Episode 96: Planning Helps Us Collectively Shape Our Future

with Holly Caggiano, Assistant Professor in Climate Justice and Environmental Planning at UBC's School of Community and Regional Planning

Holly Caggiano shares her research combining the disciplines of behavioural science and planning to explore climate equity, community-led solutions, and community solidarity and care. We also discuss some of the opportunities that arise when behavioural science and planning come together, including more exploration of the forces shaping human behaviour and more progress toward community-led planning and nudging.

Transcript:

KIRSTIN APPELT, HOST: Welcome to this edition of Calling DIBS. I'm your host, Kirstin Appelt, Research Director with UBC Decision Insights for Business and Society, or DIBS for short. Today, we're calling DIBS on Holly Caggiano.

Holly is an Assistant Professor in climate justice and environmental planning at UBC School of Community and Regional Planning, where she leads the PLACE Lab. Holly is also an affiliate member at the center for Climate Justice, the Clean Energy Research Center, and a member of the Solar Energy for Net Zero Research Excellence cluster.

Despite us both being at UBC, Holly and I actually only crossed paths very recently, and we learned that we actually have shared academic family history, as Holly's postdoc advisor was one of my grad school advisors, the amazing Elke Weber. So we've got lots to talk about. Let's just jump in. Welcome to the podcast, Holly.

HOLLY CAGGIANO, GUEST: Thank you so much for having me. I'm excited to be here.

APPELT: Can you tell us a little bit about yourself?

CAGGIANO: Well, you gave me a great introduction, so I don't have too much to say to that but, I'm just kidding, I'm excited to get to chat. I'm relatively new to UBC. I started in 2023 in the School of Community and Regional Planning for this position, focusing on climate justice and environmental planning. And it's taken a little bit of time to get settled and get to meet folks around. It's such a big university, but it's been it's been really great.

I'm also new to Canada from the United States. So before this, I was a postdoc at Princeton University's Andlinger Center for Energy and the Environment, and I did my undergraduate degree in planning at Rutgers University in New Jersey. So before moving to BC, I was a Jersey girl through and through.

APPELT: You came all the way, not only from the U.S., but also switching coasts, just like me and that is a big transition.

So I usually ask folks next about their journey to BI, but I actually wanted to break that question into a couple of pieces here because you're in the School of Community and Regional Planning. I did not know much about this area, and when I clicked on the SCARP website, it actually has a button labeled "What is planting? What is SCARP?" which I thought was brilliant. So I want to ask you those questions. Can you tell us what planning is? What is SCARP? What is planning?

CAGGIANO: Well, they're good questions because I like to tell people, mostly my students, that I didn't know what planning was, particularly until I started graduate school on a planning program, or decided that I wanted to apply to a planning program. So throughout my undergraduate degree and thinking about what I wanted to do, what I wanted to go out into the professional world and be, planning was not on my radar. I think there's also a lot of disagreement or overlaps among planners and discussions about what is planning. There's lots of conceptualizations.

You might think about planners as like your city planner who plans zoning, where stuff goes and transportation, and all of the administrative bureaucratic processes that make a city function. And in a professional title, I think that this is what a lot of planners do. But planning as a discipline more broadly, I think the kind of fun definition is thinking about how we shape our future, what we need to do to get there and how we do that at the community scale, at the regional scale.

So SCARP stands for the School of Community and Regional Planning, and I particularly like that we don't use the word urban in our program title. A lot of planners are, you know, you're known as an urban planner. But rural communities also need lots of planning and are communities too. So I like the focus on community and regional planning.

Planners, I think, use technical analysis to inform decision making. And this is something I'm excited to get into with you and talk about all of the overlaps of what I see between planning and decision making. But I think this poses a real challenge and just something to think about when we talk about planning that there's this very kind of top down perspective thinking about the master plan or a means of almost imposing control on people versus part of, in my mind, the planning that I like to be associated with or that I like to practice and do and center in my work is thinking about planning as a means of collectively organizing. So, long definition to tell you that what is planning depends on who you ask.

