, and this week sees the opening of “Robert Moses and the Modern City,” a huge exhibition that surveys his impact on New York. Organized by Hilary Ballon, an architectural historian at Columbia, the exhibition extends over three institutions. The broadest installation, at the Museum of the City of New York, is called “Remaking the Metropolis,” and presents Moses’s highway system and the big institutions, like Lincoln Center and the United Nations, that he
BE A STAR!!
JOIN THE SMALL TOWN AND RURAL PLANNING DIVISION OF APA

By Dale Powers, AICP, STaR Division Chair, and Paul Bednar, AICP, STaR Membership Coordinator

Every year when you get your invoice for renewing your APA membership, you are also renewing your dues for membership in your State Chapter. Down on the bottom of the invoice, you are also given the option of joining one or more of the Divisions of APA. Unlike Chapters that are geographically based, Divisions are based on some aspect of planning and are nationwide in scope.

By far the most dynamic of APA’s Divisions is the Small Town and Rural (STaR) Division. STaR is dedicated to planners in small town and rural areas of the USA and Canada. While many of you could not imagine working as the only planner in your agency, many of STaR’s members are solo practitioners and are called upon by their agency’s Planning Commission and City Council to provide professional guidance on planning issues. Further, these planners typically have less experience than metropolitan-area planners. Consequently, these planners look to STaR for answers to general planning and zoning matters that come before them.

Another set of planners that look to STaR for guidance are county planners. STaR is nationally known for its work in agricultural land preservation and has recognized experts in conservation subdivision among its members.

Finally, many private practitioners located in metropolitan areas are STaR members due to their client base in rural areas. Planning outside a major metropolitan area is quite different than what metropolitan planners experience, and the STaR connection has proved invaluable to these planners when working with small town elected officials and staff.

What are the benefits of joining STaR? The following list is just a sampling:

- Access to our quarterly newsletter that is an eclectic mix of planning information, planner profiles, columns on planning management and technical planning, as well as the most fascinating photography of small town and rural America of any Division newsletter.
- Access to the STaR message board where questions to your planning questions can be posted and responses received from throughout the country.
- 24-hour “rapid response” to any questions posed directly to the Division Chair, Dale Powers of Pine County, Minnesota.
- Qualification for the STaR Awards programs for best small town plan, small town planner, and student awards.

STaR is also working on an initiative to subsidize a portion of the cost of AICP certification maintenance for those STaR AICP members whose income falls below the state median.

STaR is excited about the menu of services offered to it’s over 750 members nationwide (including 21 here in Georgia), and we would like you to consider joining our Division. We believe the $25.00 annual dues are returned to you and your agency several times over in service.

For more information about joining STaR, contact Division Chair Dale Powers at drpowers@co.pine.mn.us or Membership Coordinator Paul Bednar at paul@paulbednar.com.
Like an Old Road, Transportation Bills Need to be Scraped and Resurfaced

Several bills were introduced in the Georgia Legislature during February to provide new funding sources for transportation needs in Georgia. The first bill, HB 434, introduced by State Rep. Chuck Martin of Alpharetta and State Rep. Richard Royal of Camilla would create a new type of SPLOST approved by referendums to fund multi-county transportation programs. As a replacement to decreasing federal sources of funds, which have been the backbone of Georgia transportation infrastructure, another SPLOST is not a long term solution. A new SPLOST will compete in referendums for voters with school and other local infrastructure needs that rely on SPLOST.

As currently written, HB 434 would also create a redundant transportation planning process to the federally required Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) in Georgia. See the following Georgia listing - http://www.ampo.org/directory/index.php. The new SPLOST would be organized by the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) board which the Governor alone appoints.

HB 434 would not only create overlapping responsibility but also would not solve the primary problem – the transportation construction process. Typically half of the transportation funds currently available go unspent each year as projects are not built. Slow progress, poorly chosen projects, low cost estimates, among other issues, leave funds on the table. HB 434 has been supported by 15 chambers of commerce, including the Metro Atlanta Chamber and the Regional Business Coalition. The chambers apparently forgot the concept of efficient government operation in this bill.

