

Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>
Agree		Neutral		Agree	Planners who have achieved the "AICP" process should be granted State certification without a required State exam . . . or the AICP exam should be recognized as the 'State' exam
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	Totally unnecessary to be a "Planner-In-Charge" to prepare or amend a Comprehensive Plan when there are Statutes that describe what must be in the Plan. If this is for extra credentials, what is the point? I don't understand what the problem or issue may be that a "planner-in-charge" designation will resolve.	Neutral	How would everything a planner works on be incorporated including site plan reviews, incorporation studies, neighborhood plans, etc. Totally unnecessary.	Strongly Disagree	There is AICP already. This will cost additional money to administer, create the exam, take the exam, and determine status. Do planners pay for this or hope that their employer pays? I think AICP is enough.
Disagree		Neutral		Neutral	How would this relate to the current AICP exam?
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	Comprehensive plans are ultimately approved by elected officials.	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	Planning is too diverse a profession to justify this action
Disagree	I don't see the numerous deficient Comprehensive Plans that have resulted from the Comprehensive Planning Law as being a problem caused due to lack of certification of planners. I see it as a deficiency in the law. The law does not include a QA/QC for plans. It requires that 9 elements be included but does not set any standards for what those elements must address. The law implies inclusion of the topical information under each element description. DOA reviews (only) the plans for which state planning grants were provided. DOA determines whether the public participation plan has been completed and that the 9 elements and required maps are included. The quality of the discussion is not measured. The agency does not review other non-grant funded comprehensive plans. DOA's review is not an "adequacy" type of review. My opinion is that the language in the law be strengthened so better plans are written as 10 year updates are started, before the requirement for planner in charge be discussed. There are roughly 155 Comprehensive Plans adopted in 2000-01 that should be look	Disagree	.....on all mentioned except perhaps TIF. The TIF law should also be amended to enhance compact development and redevelopment and to discourage sprawl, thereby reducing its unintended but very real consequences including impacts to natural resources, significant increases of GHG emissions and impacts to local economies for infrastructure development and maintenance.	Agree	Similar to other licensed practices, it gives planners greater credibility. Tying it to a deficient law however, doesn't give it meaning. Again, these are my opinions considering the lack of quality control in the law relative to adopted plans. I think planner in charge certification may enhance planning for sustainable urban (and rural) development, energy efficient and green building design, location and design of alternative and renewable energy facilities including fuel source locations, fuel generation and transmission and distribution facilities and other features such as urban green spaces: parks, forest, waterways, etc.
Strongly Disagree	This would prohibit communities from preparing their own plans. Although most communities work with a professional planner (private consultant, RPC, or county) to prepare comp plans, some go it alone and do a good job.	Disagree		Neutral	I don't have strong feelings on this one, but if such requirements were enacted, an AICP certification should fulfill any state registration requirements.
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree	In some Wisconsin rural towns, the citizens themselves can do a better job than many "professional" planners. If I was on such a planning committee, I would see right through an attempt to create a "class" of people seeking to protect their domain as plan-makers. A better question might be: who should write a community's zoning ordinance? Subdivision ordinance? What credentials ought they have?	Strongly Disagree	Communities presently pay a price for failing to hire good planners. If a planner makes errors in his or her professional practice, there are already means for penalizing them. A "PIC" designation would only seem to grant a false sense of capability and perhaps lead to more errors.	Disagree	If a community wishes to hire an AICP certified planner, nothing is stopping them.
Strongly Disagree	All this is after the fact. Adds to the complexity and has budgetary effects. Could license be revoked for some reason? Not good.	Strongly Disagree	Sounds like a power struggle.	Neutral	Consider Urban, Rural and Tribal - all different fields of expertise.

Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>
Neutral	While I respect the need for plans to have the oversight of qualified professionals, and for the profession to be viewed with the same importance or legitimacy of engineers, attorneys, etc., I question if this is the best method to achieve it...	Agree		Neutral	Planning is a varied profession that cannot be qualified in the same manner as the others listed.