APPELT: That is a fascinating answer, though. I really like the framing of collective organizing to shape our future. That's a really powerful lens. And I'm excited to chat about the overlaps with BI, but before we get there, I'm curious how you ended up-- you said, you know, it wasn't originally on your radar, so how did you get there? What was your journey?

CAGGIANO: My journey was a unique one, I think, in that... I like talking about it, because I hope that it's helpful for some folks who are thinking that, well, I don't know exactly what I want to do, but I want to do something good. And I was a first generation college student. I was kind of on the fence about even going to college. And then when I did, and I was really lucky to go to to Rutgers for my undergrad as well as my graduate degree, and there are so many things that were really great about just being at a big, diverse research university.

And when I was there, I'll talk a little bit about how I got into planning, but also how I got into research. When I got there as a student, particularly climate change was really starting to pick up a lot of news and a lot of attention. And I knew that was something that I wanted to work on. I wanted to work on environmental problems. That was something that was really important to me, but I didn't exactly know how I would do that. I didn't know if I wanted to be a scientist or I wanted to be a journalist.

I ended up in a degree program in environmental policy to kind of learn about the subject matter, and what we had to do before and thought, like, I'll figure out what I want to do next as I go. And I think it can be really difficult when you have a topic that you want to work on, but you don't maybe entirely know what you want to do. So I just spent a lot of time trying to think like, what do I like doing? How can I do this the best in a way that I think makes my life happy and fulfilling as well?

There's a quote by the author, Annie Dillard that I always talk about when I talk about this, where she says "how you spend your days is how you spend your life". So I tried to set out and figure out how I liked spending my days. And I liked writing, and now I get to do tons of academic writing which is great and also some public facing writing. But I also really like chitchatting, and I think that that kind of ended up being a big part of planning is just communicating with other people, building relationships, learning from each other, building collective knowledge. So it ended up kind of, yeah, being being the right place.

And I really I found out about planning from a professor in my undergraduate degree program when I was kind of having one of those many conversations where I pestered my professors about, like, what can I possibly do with this degree? What should I do next? I'm so scared of going out into the world. And one of my professors suggested that I check out Rutgers planning school, and it was a really exciting feeling finding that, oh, there are people that just think about this. How do we change the future? But how do we do that, kind of, I think what makes planning different from other disciplines from like, you know, a public policy or political science is often thinking at the community scale.

APPELT: I think that will resonate with a lot of folks, because there's this idea of like, I kind of know the stuff I want to do, but I don't know where it fits.

And so I feel like we have a little bit of a sense of your journey. We have a little bit of a sense of planning. I'd love to get more specific. Your lab, which is the lovely acronym PLACE, or Planning for Climate Equity Lab. It has three research themes. Do you want to tell us a bit about what falls under that umbrella?

CAGGIANO: Well, first I want to say that I really felt like I made it big when I had a lab with a name. That was, I thought, how do you do that? And then I realized that you just name it, you just decide to name your research group, which is just really the collection of students and collaborators that I'm lucky to work with. So, I've developed this lab at UBC, housed in SCARP, and the acronym was was really important to me, but so I love that it's PLACE.

Under the heading of planning for Climate Equity, I think about the work that I do under these three main themes, which was a great suggestion from a mentor to think about, well, what three big questions do you want your work to address? Also to kind of help you figure out what you can say no to so that you don't get too bogged down. Does this fit into my three themes?

So the way that I think about my work under these three headings, that I'll kind of have their own sub questions, are first: thinking about decision making for just transitions. And I think this is really the kind of theme that also links the most closely to behavioural science, and is why I've used behavioural science in my work. But here I think about, across scales, individuals, households, policymakers, communities, coalitions of communities, how do we make decisions that impact energy and climate? So pretty broad, and also what processes facilitate equitable decision making? How do we do this in a way that we think is inclusive and diverse and is not so top down and prescriptive?

