POLICY AND DESIGN FOR HOUSING

Lessons of the Urban Development Corporation 1968-1975

PANEL: Public and Private Sector + Community = Housing

August 4, 2005, 5:45 – 8:30PM

POLICY AND DESIGN FOR HOUSING
Lessons of the Urban Development Corporation 1968-1975

Public and Private Sector + Community = Housing
Thursday August 4, 2005, 5:45 – 8:30PM
@ Center for Architecture, 536 LaGuardia Place, New York City

STUDENT PANEL PRESENTATION:
Christopher Hayner, Aaron Hurnon and Kristen Wisniewski - Students, Community Design Center, Syracuse University School of Architecture

PANELISTS:
Carlton Brown - architect, planner, developer and COO of Full Spectrum, LLC

Mark Willis - Executive Vice President, JP Morgan Chase & Co-Chair of Housing First!

Brad Lander - Executive Director,
Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development

Irene Baldwin, Executive Director, Association for Neighborhood & Housing Development Inc.

Ted Liebman, FAIA -Partner, The Liebman Melting Partnership
Former Chief of Architecture at the NYS Urban Development Corporation;

Ronald Shiffman, Professor, Pratt Institute Graduate Center for Planning and the Environment

NINA LIEBMAN: It's really absolutely heartening and wonderful to see so many people here and to realize that the issues of the current status of affordable housing is still important and has to be discussed. The other interesting nd wonderful thing is that this exhibition was really the catalyst for tonight's program and that has made the efforts of everybody who worked on this very, very satisfying. I would like to thank the members of the committee who have spent more than a year gathering this information and putting it on the walls here, creating this symposium, and soon an archive that will be on the web for anybody, anywhere to access. So the committee that has worked so hard: Jerry Maltz, Ron Shiffman, Yvette Shiffman, Alan Melting, Ted Liebman, Judy Edelman, Susan Seigert, Elizabeth Kammell, Paul Bayard, Jim McCullar, Rolf Ohlhausen, Carme Bee, Rosalee Genevro, and Stephen Lefkowitz. I'd also like to thank CUNY, CCNY, and Syracuse University for their participation in this whole program. I'd also like to thank the AIA. I see Rick is here, Rick Bell, Pamela Puchalski, and Sophie Pache. And, I'd like to thank our sponsors without whom we would not be here at all. Our lead sponsors were Related Apartment Preservation LLC, and Deutsche Bank. And our sponsors were GMAC Commercial Holding Capital Corp, Associated Builders and Owners of Greater New York, Community Preservation Corp, JP Morgan Chase, Korman Communities, M&T Bank, The Monian Group, The Olnick Organization, Turner Construction Company, Wachovia, The Vinmont Foundation, Surdna Foundation, Lo Yi Chan, Gwathmey-Siegel Architects, The Liebman Melting Partnership, Ohlhausen Dubois Architects. And now, let

me turn over the forum to Professor Ron Shiffman. The man with ideas and passion for his mission, and he will moderate tonight's panel. Thank you all for coming.

RON SHIFFMAN: Thanks Nina. There have been a lot of thank you(s). I think I need to add just one more, and that is to the AIA for hosting the event tonight and helping us raise the funds for putting this all together. The issue that we're going to talk about tonight I think is a very critical issue around housing. I want to get to the meat of the matter, and don't want to spend a long time introducing our various panelists, and as a result, I would like to refer you to the four-page summary of everybody's bio, which is on your seat. I'm going to just briefly read their names to you in the order that they're sitting. The first person to my immediate right is Irene Baldwin, who's been the Executive Director of the Association for Neighborhood & Housing Development since May 1998. (I have to read that because I always get the organization's name wrong, because I remember it when it was formed.) Right next to her is Mark Willis, who is Executive Vice President of JP Morgan Chase and head of the Community Development Group and you're going to learn a little bit more about him. He's played an important role in housing in the City over the years. Next to him is Brad Lander, who is the Director of the Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development; a position I held for many years, and I'm very happy to have yielded to him. It's a great succession and I must say I think he's a great person and doing wonderful new things there. To his immediate right is Carlton Brown, a principal at Full Spectrum and chief operating officer with direct responsibility for new work, expanding the vision of the company and building affordable and sustainable housing in the City of New York, and I look forward to hearing his comments tonight. And then at the far right is a young man, who I've known practically since he was a baby, by the name of Ted Liebman. Ted is an architect, Theodore Liebman, excuse me. He's a grandparent. His grandkids are somewhere in the audience if they haven't escaped. He's an architect and planner and has spent over 30 years directing and designing the development of housing and large-scale urban development projects. To a great extent, the works you see on exhibit here, were the result of a lot of his creative energy. There's a lot more to say about every one of the panelists and I would suggest that what you do is to read the bios thoroughly because I think there's quite a bit to be gained by learning of their contributions to housing and to making the City a more livable one.