Agree		Disagree		Agree	
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Neutral		Neutral		Agree	
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Agree	
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree	Certification Exams, Cm credits etc.. are good enough to be an excellent Planner in charge. The State of Wisconsin is not a planning expert that should be given the audacity to do what? Please postpone and later table this issue at the next WAPA convention. Thanks!	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	What is the purpose of AICP certification then and why am I struggling to get my 32 hours CM credit?
Neutral		Neutral		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Neutral	I'm not sure that some of the plans are good enough to implement out there. I'd like to see some 'plan repair/enhancement' duties added to the PIC's list of tasks.	Disagree	Rather than expand responsibilities to other plans, perhaps more emphasis on 'coordination' of these activities within the context of the comprehensive plan are in order.	Disagree	Paying \$400 a year to have AICP isn't enough? I'd be wary of the costs for an individual to do so. Fine for the private consultant planners who may pay/pay well enough to do this, but public sector planners rarely realize such benefits so it hits them in the pocketbook more. Also, what impact will this have on more planners being dragged into court (willing or unwilling) to defend municipalities' decisions (they might anyway given the 2010 smart growth deadline) - just a thought..... now my 1 min. survey turned into 2! :)
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Neutral		Neutral		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree		Neutral	
Agree		Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	

Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>
Agree	A licence or AICP should not be required, but a degree in planning should. It doesn't have to be a Masters, but it should NOT be a "geography or related field" type of thing. They should also have to prove a high level of understanding of the comp plan law and basic Wisconsin municipal laws that relate most directly to the comp plan law.	Agree		Disagree	Our profession does not have a similar level of respect, and having a license won't make a difference. Unlike a structural engineer, no buildings will collapse if we screw something up. A license will only be one more expense planners will have to cover. Sorry folks, that's just the way it is.
Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	
Strongly Disagree	If our AICP process of credentialing (and continuing education credits) is used as the standard way to receive a Wisconsin PIC designation, I would not have any issues with this process. However, if this PIC process would require additional costs, requirements (outside of AICP process), testing, etc, I am highly opposed to it for multiple reasons. It would not add to the planner's ability to develop sound plans or a person's planning practice; it would not add to the quality improvement of comprehensive plans; and it would not add to the product communities receive from the consultants. It would eliminate lawyers, plan commissions, and some engineers from doing these plans. This is a bottom up process and designed to be this way. If a local government believes it's own plan commission should develop a plan to meet a set of comprehensive plan laws, then planning profession should not interfere. If the goal is to improve the quality of plans, strive to make the statutes more clear and with a structure of review to some degree to ensure the quality.	Strongly Disagree	Same reasoning as above.	Agree	I would agree to a registration process, similar to LA's but, again if this requires more than the national AICP requirements, I would be highly opposed to this.
Disagree	I don't know how practical this is. Yes there is licensure for engineers and architects but planning is a lot more subjective and requires a larger number of people.	Neutral		Disagree	
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Agree		Agree		Strongly Agree	
Neutral		Disagree		Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree		Agree	The state should not create its own licensure process, but instead refer to established outside organizations. AICP, CPED, etc.
Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	

<p>Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.</p>	<p><i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i></p>	<p>If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).</p>	<p><i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i></p>	<p>The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).</p>	<p><i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i></p>
Disagree		Disagree	I am hesitant to require this type of requirement given the lack of diversity in State planning profession and advanced degree programs. To the best of my knowledge, one of the two planning schools in the State (UWM) will go at least two years without graduating a student of color, and I have heard of similar stats at the other (Madison). While I understand that the type of requirement described above would help my own professional prospects, I think that requiring a certification to do this type of work (when I am not convinced one is necessary to begin with) would further lead to the exclusion of underrepresented groups from this field.	Agree	
Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree	
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Neutral		Neutral		Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Agree		Neutral		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree	<p>We have yet to establish evaluative criteria for what might satisfy 66.1001 and thus be a measure for holding folks accountable for whatever process steps as well as content, including internal implementation mechanisms, are submitted as components of comp plans. So we would be accrediting folks to entitle them to do something for which there are no current objective standards? What is the objective here? A review for quality is likely an exercise eventually shared with the courts. Plan content is also the responsibility of appointed and elected officials. It may be awkward at the very least for planners to initial a document when their professional and ethical standards have been over-ridden by the appointed/elected bodies. This takes me back to suggesting an approach to the first issue - encourage and support the political will to provide state and local agencies review authority over comp plans with the ability to send them back for revision.</p>	Disagree	<p>Some of the activities mentioned are regulated by statute, by administrative code, and by local ordinance, or administrative fiat. Other plans are frequently prepared by legal counsel, cpa's, etc. - TIF plans come to mind as a hybrid. So could this be construed to mean that a non-profit organization preparing an app for a neighborhood planning grant would have to receive review by a "planner-incharge" prior to submission? Would this mean that analysts from one state agency reviewing the work product of another state agency would have to include a "planner-in-charge" on the team? A thought occurs to me that occasionally ethical stances taken by agencies could easily challenge if not run counter to any ethical component that would part of the "planner-in-charge" designation. Of course if flipped, these are all arguments for having certifiable standards. I'm thinking of the nature of the current environment in which planners work in suggesting that designation is a fool's errand.</p>	Neutral	<p>This is the least objectionable of the three statements, and it may be the easiest to operationalize given the myriad of environments in which planners work, including serving as administrators. Instead of a separate state process, why not simply seek a bill draft acknowledging the AICP designation?</p>

Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>
Strongly Disagree	Like many certifications, the proposed would not provide any more certainty of a quality outcome than what I've seen from planners with or without AICP. Why create another unnecessary credential simply to verify that you a.) were able to study for an exam; b.) were able to pass the exam; and c.) are willing to continue paying for a certification through fees and "continued education". Those of us who employ planning outside of the academic world find little value in such certifications, but only in a quality end product.	Strongly Disagree	See comments above.	Strongly Disagree	see comments above
Agree	Yes there should be a process to review credentials, but no separate exams. I strongly encourage the use of the AICP credential since this is a well establish program and one that is a national standard. This would make for logical and easy review while creating a "level playing field" for planners throughout the US (especially since many consultants from out of state do work in Wisconsin)	Agree		Agree	Yes the state should have a licensure process but I feel it should strongly consider using AICP certification as a default license since this already a nationally recognized standard. It would be a bad idea for the state to try and implement its own review process due to the cost to the State of administering its own program and the costs to those in the profession to gain another type of accreditation beyond the already expensive AICP. Further by using AICP it would provide flexibility to WI municipalities who may work with out of state consultants that might not secure a separate WI certification.
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	The profession already has the AICP
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Neutral	
Neutral		Neutral		Neutral	
Agree		Disagree		Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Agree	I am a bit cautious about this. I believe in the age-old idea of the "citizen planner". But I think we do have an obligation to try to raise the bar or we risk the danger of becoming irrelevant. Lots of companies add to the bottom of their list of services "and Planning". I think that's a disservice to the profession and to the client. But planning is different than engineering and architecture and a bit more like Landscape Architecture. If someone builds a bad bridge someone could die, and likewise a bad building. A bad plan or a bad garden or park is simply a waste of money, but that is bad enough to earn some thoughtful discussion.	Strongly Agree	If adopted we should go for it. It is a shame that the state has only one real planner at Intergovernmental affairs overseeing the entire comprehensive planning program.	Strongly Disagree	Keep it out of the state's hands or they will screw it up. Simply require AICP designation.
Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	

Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.		If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).		The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).	
	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>		<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>		<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	
Neutral		Neutral		Neutral	
Neutral	I could live with some form of this, but my support would depend upon the details. I currently don't have much faith in the State of Wisconsin delivering on anything related to planning.	Neutral	Only if the process in #1 was successful.	Disagree	I have acquired and maintained AICP certification for 22 years. I don't want to do it again for the State.