Next is community led solutions. And this follows really naturally from decision making as well. We've made decisions about what we want the world to be like. How do we enact those? And that's a lot of the planning piece. And we'll talk about hopefully today some of my work on energy transitions, but that's been a really exciting area of my work for me, because I come to it with this idea that transitions should inherently kind of make our social lives better, should make us healthier, should make us happier. How do we do that? So I asked questions about what aspects of energy transitions can improve our livelihoods. What community benefits can we leverage? I also think about alternative ownership and governance structures under this that prioritize community self-determination.

And then finally, a strand of my research that maybe has has gotten a little less time and attention from me lately, but is really important to the way that I see the world and I see my work fitting into the world is this ethic of solidarity and care. And so I'm really interested in how communities work together during times of crisis. How do they sustain each other? Folks may have heard about, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, about mutual aid. And so I have an ongoing project thinking about mutual aid and community care and how they serve to build this other kind of social infrastructure within communities that can, you know, potentially help facilitate some of this collective action.

And thinking about the interaction between these really informal, community led groups and planners, and how do planners make room for informal or unofficial or radical or even anarchist planning and aid provisioning. That's generally what the lab is working on, but my students have been so awesome and have research interests that kind of overlap and fit between and so always a little bit expansive and inclusive to focus on that, but under under these three headings.

APPELT: Those are really interesting and timely headings and, yeah totally, I love the idea of having themes so it can help you say no to things, but then it's also still hard to say no to things. And though it does still expand, so totally hear that. I was wondering if we could get even more specific because it'd be great to just hear about a specific project. And I know last year you published a paper in Nature Energy with Elke and others, can you tell us about that project?

CAGGIANO: Yeah, I love talking about this project because it was really exciting. It got published, I was at UBC, but this was a lot of the work that I had been doing at Princeton as a postdoc and have continued from there. And just a little bit of background on the larger project is, at Princeton, the Andlinger Center, lots of great folks have been working on the Net Zero America project, which models these different pathways through which the US can reach net zero emissions by 2050 with different arrangements and configurations of technologies, including renewable energy, that can help us get there.

And I came in thinking that the models were actually really optimistic. I think it's something interesting about the intersection between planning and engineering as well and behavioural sciences, is how we use models to think about the future. How we use them to to inform plans, because they're often really not prescriptive about specific policies, but show us different arrangements of of how we can use things that we have to get where we want to go.

So on that project, I thought that the modeling looked really optimistic in that it showed we could largely do just with wind and solar, meet our net zero goals. With a lot of land use, and of course a significant cost, but that it was doable. And seeing it on the map for me was really powerful, like, this is something that we can do, and this is one way we could do it, but there are really infinite kind of arrangements of where we can build renewable energy to be able to do this.

And with my planning hat on, I started thinking about, well, this is great in theory at the national level, but, in the US, and this is also true in Canada, the way that projects are sighted is very often locally specific. And this is also true about the impacts of climate change. They too affect specific geographic areas, and particularly communities in different ways and often ways that are disproportionate and that have equity implications.

So I started thinking about this idea of, you know, what are the complications in citing energy projects locally, and through that kind of process landed doing work in Pennsylvania, which was pretty close to New Jersey, also where my dad grew up, which was fun to get to do some work there for that reason, but is a really big state for utility-scale solar, has a lot of solar potential. It's also a swing state, which makes it interesting to study. It has lots of agricultural land and agricultural communities, also. Often those places overlap with what makes a good site for solar.

So I did some survey research and also some qualitative work in this paper in Nature Energy is the survey research. And what we did is within Pennsylvania, we surveyed residents and local elected officials about their preferences for energy projects in their state. And it was really exciting to me that we also got to survey public officials. Behavioural science folks who do surveys on this call, you know, probably... I love to nerd out about that. There's a company called Civic Pulse that does a really, really great job, at least in the US, and doing some also knowledge sharing with local elected officials and officials at other levels as well.