Another bill, HB 442, introduced by House Transportation Committee Chairman Vance Smith HB 442, would create a referendum that states: “If approved by the voters there shall be imposed a state-wide 1 percent sales tax for transportation purposes in the manner
helped build. “The Road to Recreation,” at the Queens Museum of Art, documents Moses’s new parks, playgrounds, and swimming pools; and “Slum Clearance and the Superblock Solution,” at Columbia’s Wallach Art Gallery, shows his inventive mastery of the federal government’s Tide I slum-clearance programs, and the results, both good and bad. Ballon and Kenneth Jackson, a prominent historian of New York based at Columbia, have put most of the visual material from the three exhibitions, along with several strong essays, into a forthcoming book, “Robert Moses and the Modern City: The Transformation of New York” (Norton; S50). The title is an obvious retort to Caro’s subtitle, “Robert Moses and the Fall of New York,” and the book presents itself as a cautious corrective to Caro’s view.

Caro called Moses “America’s greatest builder,” and perhaps the most distinctive service of the exhibition is to bring home the sheer scale of his achievement to a new audience. There are models of many Moses projects and exceptionally elegant color photographs, by Andrew Moore, showing the current state of those projects. The photographs are so beautiful that they make you yearn for a time when enhancing the public realm was a serious calling. Moses built the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, the Triborough Bridge, the Henry Hudson Parkway, the Henry Hudson Bridge, the Southern and Northern State Parkways, the Grand Central Parkway, the Cross Island Parkway, the Bronx-Whitestone Bridge, the Throgs Neck Bridge, the Brooklyn-Battery Tunnel, the Long Island Expressway, the Meadowbrook Parkway, and the Saw Mill River Parkway. He built Jones Beach State Park (an early masterwork), Orchard Beach, the Niagara and St. Lawrence power projects, the New York Coliseum, and the 1964 World’s Fair. By his own count, Moses added six hundred and fifty-eight playgrounds and seventeen public swimming pools to the New York City park system. In Central Park, he added the Conservatory Garden, the Great Lawn, and the Zoo. He played a major role in the creation of Shea Stadium, Stuyvesant Town, Lenox Terrace, Park West Village, Lincoln Towers, Kips Bay Plaza, Washington Square Village, and Co-op City. At one point, Moses held twelve New York City and New York State positions simultaneously. He served under seven governors and five mayors, and a popular joke had it that Moses wasn’t working for them so much as they were serving under Moses.

Even more significant, perhaps, than Moses’s productivity is the fact that he was one of the first people to look at New York City not as an isolated urban zone but as the central element in a sprawling region. In the early nineteen-thirties, he would charter small planes and fly back and forth across the metropolitan area to get a better sense of regional patterns.
His vision of New York was of an integrated system with an urban center, a suburban ring, and a series of huge public recreational areas, all connected by parkways. Although the Regional Plan Association had proposed looking at the metropolitan area that way in 1929, Moses was the only public official who both grasped regionalism as a concept and had the ability to do something about it—which meant not only transcending local politics but also figuring out ways to pay for huge projects. He did this by establishing a series of public authorities, which allowed him to issue public bonds at favorable rates while leaving him with nearly as much autonomy as he would have had if he were running a private corporation. He moved among his various offices via a fleet of limousines—the highway-builder never learned to drive. His home base was in the headquarters of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, a small building on Randall’s Island, nestled under the Triborough Bridge, where he held court in lavish offices that were hidden from public view.

It is this image of Moses—unseen, omnipotent—that dominates Caro’s biography. Thirty years after its publication, the book remains remarkable both for its exhaustive research and for its almost Shakespearean scale and complexity. At the same time, it can be melodramatic (“He had learned the lesson of power. And now he grabbed for power with both hands”), and it sometimes underemphasizes the extent to which, extraordinary as he was, Moses was still a product of his time. Caro points out, for example, how many subway improvements could have been bought with the money Moses spent on highways, but in Moses’s day cities all over the country were building highways at the expense of mass transit, and New York was far from the worst. Some critics, like Jacobs and Lewis Mumford, were complaining that highways damaged urban neighborhoods, but most people didn’t see this until long after the damage had been done. Moses’s view of “urban renewal” was no different from that of officials elsewhere, and in some ways it was far more imaginative. Moses didn’t bring down New York, and he didn’t single-handedly sell its soul to the automobile. Indeed, New York probably comes closer to having a workable balance between cars and mass transit than any other city in the country.