Agree		Disagree		Agree	
Agree	This issue can not be easily addressed by a simply agree or disagree. There are clear benefits to the licensing creating a Planner in Charge designation. I certainly should lead to the overall licensing of planners. Licensing can build respectability to the profession but as was discussed at the recent March discussion of this issue planning is a diverse field. I know that licensing is not necessarily the only way to build respect but it may be a step we now need to take. We certainly need to talk about this issue further before we act.	Agree	See above	Agree	See comments above
Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Agree	This would be good for the profession, but do we not lose the "citizen planner?" This is an issue that would need to be resolved.	Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	As long as the combination does not include AICP. AICP is about theory, this must be skill based. Any registration or licensure should be Wisconsin specific, based on Wisconsin Law, and require education from an accredited planning school.
Agree		Disagree		Neutral	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree	Most good comprehensive plans and the field of planning in general are too broad to think that one exam/ licensure would be sufficient to certify one person as responsible for a 20-year planning document.	Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Agree		Agree		Strongly Agree	
Disagree		Disagree		Neutral	
Disagree		Agree		Neutral	How is this different that the first question? This is confusing.
Strongly Disagree	Adding another layer of bureaucracy does not ensure quality, but it does make it less likely or less feasible for community leadership to be involved in the process.	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	

<p>Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.</p>	<p><i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i></p>	<p>If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).</p>	<p><i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i></p>	<p>The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).</p>	<p><i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i></p>
<p>Agree</p>		<p>Strongly Agree</p>		<p>Agree</p>	
<p>Disagree</p>	<p>This is just another state fee that will not make a substantive difference in the profession</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>Same comment as above</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	
<p>Agree</p>	<p>I agree with the concept, but give this responsibility and designation to the Planning Director who typically does the review and approval of comprehensive plans. "Planner-in-Charge" does not sound very professional at all (rinky dink) and will create confusion. Just call the credential a "PD" (Planning Director) and if the agency doesn't have a "Planning Director" still call it a PD but require the senior staff member to get the PD designation. My point is, why create a new title that will create confusion????</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Again, "PD" or Planning Director</p>	<p>Agree</p>	
<p>Disagree</p>		<p>Disagree</p>		<p>Disagree</p>	
<p>Strongly Agree</p>	<p>Definitely, comprehensive plans should be prepared by professional planners, using the AICP certification and maintenance thereof.</p>	<p>Strongly Agree</p>	<p>I strongly agree for those plans which are specifically authorized by state statute (e.g. TIF Plan) or required by a granting agency authority (e.g. parks and recreation plan) as these standards could be written into the appropriate legislation or grant guidelines. I would not support this for grant applications or "studies" - this would be reaching too far, difficult to define and unlikely to become reality.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>While I "Strongly Agreed" with the first two questions, I disagree with this one based on my experience in Michigan which had a planner's certification program (called "Professional Community Planner" or PCP). To become PCP, you first needed references from two current PCP's, pass the AICP, pass a planning jurisprudence exam and pass a "design" test. I was a member of both AICP and PCP, and even after many years, the PCP label never became as relevant, recognized or respected as the AICP. In the end, it seemed to be just another unnecessary and unwelcome expense. IF, a "stamp" is required for plans, than of course this designation would become more meaningful. But, I would suggest - especially with the AICP CM program and increasingly tight budget times, that any "stamping" requirement be based on an existing established and respected program like AICP. Plus, creating this additional layer of bureaucracy at the state level will require a staff and budget - not likely at this time or perhaps the foreseeable future. Rather than fighting all these negatives, I'd suggest p</p>