The exhibition, which if you haven't looked at, I suggest you look at today before you leave, or between now and September 10th when it comes down. It is a demonstrative view of when government was committed to addressing housing and community development needs, and it emanates from the needs in the late '60's. It was in a different time; the role of government was significantly different than it is today, but there was a commitment to addressing the problems of the city. That commitment was aborted in the mid '70's and if we fast-forward to today, we see a continuing housing crisis, albeit manifest in many different ways. In the intervening years between the '70's and today, we saw the emergence of the community-based housing movement. A movement that helped alleviate the housing crisis, but did not in any way solve it, and, in many cases, played a key role in revitalizing and stabilizing communities throughout the city. This effort, coupled with the City's 10 year housing initiative, evolved over the years into a formidable development and revitalization force. Nonetheless, today we continue to face a housing crisis of enormous proportions, even if you read today's New York Times, and you're told that we're now building more private units then we've been building in decades, the City is experiencing a great

shortage of housing. Brad Lander, working with a friend and colleague, Joe Weisbord, wrote in 2002, that New York City is experiencing the most acute housing supply and affordability problems that it has experienced in the last 50 years. Record high homelessness is just the starting point. On an average night, they wrote, in early October, there were 36,000 people in New York City shelters, including more than 15,000 children. The cost of that emergency care has risen to over half a billion dollars each year. More than 150,000 families are doubled up in overcrowded or substandard apartments, and the wait for an apartment in public housing is now, or was in 2002, 8 years long. I don't think it's changed since then. Not just poor people, but hundreds of thousands of middle-income families have trouble meeting their housing needs. Currently, more than 500,000 New York City families pay more than half their income for rent. That's an extraordinary 1 in 4 renter households. In the 1990's, New York City welcomed more than 456,000 new residents, but produced only 82,000 new units. The housing crisis does more than harm families. It has ripple effects throughout the City. Since Brad and Joe wrote that in 2002, much has happened. I was hoping that Brad you would open up by describing for us some of the advocacy efforts that you and others in the front of the room have been engaged in, and touch on the City's reaction to those advocacy efforts, and in general bring us up to date on where we are today and what are the housing initiatives in the City today?

BRAD: First of all, thanks so much to everyone for being here. It's really exciting to see this audience and to have the chance to have a real and hopefully honest discussion about the roles of the public sector, of private developers, and of community-based and non-profit organizations, in confronting the challenges that we're talking about. Before I do the fast forward from 2002 to 2005 and talk about some of the advocacy work, getting the money from Battery Park City really committed to affordable housing, getting the administration more on board with a large scale housing plan and thinking about how we re-zone neighborhoods, I do think it's important to understand that while we've had a persistent housing crisis for more than 50 years, it has taken very different forms, and the response has been quite different. It's really interesting to look along the walls of the exhibit, and think about a time when it was the public sector, when it was government as the key actor, rolling up the sites, setting out the context and figuring out what would happen on them.

We then went through a period of time essentially after this, when neighborhood abandonment hit such a scale that, in many ways, the plan of government was to see how they could shrink these neighborhoods, not build. What happened was that the people left in those neighborhoods got together as community-based housing organizations and said, we've got to save our neighborhoods. And for a period of time, what happened was that community-based not-for-profit organizations and a small handful of private developers, looked at rehabbing and saving those neighborhoods. What we really had in many ways was an abandonment crisis with housing developed largely by community-based not-for-profits and some private developers, in many ways facilitated by government because they had become the holders of last resort of this housing. And a lot of us came to think of that as community development and really to embrace it for reasons I think Irene will talk about later. Unlike the worst aspects of urban renewal, community was central in thinking about, in re-envisioning and re-building neighborhoods. I think there's a lot of reasons to believe that that was a great model, but it turns out to have been an historic moment when the neighborhoods were abandoned, and when there was no market for

doing anything in them. It was when those community groups were the one set of folks left that said, we're going to figure out how to do this and we're going to need the help of government, in some cases, we're going to need the help of the private sector, but that's who led.