One of Caro’s most damaging accusations is that Moses was motivated by racism both in his designs for certain projects and in his decisions about what neighborhoods would be given priority for new parks and pools. In an interview with Paul Windels, a colleague of Moses, Caro turns up the bizarre detail that Moses believed that black people preferred warm water and decided to use this supposed fact to deter them from using a particular pool in East Harlem: “While heating plants at the other swimming pools kept the water at a comfortable seventy degrees, at the Thomas Jefferson Pool, the water was left untreated.” The essays in the exhibition catalogue go into the issue of racism in some detail but do little to rebut Caro’s claims. They show a willingness to give Moses the benefit of the doubt, where doubt exists. The architectural historian Marta Gutman points out that the placement of swimming pools was in almost all cases determined by the location of existing city parks. She also confirms that the pool in East Harlem contained the same heating equipment as the others (although, of course, there is no proof that it was turned on). Kenneth Jackson makes a more general point: “The important questions, however, are not whether Moses was prejudiced—no doubt he was—but whether that prejudice was something upon which he acted frequently.” Jackson argues that Moses’s strong commitment to the creation of expansive public works more than compensated for his tendency to skimp on facilities for black neighborhoods. It’s also worth pointing out that, no matter what planners think or do, architecture is ultimately defined by patterns of use that emerge over generations; today, Moses’s pools, situated in multiethnic neighborhoods, serve entirely different communities from the ones he envisaged.

Whatever Moses’s racial views, the swimming pools he built were monuments that conferred grandeur, even nobility, on their neighborhoods, and they suggest that Moses believed that the public realm deserved only the best design. In the summer of 1936, he opened one swimming pool per week. Each was architecturally notable; each was different, and the biggest ones could hold thousands of people at a time. A few, like the Crotona Pool, in East Tremont, and the McCarren Pool, in Greenpoint, were masterworks of modernist public architecture. Gutman writes that Moses managed “to integrate monumental modern buildings into the fabric of everyday urban life,” and she persuasively asserts that the buildings were “unique in the United States during the New Deal.”

Oddly, for all that Caro tried to destroy the myths about Moses, he never challenged the biggest one of all—that of his omnipotence. Moses is portrayed as rarely losing a political battle, but in fact he lost quite a few. One of the most important was the struggle, in the early nineteen-fifties, to extend Fifth Avenue south through Washington Square, splitting the park in two. It was as indefensible as the Lower Manhattan Expressway plan, a few years later, and Moses’s inept handling of opposition to the Fifth Avenue plan from residents of Greenwich Village contributed directly to Jane Jacobs’s radicalization and,
ultimately, to the growing interest in preserving urban neighborhoods. In 1958, in a speech titled “Washington Square and the Revolt of the Urbs,” the urban planner Charles Abrams said, “It is no surprise that, at long last, rebellion is brewing in America, that the American city is the battleground for the preservation of diversity, and that Greenwich Village should be its Bunker Hill.... In the battle of Washington Square, even Moses is yielding.”

Lewis Mumford, writing in this magazine in 1959, described the fight to ban traffic from Washington Square as “a heartening sign of the way in which a stir of intelligence and feeling not only can rally far more support than one would expect. . . but can bring to a halt the seemingly irresistible force of a group of experts and ‘authorities.’” Caro barely mentions the battle over Washington Square. By contrast, he devotes three chapters to the saga of the Cross-Bronx Expressway, in which Moses trampled over the neighborhood opposition.

Caro enhances the sense of Moses’s power by minimizing the influence of less flamboyant players, such as Austin Tobin, the head of the Port Authority from 1942 to 1972. Tobin managed to wrestle control of the city airports from Moses, construct a container port, expand the Lincoln Tunnel and the George Washington Bridge, and to build the World Trade Center.