But so we ran the survey-- and so we also wanted to know not only what local elected officials thought about in what energy projects they preferred, but also how they perceived public support. So in addition to asking about their own preferences, we also asked local elected officials to choose which project they thought most of their constituents would prefer. And we used a conjoint experiment, which allowed us to capture different trade offs between different dimensions of these projects, and I can kind of talk more at length about that if we want.

And the thing I thought was also really exciting is that most of our findings were true across political parties in the US, so even in a really polarized landscape on a topic that we often think of as polarized, we found that across Democrats and Republicans, that residents were more likely to support energy projects that were community owned, that created jobs and that generated solar energy. So all things that we know deliver community benefits in comparison to other types of energy technology and that we know, we have an idea of that, well, jobs are important to energy projects, but this is kind of also in comparison to things like distance from residential areas, how near or far an energy project is from your house. And that jobs came out. That's really important, and so did community ownership.

But local elected officials underestimated their constituents support for projects with these characteristics. So, people said that these are the types of projects that they supported. Local elected officials didn't predict that those would be the things that their constituents supported.

So it was a really fun project, and I think it has some really important implications for planning and thinking about, how do we design projects that deliver community benefits? I think that fundamentally, transitions really require a certain degree of material benefits to be felt. And I think that there's a lot of really important behavioural science work to do there in terms of how people perceive these changes in their lives and how that impacts other types of decision making.

APPELT: And it's such an interesting project because, you know, everyone is actually more in agreement than we expect, but then they're not communicating that agreement to one another. And so how do we surmount that obstacle? Are there ways you want to take that project forward to be able to bridge some of those gaps, or what are some next steps for that project?

CAGGIANO: So the thing that I was really most excited about from thinking about those implications is I was talking about having my planning hat on and thinking about, well, how important the local level is. And I felt like, okay, this seems like a problem that we can approach, thinking about how do you kind of align priorities, and try to remedy some of these misperception?

And I think that probably the most important way to do that, and especially on a planning end, is through these practices of deliberative planning. How do you get people together to be able to deliberate so that opinions and values are known? I think that though energy transitions and climate can be really polarizing from a policy perspective, I really like to approach transitions with the idea that everybody fundamentally wants some version of the same thing. They want to live in and healthy, happy, safe communities. They want that for their loved ones. But we have very different ideas about how to get there.

And I think that there's a lot that we can do around aligning those values. I think people want self-determination, people want good jobs in their communities. To what extent can we help these benefits to materialize? So, in kind of recent work that's starting out... I'm also excited to finish analyzing some of our qualitative data from that project as well. That is coming, which is fun, and digs into some of those coordination challenges. And in addition to just residents and local elected officials, there's tons of other actors involved as well. There's renewable energy developers, there's labor unions, there's other coalitions of actors. So thinking about how these groups align and communicate is something that I've been really interested in.

So, also with Elke and with Sara Constantino at Stanford, who also was a postdoc, that's where we briefly overlapped and now we're close collaborators, we are working on a project right now on large scale solar siting and examining opportunities for community benefits. And so that's been-- community benefits plans was a little bit of a buzzword from the Inflation Reduction Act, but we're thinking about community benefits mechanisms more broadly as, you know, through which mechanisms can projects and policies targeted at expanding renewable energy development deliver community benefits to places that are direct and material and improve the quality of people's lives? But also, how are these benefits understood? How are they prioritized? What changes do people want to see in their communities, and how do they, if at all, link that to energy and new development in the energy landscape?

APPELT: Okay, so I think this is really interesting just in and of itself, but also because a lot of the things you're saying, including the name Elke, who is a psychologist by training, I see a lot of overlaps with behavioural science, and I could see parts of this project being just described as behavioural science projects. So I'd love to use this as our opportunity to jump into this interface. So how would you characterize the interface between behavioural science and planning?