So at first the phase we're looking at on the walls, the government led, then a phase that community-based non-profits led, and today, we really have a different problem. We have an affordability crisis fed by the demand people have to live in the city. So, it's immigration that brought all the 500,000 new people to the city in the 1990's and is likely to bring 4 million people to the region over the next 20 or 25 years, and as long as demand to come and live here is high, and we can't build housing fast enough, we'll have a serious affordability crisis throughout the city and throughout the region. But what that also means is, in the very neighborhoods that we're looking at on the walls, and the ones in which community developers really did their work, the market is hot and private developers, there are a few who care about building affordable housing like Carlton, but most are there to figure out how they can make as much money as possible, are building again in the neighborhoods and in many ways it's wonderful. You don't want to have abandonment. You'd like to have vibrant markets, but an increasingly income-polarized service economy, where a lot of people are in retail and social service work, domestic services and health care, they just can't possibly compete for what's getting produced in our neighborhoods. And so, we do have a new kind of problem. We don't have government able to do urban renewal or the kinds of things that the Urban Development Corporation did. We don't have abandoned housing stock for community-based non-profits and others to rehab. We've got hot markets. Government is willing to put some money in maybe, but not really willing to take a very strong hand in the marketplace and solve what continues to be a severe affordability crisis. So, that I think is the challenge. We want what the community perspective brings in community development. We do want vibrant markets creating livable neighborhoods, but what's the role of government in trying to bring the resources to bear to make sure we get affordable housing?

Now, a couple of promising signs since 2002. First, though Mayor Bloomberg did not really run on a housing platform, did not promise all that much when he first ran, he was persuaded to put in place the first housing plan since Ed Koch's 10 year plan. A plan that was a significant commitment of new resources, some new tools to affordable housing development, a commitment to build or renovate 65,000 units over 5 years. A lot of us did a lot of quibbling with different aspects of the plan, wanting to make sure it really went to the low-income folks and not just to moderate or middle-income people, but by and large, it is a very meaningful commitment. Advocates then stepped up and said, good, but we're going to need more if we're going to solve this problem, and led by the Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development and ACORN and some other groups, folks said first we need to fulfill the promise that Battery Park City was to be for affordable housing. It was supposed to be a mixed-income community. That promise was reneged on. At least the money that's coming in from the payments, the taxes, and the development rights, needs to be committed to affordable housing and, we're happy to say, earlier in this election year, Mayor Bloomberg agreed to commit a significant chunk of that money over the next four years to building affordable housing. At the same time, the city has been looking at re-zoning much of the city to take account of growing market demand on the West Side, Greenpoint/Williamsburg, with another dozen neighborhoods to come. A set of community-based housing groups, housing advocates and others said, if we're going to re-zone neighborhoods

for housing development, we've got to make sure a meaningful chunk of it is affordable. At the beginning, the city said no way -- we won't connect zoning and housing affordability at all. But the city came a long way. While they didn't go to what some of us wanted, which was essentially requiring or mandating that developers include affordable housing, they created a significant incentive program that uses zoning bonuses, tax breaks and financial incentives to give developers powerful incentives to include a meaningful chunk of affordable housing in the re-zoning of Greenpoint/Williamsburg, Hudson Yards, and West Chelsea, and I think we'll see these become the model for future re-zonings. And they've also taken some meaningful steps around preservation of existing units, trying to make sure that as the subsidies expire on the kinds of developments we're looking at, that they're preserved, and that existing housing that rents for more modest sums is also fixed up.

I think this administration has been surprised by the resonance that trying to solve the housing crisis has with New Yorkers. It's a shame that they didn't see it earlier, and it hasn't been higher on the radar screen, but I think that both the democratic opponents and the administration have discovered housing as a real powerful issue for New Yorkers, who want a lot. We want affordable places to live, and we want livable neighborhoods that work for us. As for the challenge of how to do that in the context we're in, I hope others have better ideas than I do.

RON: Mark, in addition to being a banker, which you've been for a number of years ...

MARK: You really know how to hurt a guy.

RON: I may hurt you even more now. You used to be a housing advocate. I'm calling you an advocate, and co-chair of Housing First! You were very much a part of the Koch administration that administered the ten year housing strategy. You know to some degree it was the Koch initiative, but to a great extent, it came out of the work of housing advocates like ANHD, the Housing Justice Campaign, and community-based organizations around the city, but it was a response and it was a very healthy response and it contributed a lot to what went on in the city. And I'm wondering from that perspective what you could add to what Brad has said and how you think one might forge the new initiatives in such a way that they're really accountable and begin to move forward?