<p>Strongly Disagree</p>	<p>I don't think this adds to the profession, or provides any more assurances for communities that they are guaranteed to receive quality services. The field is too broad, the issues we deal with too varied. Also, the last thing we need is to heap more responsibilities onto the state, which cannot provide the services it is obligated to provide now in a cost effective manner. I can foresee either huge application fees to fund this service, or a program that gets its funding stripped and long backlogs of applications. If a community is concerned about the credentials of their planner or a consultant, there are already resources for them to look into - AICP certification and certification maintenance, project references, etc.</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree</p>		<p>Strongly Disagree</p>	<p>Waste of time and resources in my opinion. This would be a big mistake. Licensure in these other professions does not guarantee good work. In my time as a local governmental official, it has become obvious to me that the letters after a professional's name mean very little - it is best to evaluate based on projects completed and referrals/references from other clients. Way too much emphasis is already placed on certification and certification maintenance in my opinion, to the detriment of the profession. Time wasted fighting with the APA website to log credits would be better spent serving the community I work for, and training and membership budgets are already tight and being slashed due to budget constraints - the last thing we need is more cost and time lost associated with licensure.</p>
<p>Disagree</p>		<p>Disagree</p>		<p>Disagree</p>	<p>It would be great if the fact that some planners attend accredited, masters level programs are actually recognized for that achievement. That plus years of experience in the field would be a nice way of establishing some credentialing system instead of a very expensive trivia test superceding all else.</p>

Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree	It's too late to address this issue. WAPA should have had a peer review system set up when comp planning was first required. Many local communities are very capable of amending their comprehensive plans without the assistance of planners. To require a "planner in charge" to approve an amendment seems over the top.	Neutral	I would need to learn more about what this could entail to make a judgement.	Neutral	If this is implemented, I think the licensure needs to consider the fact that many practicing planners come from many different educational backgrounds and not all come from an accredited planning school. Therefore, to qualify for licensure, these practicing planners need some kind of a 'waiver'. Professionally, I see the value in this. Personally, I am not that interested in dedicating more of my life to my career, at the expense of family.
Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Disagree	Need to know more. AICP professionals with several years of experience and/or advanced degrees should be exempted from an exam.
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	If you are hellbent on pursuing this, I would plead that AICP become the sole determining factor -- no other tests, education or experience requirements.	Strongly Disagree	I've been through this discussion in other states and can tell you that you will face overwhelming opposition from the engineers, architects and LA's to the point that it will only pass if all of them are included. If that becomes the case, then what have you really accomplished?	Strongly Disagree	Talk to folks from NJ, the only state currently doing this, and they will tell you without hesitation, DON'T DO IT.
Strongly Disagree	I disagree with specific licensure for planning activities, but the planning profession should be regulated.	Strongly Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Agree	I was a PIC under the old HUD 701 planning program and it was a very strong quality assurance program. This was before AICP. since 701, the quality of a lot of planning has gone downhill. AICP certification is voluntary. It was more effective when the primary source of planning funds--the 701 program-- carried the mandate that a HUD qualified planner be in charge of public planning. After the demise of the HUD 701 program, the flood-gates opened for substandard planning nationwide.	Agree	for these programs a PIC wouldn't work unless there were specific professional standards for those programs such as for the comp planning law that is very specific. Also, TIF's are commonly done by attorneys and bond consultants and other administrators. I doubt if a PIC requirements limited to planners would be approved.	Strongly Agree	should have been done long ago, but be prepared for such legislation to sweep in engineers, architects and maybe lawyers, as I believe is the case in Michigan and maybe New Jersey. . . At a national planning conference in the late 60's this issue was brought up and the planning community was dead-set against it. But our profession has been paying the price. In my experience, most planning, particularly outside of large urban areas, is done by non planners. the other issue with licensure is our definition of what planning is, and the educational and experience qualifications for same. What are the core standards of the planning community that can be described in a licensure law and who would write such a law?
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Agree	I dislike the term "Planner-in-charge", but think it would be useful to have a state-level certification or examination to ensure that both public and private sector planners working with comprehensive plans have an understanding of relevant statutes.	Neutral		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Disagree	As long as the plan follows current state statutes it should be up to the particular city to decide how it is structured. Planners are already involved at the local level where it is comprised.	Agree		Neutral	

Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.		If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).		The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).	