CAGGIANO: I love this question. I've been so excited to talk about this. It's something I've been thinking about a lot lately as I transitioned from working in Elke's lab doing behavioural science to being back in a, you know, disciplinary planning department.

And I guess to answer this question, I'll go back a little bit to say how I came to behavioural science, which was I had a little bit of an unconventional dissertation experience doing interdisciplinary research, which was a lot of fun and highly recommended. My degree program was in a planning school at Rutgers in Planning and Public Policy, but where both of my advisors were appointed was in the Department of Human Ecology, which is also at Rutgers, but in the School of Environmental and Biological Sciences, and is this great interdisciplinary department with faculty that come from a lot of different backgrounds.

And so my dissertation chairs, I had co-chairs-- Rachel Shwom is a sociologist who works on climate and environment and Cara Cuite is a social psychologist. And so I had that kind of social psychology training, and I worked with them on a National Science Foundation funded project on household behaviour for conservation, for food, energy and water conservation.

So I had kind of come to behavioural science from that perspective in my dissertation research, and then as I was thinking about, well, what do I want to do next, and I knew I really wanted to work on renewable energy. I knew that Elke was doing this really great research down the road at Princeton, and so it was an awesome experience to get to work with her in the Behavioural Science for Policy Lab. So I've had, you know, these kind of thoughts about, how are we integrating these two things?

And, you know, the challenges of being an interdisciplinary academic is having a lot of wide ranging conversations, you know, jumping into different places. But back to your question about this interface between behavioural science and planning, if we're looking at planning as the sum of the processes that we use to organize and create this future that we've imagined at the community scale, we also think about behavioural science as, well how do people make decisions? What motivates behaviour change? And so these go hand in hand.

And then in a major way, I think behavioural science can kind of tell us-- if planning is telling us, well, what is it that we want to do? What do we agree on that we want our community to look like? I think behavioural science can both help us reach those decisions by understanding, well, how do we draw people in? How do we engage people and meet them where they're at? And then also, how do we make the changes that we need to reach this future?

And whether that's through policy or governance or changes to the built environment, planning can kind of come in with a lot of the ways that, well, how do we make this materialize? But that they really have a lot to learn from each other and are... I'm often surprised to the extent where I feel like they almost like should be in conversation all of the time, and maybe aren't.

APPELT: Yeah, they really do feel like they go hand in hand. And just going back to what you were saying about being interdisciplinary, it feels like these days interdisciplinary researchers are becoming more common, but it still is a challenge because you are often carving a less trodden path. And the jargon different fields use, the methods, the places they publish, the ways they get funding can be different. And so it is challenging to work at these intersections, but then it's so rewarding because there is so much that any two different fields complement each other.

So I'm curious if we think about it maybe first from a planning perspective, what are some of the things that behavioural science adds?

CAGGIANO: The thing that I keep coming to in my work around bringing behavioural science into planning is how great a job behavioural science has done at explaining all of the ways in which people are not rational economic actors that make decisions based on the things that we, especially planners, might think about. How much does something cost or how much time does something take? Those are two considerations, but really, there is a whole host of reasons why people make decisions that are quite complicated. I think planners intuitively know that, but it's often underappreciated in the planning process.

So right now, a PhD student who I've been working with who's fabulous, Madison Lore, had also been thinking that even before I got here and had been thinking a lot about norms and how norms shape things like whether or not people use public transportation. So she's been investigating, and we've been thinking about also kind

of what, to your point about definitions, how planners define norms and how behavioural scientists define norms is in the same spirit. But I think behavioural scientists, you know, are more specific and have been thinking about norms really seriously for a while now. And so thinking about, well, even if two cities have pretty much the same level of public transportation in terms of... how many lines, and that it's fast and frequent. That's not the only thing that predicts ridership and use of public transportation. So that's something that she's been working on that I think like really gets at that question of how do planners use behavioural science and how do we integrate this a little bit better.