MARK: One thing I want to do is complement Brad on, first of all, covering the territory very well, but pointing out that this is a very different time. So I think we need to think carefully about what are the lessons we can learn and which ones we need to think more creatively about. In the time you're talking about, that of the 10 Year Plan, we had neighborhoods, as Brad said, that people were abandoning or talking about planned shrinkage and moving away, and we had people in the community who cared and wanted to preserve those communities. I started at HPD in 1986, when the 10 Year Plan was announced, and we looked around and said, we have all this money, what do we do with it? And it was very clear to us that one of the most important components of that, were community-based organizations, and while they didn't necessarily have experience in developing housing, they were in the communities. They were committed, and they would be there for 30 years or 40 years, so this was a great vehicle and group to work with. So, it was a key component of the organization for those reasons back then because in many ways no one else

even cared about the neighborhoods. Now, I often take people on tours and they just have no idea what the city looked like 20, 30 years ago, when the city owned 100,000 units, which I think is the number you used on one of these panels, of housing. What was demonstrated there that had not been done previously is the power of community groups, their ability to develop housing and the commitment to stay in the communities. Now, we have a completely different issue, which is the City doesn't have the land, so it can't hand it to these groups and say do it; now you've got to go in the private sector and buy it. That's a huge problem because, and I'm sure Irene will talk a lot more about this, but deep pockets is not a term that comes readily to mind when you think about community-based organizations. And so how are we going to help them continue what they're doing and complement what is happening in the private sector? I think the administration has used, or is looking for tools to use the market to build affordable housing whether it is inclusionary or whether it is a cross-subsidized project that many of us have seen, been involved in, and others will talk about. I think the role of not-for-profits with community-based organizations, something needs to be looked at in this new context, seeing what the strengths are, but understanding unless they play a different role here, it's not so easy as it was when the City had all this excess land that no one else wanted.

RON: Irene, you represent groups that basically are the community-based housing organizations. They have built up a substantial infrastructure that knows how to maintain, operate and develop housing. What do you see happening to that infrastructure given the changes in the nature of things, the way that both Mark and Brad have indicated? What do you hope will take place, and what role do you think you can play?

IRENE: Well, as one of our colleagues says, your perspective is from the mountain you stand on. I don't remember government ever being heavily involved in housing in our neighborhoods. I'll take your word for it, but it was a little before my time. When I was coming up, late '70's and early 80's, our neighborhoods were completely abandoned. Government wasn't there. The private capital wasn't there. What brought that back were the neighborhood groups, and the neighborhood residents. I think there are a lot of community-based organizations in the room tonight, and let me tell you, it wasn't easy back then. I mean, I don't remember things being handed to us. There was land and there were commitments, but these commitments came through the neighborhoods groups forcing the City to come back, and forcing banks and private investors; they took over the buildings that the real estate industry abandoned, and they renovated and took care of them. That was the challenge, they weren't experienced, and it was a challenge they stepped up to. In the past, by the time Mayor Giuliani came in, we had 90 ANHD members, and were not the entire neighborhood housing movement. We have 90 members in the five boroughs of New York City, which are doing tremendous work; they had a tremendous pipeline. We don't have an exact count, but just these groups have done more than 40,000 units of affordable housing. And this is housing mostly for poor people and people of really modest means.

When the Giuliani administration came in, he just completely abandoned the City's housing programs. These were successful programs. These were programs that were working, that were responding to the housing crisis. That administration just said this isn't where we want to go. Instead we just want to divest ourselves of the real estate we own, and we want the market

to take care of this problem. The community groups survived that. All the groups that are in the room today were here before that time and they're here today, and they're still building housing. Sometimes I think it's a little ironic. We're told that you know government doesn't have any land anymore. Well you know there was a fire sale. They just auctioned it off. That's why we don't have land. We're told that the community groups aren't positioned to develop housing. Yes, there are market forces, but there are also the programs that exist and, still today, are biased against non-profit participation. So, it's not a capacity issue for neighborhood organizations. I think ANHD's challenge and the challenge of our members is that we need to acknowledge a new landscape and, yes, this is now a different housing market and that private investors are interested in our neighborhoods and we need to find a way to work with them differently than we have in the past, but I think community groups can rise to that challenge. And I think what we really need to do is insist as aggressively as we can that City housing programs really serve the City's residents and that they have the appropriate role for non-profits. (applause) There you go. Yes.