When Caro’s book was published, Jane Jacobs’s views were on the ascendent, and it seemed reasonable to connect the city’s troubles to Moses’s imperious way of doing things. But Moses’s surgery, while radical, may just possibly have saved New York. For every Moses project that ruined a neighborhood, as the Cross-Bronx Expressway did East Tremont, there are others, like the vast pool and play center in Astoria Park, Queens, or the Hamilton Fish Pool, on the Lower East Side, that became anchors of their neighborhoods and now are designated landmarks. Lincoln Center, whatever you may think of it, jump-started the revival of the Upper West Side; if Moses hadn’t pushed it through, there is little chance that the high-rise condominiums, multiplex theaters, restaurants, and stores that now fill the neighborhood could have sprung up when they did. We are lucky, of course, that Moses’s last big project, a bridge across the Long Island Sound connecting Rye and Oyster Bay, was defeated on environmental grounds, but it is difficult to imagine the New York region functioning without the Triborough Bridge or the Grand Central Parkway.

And Robert Moses got things done. In the age of citizen participation, this has become harder and harder. For more than five years, we have been fighting over what to do at Ground Zero, and the future of much of the sixteen-acre site is still unresolved. The idea of Moynihan Station—a conversion of the classical Parley Post Office, on Eighth Avenue, into an improved Penn Station—was first proposed a decade ago, and it still hasn’t happened. By contrast, Moses’s plan to cover miles of train tracks on the Upper West Side with an extension of Riverside Park took under three years from design to completion. In an era when almost any project can be held up for years by public hearings and reviews by community boards, community groups, civic groups, and planning commissions, not to mention the courts, it is hard not to feel a certain nostalgic tug for Moses’s method of building by decree. It may not have been democratic, or even right. Still, somebody has to look at the big picture and make decisions for the greater good. Moses’s problem was that he couldn’t take his eye off the big picture. He was so in tune with New York’s vastness that he had no patience for anything small within it. Caro brilliantly immortalized Moses’s indifference to neighborhoods and people at a time when the city was weak, when the wounds from his high-handed approach were raw, and when Jane Jacobs’s focus on the fine grain of neighborhoods held fresh promise. But there is a price to pay for thinking small, just as there is for thinking big. Thirty years later, we are still trying to find the balance.
Perry, GA has been selected as the site for the Georgia Department of Community Affairs’ Office of Planning and Quality Growth Spring 2007 Resource Team. Team members will meet with Perry elected officials, planners, and stakeholders March 26-30.

Resource Team visits are organized by DCA, working with its quality growth partners, to assist Georgia communities in implementing quality growth principles into the comprehensive plan, land development ordinances, and day-to-day decision making. Some of the quality growth issues the resource team may examine are: Environmental Protection & Open Space; Growth Preparedness; Appropriate Economic Development; Housing Choices; Sense of Place.

“Resource Teams are a great opportunity for outside the box thinking for planning the future of the community,” said Jim Frederick, OPQG Office Director. “At little cost to the community, some of Georgia’s best minds will spend a week in Perry, brainstorming and sharing their ideas for what the community might become.”

Frederick continued, “And this is not just a fantasy exercise. We’ve found over the years that communities end up adopting and implementing many of the ideas that come out of their ‘resource team’ experience.”

A community can request a Quality Growth Resource Team for two purposes:

1) Community Visioning through identification of character areas and formation of development strategies for each character area.

2) Small Area Planning for already-identified character area(s) in need of special attention and focused planning efforts.

“A resource team is about turning vision into reality,” said Annaka Woodruff, Manager Outreach Services. “The energy of all these professionals, dedicated to community design, can be contagious.”

Woodruff added, “We love working with communities that are working to create great plans and communities that have plans in place and are excited about implementing them. Members of a Resource Team can take a community’s plan, take a look around, and say ‘okay, if you want this vision to happen, here’s a list of priorities for getting there’. Community building is a long process, but the length of the journey shouldn’t stop us from getting started.”

The team will consist of 10x20 members inclusive of DCA staff, planners, city officials, state officials, landscape architects and others who have been selected from across the state for their expertise in matters that are of concern to the Perry community.

“OPQG makes Resource Team visits four times a year,” said Resource Team Coordinator, Rebecca Born. “We are excited about our visit to Perry. This is a great opportunity and a premier program that allows us to interact with the public.”

Born continued, “Resource Teams bring together a diversity of professions – and all of these diverse ideas come together as one cohesive product in the effort to serve the community.”