So I think yeah, like anything that we can do to think outside of that box of rational choice and that behavioural science has a lot of tools to offer in terms of strategies that are evidence based, that have been tested, that offer specific theories. And planning offers a lot of opportunity for case studies of, well, how does this theory play out in this specific geographical, social context at a specific point in time?

APPELT: Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. And you started to talk about what planning adds to behavioural science, about the idea of case studies. Can you maybe elaborate a little bit there?

CAGGIANO: The other kind of intersection that I've been thinking about is that, in the behavioural science world, when we're thinking about, well what do we want to test? You know, maybe you have a theory in mind and you're thinking about, well, how do I test this intervention? I want to understand how, you know, values are important in decision making. You have to have a desired outcome, or the behaviour that you want to change. I mean, sometimes you don't.

Sometimes you're just you're looking at the kind of cognitive process of how a decision is reached. But I think often, you know, particularly in research with interventions, there's some kind of desired outcome that we want to reach, which had to at some point be normatively agreed on, right, that this is the desirable outcome. And I think that planning can kind of help us decide what we want that outcome to be, and that those outcomes are often really context specific and then start to think about, well, what governance or policy strategies can we use to get there? But okay, we need those to be informed by behavioural science.

One that I talked about last night that I just keep coming back to, back when the Inflation Reduction Act, and this is getting into the weeds of U.S. policy, but which was a now uncertain but large investment in climate in the US and climate funding, mostly through the form of incentives. And back when it was in negotiations and they were calling it Build Back Better, I had written something in Scientific American about how we should be thinking about how behavioural science informs these policies and the uptake of policies.

And so one that comes to mind is rebates. Anything that's kind of like targeted at the household level, like you're going to install a heat pump. How do you do that? We know from a behavioural science perspective that point of sale rebates are the gold standard. That you don't have to go out of pocket and spend your own money. Also, you know, there's lots of reasons that it's more equitable and being able to serve lower income communities who can't front the cash to to do an upgrade, especially I mean, it assumes that they even, you know, own their home and can make that kind of upgrade.

But we know that delivering these benefits through mechanisms that make these incentives easier to access, more equitable, improves the policy, improves people's perceptions of it, improves the material impact it has. But yet so many policies continue to kind of work through the tax system to give people money, you know, back at the end of the year through their taxes. But we know that that, you know, there's lots of kind of behavioural science components, whether, you know, how we think about how we discount the future and think about, you know, do I want money today or in ten days? How we perceive risk. What if I just don't get that money back?

So I keep thinking about like, there are some things that are actually probably quite simple in terms from a policy perspective that we can do to kind of just make them work better for people, help with the uptake. But you have to come with that behavioural science lens.

APPELT: That's really interesting. That's a really good example. And that also just seems like an exciting area to work. Are there other areas that you're excited about when you think about collaboration between the disciplines?

CAGGIANO: Yeah. The thing that I'm most excited about, and particularly with working on this next project on sighting large scale solar and community benefits, is thinking about just how do we do a better job of deliberating and working collectively. I think there's lots of really interesting efforts happening right now in terms of deliberative democracy and participatory planning.

And I think behavioural science has a lot of the tools to unpack, not the desired outcome in terms of a specific policy, but a desired outcome in terms of better collaboration, more participatory decision making. How do we kind of encourage people to build that kind of trust, where they can openly deliberate and and feel heard? And so we're thinking about how to do that, and particularly in the form of workshops that involve different types of actors that make decisions about sighting large scale solar, and that's a place that I'm really excited about.

Planning also has quite a long history of thinking about deliberation, participation, how narratives work, that I think that there could just be a really fruitful kind of body of work built around that kind of, what do we know from behavioural science about how people collaborate? How cognitively we're able to do that and show up and sit at the same table. And so to me, that's kind of the most exciting thing to be working on right now.