RON: I don't want to intervene too much, but there's a gentlemen in the audience, Henry Lanier, and a couple of other faces that I've seen that really were the pioneers. They actually were in some of these groups; was it '70 or '68 that you were running Los Sures?

HENRY: We put it together in '73.

RON: But when did you start with...

HENRY: In '69.

RON: In '69

MARK: I was in kindergarten.

RON: Basically, putting together these community groups and, as Irene points out, it was a real struggle to get both the programs and the City first to take the land, by the way, that were taken in rem. The City was ready to auction the properties off then and to turn that into the resource to rebuild. And in a few minutes I want to get into some of the implications of this. I mean what's going to happen to many of the people who saved the neighborhoods? They worked and struggled to save the neighborhoods and they're now being priced out of the neighborhoods they worked to save? But before we go there, I want to ask Carlton, who really represents the private sector here, I guess Ted does too to some degree, but Carlton, how do you see the private work you do really engaging both the new landscape that Brad and Mark talk about, as well as the partnership with some of the community-based organizations that exist? And in addition to your reflecting on that, could you also talk a little bit about the need to add some new ingredients to the process? Something called design? And something called sustainability? I just want to see if you could add those two elements.

CARLTON: Yeah, I'll add something on all those things. I want to make a couple of comments. I think one of the things is, and I think that whether you're a community organization or for-profit

organization or government, there are just market forces that say the landscape changes, right? And that's what's inevitable about all things -- they change. I think that being able to increase production, you have to recognize those changes and develop strategies for it. And I think that when you talk about what happened early on, in the late 60's and early 70's, there was no private sector investment. Banks didn't invest. There was redlining. And there was this 50-year history of disinvestment in urban communities. Starting in the late 50's, you couldn't borrow money. Landlords walked away from property and communities were abandoned. There are things government can do. And sometimes you don't necessarily realize what the immediate impact is, but when the CRA legislation was passed, banks suddenly realized they had good reason to make these loans. Later on, after they started doing it, they realized they had good business reasons to do it. So government in some cases can provide incentives to start something moving, and then it takes off from there. That's an example of how market forces change.

At the same time, government as it stands right now, where they aren't making direct investment in housing like they once did, I think in many ways government stands in the way of creating affordable housing. For instance, in New York City, if you want to create affordable housing, even if you get subsidies from the City, you will pay Building Department fees, you will pay all sorts of fees, that add a burden that just makes no sense if the objective is to create affordable housing. So if you look at a budget for an affordable housing project, and you look at transfer fees, etc., you'd be looking at about 6 or 7% of the costs of the housing that was going right back to government. In New York right now, it costs in the vicinity of 150,000, 200,000 dollars per unit to build, so you're talking about a large amount of money that could be saved and reduce the cost of housing. So, even if they aren't going to make direct investments in housing, I think government needs to look at the process of creating housing and find ways to reduce the costs to make them less burdensome.

One of the things that we do in our business, we believe that actually walking around here and looking at some of the things UDC did, some of the things we do aren't really that new. One of the things that we found in our business is, that as government provides less of a subsidy, we use cross-subsidies by making housing that's affordable to middle-income, moderate-income, and low-income people. The middle-income housing could actually subsidize the low-income housing. And if you look at some of these boards around here about UDC, it was one of the UDC models to have mixed-income housing. If you think about it, a community organization wants to create a stable community. For a long time, and I think about where a lot of our work has been in Harlem and in Bedford-Stuyvesant, (I guess I've been in this business since '88, '89 or something, I don't know, a long time) but, at the time we started doing this with HPD and the New York City Housing Partnership, up until that time, practically everything that had been in these neighborhoods, was really special needs housing. There was halfway housing for people just back from prison. And not to say that you don't need these facilities, but if you put all the special needs housing in 2 or 3 communities in the City, you can't really expect those communities to be sustainable. So when we look at the notion of sustainability, we look at economic sustainability. We look at environmental sustainability, and we look at human sustainability. And when you start to look at those things, the environmental discussion becomes a much broader discussion because it becomes a discussion about human empowerment.