Public input is critical to the planning process. Citizens are urged to participate in stakeholders meetings designed to develop ideas and solutions for development in the community and should watch for newspaper articles and further information on the Resource Team visit. Further, residents of Perry can expect continued communication – work with a community does not end with the Resource Team visit. OPQG staff will stay in touch with community officials, offering follow-up assistance and encouragement.

For information on OPQG Resource Teams or for information on how you can volunteer your time and talent, contact Rebecca Born at 404-679-4859 or rborn@dca.state.ga.us. Also see our website: www.georgiaplanning.com.
The Atlanta region has prospered and many families and individuals have achieved better lives during the past 30 plus years of growth. Local governments and ARC have supported this growth in many ways through new infrastructure and planning. But a primary component of supporting the region’s economy and citizens lives is often left up to the private sector. This issue is a sufficient supply, types and cost of housing to meet the needs of our state’s citizens. Adequate housing for many different needs and jobs is an important aspect of life that often is not well understood or supported by governments.

The term “housing” is often associated with housing for persons with low incomes or disabilities. However, everyone requires housing. The number of households in the U.S. with two parents and children was 40% in 1970. In 2000, the percentage of “traditional” family households had shrunk to 32% and by 2030 will be 21% of all U.S. households. The reasons for this decline is because individuals are waiting longer to be married, longer to have children and are living longer after their children have moved away. These increased stages of lives and other issues including divorce have created more households that do not need a large home and lot and in many cases cannot afford the large homes that many persons associate with the “American Dream”.

Despite these trends, in 2004 more than 62% of housing was classified as large lot single family homes in the Atlanta region by the American Housing Survey. Looking forward as the baby boomers move into their retirement years, most will be seeking smaller lot single family housing or attached housing according to surveys. In addition, while the Atlanta region is generally regarded as affordable as compared to many regions of the U.S., increasingly the appreciation of housing and the salaries of jobs, particularly service, retail and government jobs are in the region are not increasing at the same rates.

Many organizations in the Atlanta region now recognize the housing availability, choices and costs are a major issue and a potential threat to the growth of our economy. The Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce Quality Growth Task Force designated housing as one of the top three issue in the region. The ARC Livable Centers Initiative program (LCI) has made the designation of new potential housing development areas an important part of the studies that are occurring. The Atlanta Neighborhood Development Partnership through their Mixed Income Community Initiative (MICI) has demonstrated through research that a major job-housing imbalance exists in the region. This jobs-housing imbalance is a major contributor to traffic congestion as there are too few choices to live in areas that are accessible to the largest concentrations of jobs in the region.

According to the Georgia Budget and Policy Institute in the 2006 State of Working Georgia report, in 2005, 28.1 percent of Georgia’s workforce had a bachelor’s degree or higher, while 13.7 percent did not complete high school. This leaves 58 percent of Georgians with only a high school degree. Georgia’s 2005 poverty rate of 14.4 percent meant over 1.2 million of the roughly 8 million Georgians were living in poverty. In 2005, 20.2 percent of Georgia’s children lived in poverty, giving Georgia the 15th highest child poverty rate in the nation.

Often regulations focus on making new housing in communities attractive and economically successful but at the same time these regulations make housing less affordable. We trust that the
housing market, which governments and the private sector interact, will provide housing to the needy. Unfortunately, the availability of housing and jobs is not well understood or matched across the region with the result being many unmet housing needs and more traffic congestion.

Creating communities that provide adequate housing for retired citizens on fixed incomes, elderly widows, veterans, disabled persons, mothers and children is an important aspect of government. The fact is that most Georgians are not wealthy. With median incomes of $45,604 in 2005, Georgia was below the nation’s level of $46,242 and about average in comparison to other states.

In December 2006, the nonprofit League of Cities, based in Washington, which describes itself as a resource and advocate for more than 18,000 cities, towns and villages reported that four out of five housing directors in more than 1,000 U. S. cities said that the value of homes and rental costs have increased significantly, putting severe financial strain on families. Local and state governments must understand citizens housing needs and balance regulations and market demands to provide adequate housing choices.