	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>		<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>		<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>
Strongly Disagree	I fail to see the purpose in state licensing of planners to do comp plans (or any other planning activity). AICP certification and the continuing education requirements are enough to ensure adequate experience. I do not think state regulation/licensing of the planning profession is needed. It's up to the architect, engineer, or landscape architect to see that their project is completed as specified. Their projects are almost always more technical (as far as specifications and calculations) and shorter-term. Unfortunately, it's not ultimately up to the planner whether the Comp Plan gets implemented -- that usually falls to the Plan Commission and City Council. A bridge is poorly designed if it falls down. A good plan is not necessarily poorly designed if it's not implemented. Engineers, architects, and landscape architects will also always have more say in their designs/plans, but requiring planners to "stamp" comprehensive plans that have been created through broad participation that sometimes leads to marginal	Strongly Disagree	This seems like some misguided quest for legitimacy. Licensing is not going to convince people who don't like the profession that planning is somehow now more important because it is state-licensed. The whole idea of state licensing for planners is a solution in search of a problem.	Strongly Disagree	Experience is already necessary to take the AICP exam. Educational attainment is necessary to get hired. I am not worried about fly-by-night planning firms or door-to-door planners covertly stealing business that they are not qualified to do. Consultants are chosen for projects based on merit and experience by (usually) knowledgeable committees. Municipal planning employees are hired on their experience and merits. I don't think state licensing would change this.
Disagree		Disagree		Agree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Disagree	I do not have a lot of confidence in the state doing this well. In addition, the "health and safety" rationale for licensing in planning is much less direct than in architecture and engineering.	Disagree	Same reasons as above. I do not have a lot of confidence in the state doing this well. In addition, the "health and safety" rationale for licensing in planning is much less direct than in architecture and engineering.	Strongly Disagree	I do not have a lot of confidence in the state doing this well. In addition, the "health and safety" rationale for licensing in planning is much less direct than in architecture and engineering.
Disagree		Disagree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	Do we not have faith in our Planning Educators? Or is it that the "big" planning firms (i.e., the three or four that DOMINATED the field in preparation of municipal comp plans in Wisconsin in the past decade) have "perfected" the wheel and are giving the lion's share of responsibility for plan development and preparation over to interns, new professionals, or potentially ill-prepared/underqualified/"undynamic" firm employees? I don't know what the motivation for a "Planner-In-Charge" designation is. We're not engineers or architects: as you all know, at its purest form our profession isn't purely scientific or artistic or sociological or even classifiable. If there's some sort of problem with the preparation and amendment of comprehensive plans in this state, maybe what we need to do is make sure our professional planners are exceptional, and encourage employers in the private and public sectors to be more judicious and scrupulous in their recruitment and assignment processes. Although, I guess it doesn't help that a significant percentage of the communities in this state have	Strongly Disagree	See above. Again, remind me why I pursued a master's degree and AICP if now the state legislature/executive (sorry, I don't know how you propose the "Planner-in-Charge" would be enthroned) of the state (to my knowledge, none of them trained planners) will determine whether I'm qualified to help a community prepare for its future comprehensively, systematically, and logically?	Strongly Disagree	Enough
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	

Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.		If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).		The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).	
	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>		<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>		<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>
Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Neutral		Neutral		Strongly Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Neutral		Agree		Agree	
Agree		Agree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Disagree	
Strongly Agree	A credentialing process, coupled with continuing education, would ensure that planners have a minimum knowledge of current planning processes, laws, and best practices. This may avoid issues of municipalities being left behind in terms of planning, and in turn, economic development & environmental protection.	Strongly Agree	These plans and processes are regulated through state (and sometimes also federal) statute, and thus the planners responsible for the plan should have a minimum, tested knowledge of the process.	Strongly Agree	
Neutral	Not all places can afford to hire to have this done.	Agree		Neutral	
Disagree		Disagree		Agree	
Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	This is a worse idea than AICP Certification Maintenance, which I thought was just a ploy to get more people to spend money on APA products, seminars, and conferences. It will create another useless level of bureaucracy that serves no purpose other than to stroke the egos of a small segment of the Planning community in Wisconsin who just cannot fathom why Planners are not held in the same regard as Engineers and Architects. It will also undoubtedly cost money for this certification, and maintaining it. If you want to be treated like an Engineer or Architect, go back to school and become one. Enough with the special requirements and designations already.	Strongly Disagree	Who comes up with these stupid ideas? Since I feel the idea of a Planner-In-Charge for comprehensive plans is asinine, the idea of having it for grant applications, and planning planning studies is even worse. Oh and most TIF project plans are prepared (or have significant work done) by financial consultants, not planners. Maybe we should have them stamp all the TIF Project Plans too! Aren't there more pressing issues for WAPA to work on? Maybe more seminars on economic development and job creation?	Strongly Disagree	We don't need another level of registration and licensing. I know Planners who never had a Planning class in college who do an excellent job. Its not a job that needs licensing like Engineers and Architects (why Landscape Architects need to be registered is beyond me). If an engineer screws up a bridge design it could collapse people can die. If an architect screws up a building it can collapse and people can die. If a Planner screws up what is going to happen? Again, we are not Engineers or Architects so quit trying to pretend we need the same licensing.