What we have found is that by creating mixed-use, mixed-income housing, the way we build in New York as architects and contractors is largely the way people built in the 19th century. Again, if you look at some of the things that UDC explored in the late sixties and early seventies, they looked at different ways of building that really got dropped, they were never developed any further. If you look at any other industry, since the '90's they've looked at how material sciences work, they look at how manufacturing can be more effective and they look at better ways to use materials and components to make a better product for less cost. In our industry, we haven't done this so our costs have continued to rise. Our quality has continued to go down. So in some ways, we are very different from every other manufacturing industry that you can think of. In our practice, what we try to do is find ways to work counter to that and put the value that we create, or those savings that we create through different ways of building, back into the product to increase the quality of the product, but also to reduce the cost to make it more affordable to a broader range of people.

At the same time we're doing that, we're looking at green building or sustainable ways to reduce resources, reduce energy consumption. Typically, our projects reduce energy consumption somewhere between 35 and 60% below the New York State energy code. What we believe that this does is it starts to re-empower communities. When people can save 1,200, 1,500 dollars a year on energy costs, it gives them the opportunity to do other things with that money. It gives them choices. They can invest it in education for their child. They can go spend it in Vegas. They can do whatever they want to do, but the idea that as we try to build communities, and rebuild communities, we have to think about ways to give people choices and more control over their lives. One of the things about government housing programs, is that, in some cases, in those that we've dealt with, they were very rigid in the way that they were structured, in the way that you were supposed to approach things. And when we tried to make changes initially, there was opposition. If you do it somehow and it's successful, it moves on. One of the things that it takes for the parties to create affordable housing and sustainable communities is an open-minded approach – a willingness to make trade-offs and to be fully engaged, and not engaged in the sense that one party to the agreement is subordinate to the others. If you're talking about partnering with community organizations, or partnering with government or partnering with the private sector, it takes a new approach and a new willingness to really be engaged.

RON: Thanks. You said something mid-way that I just want to pick up on, and that was about the fees that go into affordability. For those of you who haven't looked at the article in The New York Times today, apparently New York City this year, got over 300% more in taxes due to the real estate transfer tax than it did last year. It went up to 2.2 billion dollars in real estate transfer taxes as compared to 2000, when it only earned 875 million dollars. And if we took that money and plowed that into affordable housing and leveraged it, we could begin to see some of the benefits that could accrue to the kind of thinking that Carlton was talking about. Ted, you've heard the others. They say the landscape has changed. Has it really changed, or has it come full circle? And I'm just wondering if you could, from your perspective, talk a little bit about what you think might be some of the lessons, even in a changed landscape, for today?

TED: It was very interesting listening to Carlton Brown because he defines sustainability as we did 35 years ago. And we didn't know the word sustainability then by the way. We thought that good housing and good neighborhoods meant socially, economically and environmentally integrated neighborhoods. And it's very interesting that one of the projects that we feature in this exhibit, Roosevelt Island, which has been open since 1975, when the first half of the housing was built, has changed, but the goals of Roosevelt Island are in fact the goals that everyone up here would dream could be realized. It was going to be a dense urban village -- a new town in town. By the way, all the housing we build in New York City is sustainable, if we think of the nation that we live in, because it's less car dependent, it's denser, we use transit and use it well, and by packing our houses next to each other, we gain a little bit of energy efficiency automatically. So, immediately, all of our work is great work, because it's quite sustainable. But the social and economic aspects of sustainability are very difficult to achieve.

Roosevelt Island was Ed Logue's dream project, which he wanted as a model that would be repeated elsewhere, both in other neighborhoods within cities, as well as the isolated island neighborhood that he created. And it had a system for collecting garbage that was a suction tube to collect garbage on the island. It was supposedly going to remain a car free island with a parking garage that you went into when you entered the island and you then went onto a battery operated bus. It was the first barrier free island -- totally barrier free. It was to have eight parks, an internal sports park that was going to have a lot of recreation for everyone on the island. It had bicycle paths and walkways with 100% access to the edge of the water. It had more handicapped people living on the island and chronically ill disabled people living in hospitals that, after 20 to 30 years of residency in a hospital situation, became residents of a living community, and were able to circulate through it barrier free. It was an amazing place in the first decade. It had a mini school system. It wanted to have children integrated into housing as they went from grade to grade, from school to school. All of these things were done at the same time and done under the powerful leadership of a Governor and a development administrator of the program, Ed Logue, but without Governor Rockefeller, a powerful state governor, it never would have happened. Without powerful leadership, good leadership, intelligent leadership, nothing really happens. So, I've seen Lindsay, the wonderful Mayor, but weak, too weak in the sixties, when he tried to get planning, development and housing all united into one centrally controlled group, so that when the city planners were working, and worked in the neighborhood, the HPD, and the Housing Authority could look for opportunities with them, and all the development efforts could be put together and integrated.