The real estate market provides adequate housing options for persons or families with good incomes in the Atlanta region. The public and private sectors and non-profits need to consider ways to provide good neighborhoods and housing for the less affluent, working class and the middle class who are the majority of Georgians.

**Transportation Bills (continued from p. 3)**

provided by law”. The bill was later expanded to create toll roads in metro Atlanta and added a long list of unproven transportation project ideas.

The Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University reported in April 2006 that as of 2004 only Alaska and Wyoming had lower effective fuel tax rates. “Increases in fuel prices have increased the effective tax rate in Georgia, as well as in several other states. At the current (2006) effective tax rate of 15.3 cents per gallon (gasoline) and 16.5 cents per gallon (diesel), Georgia’s effective motor fuel tax ranks among the lowest in the nation.”

One tenant of good government is to tax the user. Rather than raise Georgia’s motor fuel tax to a reasonable amount for the 9th largest U.S. state, a new sales tax would tax everything from grandma’s underwear to dog food. And a sales tax for transportation will be on top of existing sales taxes and SPLOST.

We need to solve existing construction problems, state funding for MARTA and educate the clueless who don’t understand the problem or the future before we throw more money to highway building. Georgia is competing for resources in a world that will double energy consumption during the next 25 years. The end of oil may not be near, but the end of cheap oil is a certainty. Georgia should increase the gas tax and put the funds towards developing transportation solutions that serve the most Georgians and sustain our economy. Our children and the baby boomers, who will need transportation options as they age, will one day thank us for our vision.
thank you to our sponsors!
CHANGE OF ADDRESS
The Georgia Chapter does not maintain address lists. All lists are maintained at the national office and are mailed to the local chapters each month. If you have moved, e-mail: addresschange@planning.org, go to Member Login at www.planning.org, or write to:
American Planning Association
97774 Eagle Way
Chicago, IL 60678-9770

MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION
If you are interested in joining GPA or the American Planning Association, contact the national headquarters at the address above or call (312) 431-9100 or visit their website at www.planning.org.

CONTACTS
Direct financial inquiries and address payments to the Treasurer. Direct questions about chapter records to the Secretary. Direct matters for the Board of Directors to the President. See mailing and email addresses inside.

SUBMISSION
The Georgia Planning Association welcomes articles, letters to the editor, photos of planning events or state happenings, calendar listings, job notices, planners on the move, etc. We are always interested in publishing items you think may be of interest to others throughout the state. Graphics are especially welcome. Articles may be edited for space. Articles printed in any issue of The Georgia Planner are not the expressed opinion of the Chapter.

DEADLINE
The deadline for the next issue is May 31, 2007.

Send items for the newsletter to:
William F. Ross
ROSS+associates
2161 Peachtree Road, NE Suite 806
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Bill@planross.com

CALENDAR OF EVENTS - visit the website for the current events listing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 14th – 16th</td>
<td>National Bike Summit</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bikeleague.org">www.bikeleague.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the 21st Century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22nd – 23rd</td>
<td>Greenprints Conference</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southface.org">www.southface.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9th – 10th</td>
<td>Complete Management Course for Planning Directors</td>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.zuckersystems.com">www.zuckersystems.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13th</td>
<td>Southface – Sustainable Atlanta Roundtable</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southface.org">www.southface.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14th – 18th</td>
<td>APA National Planning Conference</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.planning.org">www.planning.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4th</td>
<td>Southface – Sustainable Atlanta Roundtable</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southface.org">www.southface.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8th – 11th</td>
<td>International Downtown Association</td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ida-downtown.org">www.ida-downtown.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23rd – 25th</td>
<td>GEDA Spring Workshop</td>
<td>Brasstown Valley</td>
<td><a href="http://www.geda.org">www.geda.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1st</td>
<td>Southface – Sustainable Atlanta Roundtable</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southface.org">www.southface.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13th</td>
<td>Southface – Sustainable Atlanta Roundtable</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southface.org">www.southface.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 3rd</td>
<td>Southface – Sustainable Atlanta Roundtable</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southface.org">www.southface.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7th</td>
<td>Southface – Sustainable Atlanta Roundtable</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southface.org">www.southface.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19th – 21st</td>
<td>GPA Fall Conference</td>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rbleau@atlantaregional.com">rbleau@atlantaregional.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>