Disagree		Neutral		Disagree	
Disagree	While comp plans are important, the public risk and liability issues are very different from what a civil engineer might face with a bridge design, for example. The AICP credential and the associated firm are sufficient. A new state credentialing would do nothing to improve the practice or shift responsibility. How does this address the implied objective?	Disagree	see previous comment	Disagree	see previous comment: we as a profession are way over-certified and over-credentialed already - there are so many variables at play with any individual that another abbreviation after their name is increasingly meaningless; leave in place those licenses where public safety is at immediate issue, e.g., doctors, structural engineers, pilots, etc., but not for planners, and architects and surveyors should no longer need licenses
Agree	I personally do not like the title of "Planner-In-Charge," or the acronym of PIC; the former sounds pretentious, like we're a bunch of know-it-all's, and the latter sounds unappealing.	Agree		Agree	I presume that the Wisconsin registration and licensure would be accompanied by an increase in the availability of training and a compilation of literature oriented specifically toward planning in Wisconsin, sponsored jointly by the state and WAPA?
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	

Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>	The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).	<i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i>
Agree	If this can be awarded based on merit, and not on theories that do not apply in most communities, there may be validity to the designation.	Agree		Neutral	Not familiar with other professional requirements
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Neutral		Neutral		Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Neutral	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree	I would likely tend to agree if AICP accreditation is applied as a condition as opposed to a "State Administered Examination." I feel it would be inefficient and inappropriate to require both an exam and spending the required time maintaining the AICP certification.	Disagree		Neutral	See comments to the first question above.
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Agree	A competency exam shouldn't be limited to comprehensive plans. It could cover other important planning functions (e.g., development review), as well.	Agree	"Planner-in-charge" is an abrasive term. How about something less authoritarian?	Strongly Agree	Ideally, this effort should be coordinated with APA (national).
Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Neutral	
Agree	The term "Planner-In-Charge" is STUPID, otherwise, some credentialing would be favored	Agree		Agree	
Strongly Disagree	There is no guarantee this would be limited to comp plans. Eventually this could be expanded to all types of planning. The legislature should not have a say in the qualifications of planners.	Strongly Disagree	See above comment.	Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Agree		Strongly Agree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Neutral	
Neutral		Neutral		Agree	
Neutral		Agree		Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Agree	
Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Disagree		Disagree		Neutral	

<p>Please respond to the following statements: The State of Wisconsin should establish a process to review credentials, administer an examination, or implement other measures necessary to grant a "Planner-In-Charge" designation to those planners who will be principally charged with the preparation or amendment of comprehensive plans under Wisconsin Statutes 66.1001.</p>	<p><i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i></p>	<p>If adopted, the requirement that a "Planner-In-Charge" oversee and certify the preparation of a comprehensive plan should be extended to include other planning activities authorized by legislation (e.g., TIF plans) or administered by the State (e.g., grant applications, planning studies conducted by other agencies, etc.).</p>	<p><i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i></p>	<p>The State of Wisconsin should implement a registration and licensure process for professional planners based on a combination of educational attainment, experience, and/or examination and be similar to the processes currently applicable to allied professions (i.e., engineering, architecture, landscape architecture).</p>	<p><i>Please feel free to add additional comments:</i></p>
Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree		Strongly Agree	