It's very interesting, in a couple of weeks, the AIA housing committee is going to host Amanda Burden and Shaun Donovan, two very creative leaders within the Bloomberg administration, and they're going to come and talk about how they're talking with each other now. And that's a revelation, and that's wonderful and we should all be here and encourage them because whatever they do, will be great for all of us. But I lived through the after government subsidy years, when in fact, the biggest tragedy for me was a model like Roosevelt Island being subverted at the same time that Battery Park City had lovely design guidelines, and didn't help one poor person for twenty years. And now it may be doing that, but architects published the fact that there were a few level stories of granite detail as a great achievement, and they negated the fact that 50% of all the people on Roosevelt Island were poor, and they went to schools together and

they still go to schools together and they love it there. It was a community, a mixed-income community in which people who went there on day one, went there understanding that half of the people they would see on the street were going to be very poor people that needed heavy subsidies, and lived in housing for the poor. And they chose to live there. What a marvelous thing. Now it exists now as a real community. But each and every new building that goes there, now there's some 80/20's, and 99/1's; someday I'm going to be here at 110 years of age and I'm going to say, I really am pleased that the 99/1 program got through. We struggled to get that.

PANELIST (unidentified): They'll always need a super.

TED: Yeah that's right. But truthfully, during that interim period, we had less leadership at the top. Have we mentioned a state program? We have Bloomberg and he has a very good program, but he's the Mayor, and he doesn't have a Governor to rely on at this moment.

RON: Or President.

TED: We don't even discuss the President. Do you know that I used to know 50 names of people at HUD. I would know every under-secretary, every department head, everyone looking into new technology. Everyone, and they were important people in my life. My God, that building must be a barren wasteland. You know, that curved building. That's terrible to even think that people must be there. They must be relics. I will stop but I should tell you, that interim period was also a disappointment to me. Nehemiah Housing that took good neighborhoods with great transit and made them into wastelands with one and two story housing. They populated those good neighborhoods of the '20's and '30's into another 50 years of nothing, until someone comes back and changes it. And we can't afford that. We should never do that again. As an architect, I have not been able to do a great deal of affordable housing in the last two decades. I would love to. I'm ready to do it, but there's no program that exists that I'm willing to do because it either under-populates, or will have no design awareness, and design, what I mean by design, is adequate community facilities and how they relate entries to homes, that create communities. None of these things are in the vocabulary of the for-profit affordable housing groups that I see. And there's only a few bright lights, and they're far and few between. Developing more of that in the next decade or two, and somehow changing leadership at the very top, and at the state level and really working to get those programs when people run for office that understand community, is very important for all of us because I do believe that the lessons of the Urban Development Corporation can be renewed overnight with proper leadership.

RON: Brad, you looked like you wanted to say something. Was I reading your body language correctly?

BRAD: Sure. I love Roosevelt Island. You know Spiderman is my favorite superhero for saving it, and I think a lot of people in the room are inspired deeply by the concept of a community that is mixed. I do think it's worth facing up to the challenges of the fact that a community that is mixed, that is far-reaching, means a community that was planned, that was assembled by, built by government, with a real strong leadership and a real strong hand, and while a lot about it inspires me, it's not just the lack of leadership on the part of a couple of people that's in the interim, it's