APPELT: Yeah, absolutely. And I think going back to some of the stuff you talked about kind of throughout, but you introduced at the beginning of the idea of moving away from more top down planning to more bottom up planning and and community-based and collective-based planning. That also makes me think of some of the discussions that are happening in behavioural science now, because obviously some behavioural science tools can be more top down, but there is movement to think about ways where we're involving the communities throughout the process so that they're more involved. So that seems like another great place where there can be some exciting learning between the two fields.

So I know we've used up most of our time, but I do have a couple of last questions for you. I always like to ask folks who are working in the field of behavioural science if they have a message for folks who are newer to the field, and this could be folks who are in planning looking at behavioural science, or folks who are in behavioural science looking at planning, or folks like yourself who are already in both. Any words of wisdom for folks newer to the field?

CAGGIANO: Well, hopefully, if you were still scratching your head and saying "I don't know what I want to do" you maybe have a little bit more confidence that you will figure it out and that it doesn't need to happen overnight. But the other thing that I would tell folks is just how much of the work relationship building is, and I think that can be difficult when the way that we are evaluated and judged is on, you know, the number of publications that we have or presentations and sometimes meeting for a coffee doesn't feel like, you know, in our kind of productivity culture, like you are checking off a box of something that you need to do. I say this as a reminder to myself as well.

But you know, some of the things that you don't have... there's no quantifiable impact in that day. I mean, really building relationships takes time. And it's so much of what I think makes the work good and productive over time. It's also so much of what actually brings me joy when I think about, well, what do I like about my job and the things that I do? I think building relationships is so important. And that's also kind of what helps us get to a place where we're making more community driven decisions.

And I completely agree with you about the ways that we think about, like, behavioural science has a lot of overlap with planning in that way of thinking about, well, it can be really top down and prescriptive and problematic. It also can be a really powerful means of organizing collectively. So I think sometimes it's, you know, we think about the balance between individual and systems, and it's something that my students want to chat about all the time. And my answer is always some kind of unsatisfying, like, it's somewhere in the middle. Individuals create systems, but we have to decide on on what we want those systems to be.

And so I think, yeah, that's the other thing I'd kind of say is like, encourage behavioural scientists to chat with planners and planners to talk with more behavioural scientists and thinking about like, well, I have this great policy idea that I think would, you know, make our community so much better. But how do I get there? How do I do this in a way that meets folks where they're at?

APPELT: Yeah, I think that's perfect. The idea of both building relationships and also making sure you're building those relationships across disciplinary or sectoral boundaries, because that's where you get lots of fruitful ideas. And also, like you said, if you want to have collective decisionmaking, you need a collective. So that's a basic requirement. Any other questions I should have asked and didn't? Any last thoughts? Anything you wanted to say and didn't get a chance to?

CAGGIANO: I'll have so much more to think about, I'm sure, after this, and also hope that it encourages other folks to think about some of these intersections, because I think that there's really plenty. I've been thinking about like, if I taught a course on behavioural science for planners, like, what would I teach? What would be the most important things? So if you have ideas about that, email me. I'm not really planning that course right now, but I think it's a cool thought exercise.

APPELT: Yeah, and that would be a really neat course. I'd love to explore that. That's a neat opportunity-- thought exercise and potential actual exercise down the road. We'll have to have you back as these conversations evolve and we think more about this intersection, because I think it's a really ripe one. So thanks for joining today. I mean, this really does seem like a powerhouse combo of combining planning and behavioural science, and I do hope there's more collaboration at this interface, both personally with maybe us getting chances to work together, but also more broadly.

So thanks for being among those leading the charge to integrate these two fields to work together more. And just thanks for joining us today.

CAGGIANO: So fun. Thanks for giving me the opportunity to yap about it. And I'm also excited to think about what we can do next.

APPELT: And thanks to our listeners for another episode of Calling DIBS.