a total lack of faith on the part of progressives, moderates, and conservatives, that the level of government planning, leadership, a kind of benevolent dictatorship, is the way we want to see communities developed. What we've got on the walls here are the best examples of what could happen with state power creating good communities, but they are tiny islands in a big sea of state power creating terrible communities, demolishing previously existing slums, but places people lived, to build things that didn't work at all, so that's on the one hand. On the other, it is entirely true that without a stronger hand, you never could get a mixed-income community. It's one thing to build affordable housing, but a mixed-income neighborhood is an anomaly in a capitalist real estate economy. As soon as someone has a unit that rents for $2,000 a month with the schmo next door who rents their unit for $700 a month, so you are only going to have mixed-income neighborhoods if you're willing to back things like rent regulation and rent control and far-reaching public planning. And I just think we have to own up to this dilemma a little bit because I don't think it's so easy. I guess I don't agree we could recreate this overnight. I think there's a really challenging fundamental dilemma between wanting livable neighborhoods in which markets operate and community has a lot to say, and people don't think kindly of government. Right now, the one thing that progressives and conservatives agree about is that no one wants eminent domain powers, so, on the other hand, if we want the kind of communities we're looking at, we'll need a lot more of that kind of power, and I would say, it's a real dilemma. I don't think we know the answers, and we're the ones in New York who believe in its possibility. What we mostly face throughout the country are people who've really said, we don't want government at all to solve these problems. So to get back to a model that would work, because I don't think we could sell the one on the wall today, is a real challenge.

RON: Let me posit one potential, all right? Let's take Atlantic Yards in Brooklyn, which is owned by the MTA, or even the Far West Side, owned by the MTA. This is a public entity. Why are we allowing a private developer to plan it, come forward, and then basically because of the advocacy effort of really great community-based groups, forcing it through the mechanism of a community benefits agreement, to yield some public benefits. But what if it were done better? What if it were a public entity, working with the various different community-based organizations around it, working with the advocacy groups around it, that actually came up with a rational plan, not one by either the Carlton Group or by the Ratner Group, but one basically developed by the public interest that then said, some housing would be developed by the private sector and some would be developed by not-for-profit groups. This is where we would put schools. These are the goals that we would like to attain in this area. Why, and I'm going back to something that Irene said, why are we allowing this public resource to go off and be totally planned to the highest use that benefits only a single private developer? I just want to open that question up to all of you.

CARLTON: I think Brad already answered that. Not only New York, but the country also has got this thing like, the market solves everything, whatever the problem is, the free market will solve it. If any of you know Texas, we've done work in Texas. There are no zoning regulations there. I can build a twenty story used car lot right next to your kindergarten, and it doesn't matter, and I think that sort of attitude is really the prevailing attitude certainly among conservatives. When you look at government, even people that now call themselves moderates would have been considered conservatives 30 years ago. So I think the sway of government, and to a certain extent of the public, is that government should do nothing and the private sector determines everything. Get

the best bid. Whoever's got the most money, let them do it, and everything will be fine, because the market solves everything. Of course I don't believe that, but I do believe that that's the prevailing belief.

BRAD: I want to play devil's advocate on Atlantic Yards for a minute because I'm very ambivalent about the Ratner proposal and it's easy for me to imagine in the equivalent of my Ed Logue dreams of Roosevelt Island, a public planning process that would have accomplished what Ron outlined. But honestly what would have happened if Bruce Ratner had not proposed this development, and ACORN had not organized to require that 50% of the housing is affordable, (maybe we'll see what it winds up in the end)? I think there are two possibilities. One is nothing happens - actually the likely answer is nothing for a long time. Or two, a much lower density development because if they had opened it up to community planning, I think the folks around would have said 6 or 8 stories seems about right and we would have lost the opportunity to build at meaningful density on a site that can take it and we would have been delighted to get 20 or 30% affordable units. So we'd have maybe 1500 units on that site, and 300, 350 of them would be affordable. That's what I think would have happened. So, I'm still ambivalent about the Ratner proposal. I still prefer the dream of a real possibility of government saying, this is a site for density. Let's see what it could sustain. Design it right, and then let's do it as a public project with all the possibilities that that would entail. But I also think realistically what is proposed is actually closer to the UDC model of density with half of the units affordable, than would have come out of what would have been a public planning process, had we had one in the real world that we live in today.

RON: Well, I'm not sure of that...

MARK: I go back to the framework that Brad started with because I just don't think we should be nostalgic. UDC did not solve the problems we then faced in the City. Neighborhoods declined despite UDC's wonderful planning. Even Roosevelt Island declined, and there was a period there, where it wasn't considered a great place to live. And that may be maintenance or whatever else, but it did go through that....

TED: Or lack of subsidy.

SPEAKER: Well, I love it, but let's not be romantic even about Ed Logue. He built Charlotte Gardens, which is one of the most low-density things, but for the right reason. He saw what needed to be done there.

TED: No. No.

RON: It's terrible. It was the wrong reason.

MARK: I don't remember when I came to HPD people talking about the great days, when there was all this public consulting with neighborhood groups by UDC. I don't remember hearing that. I'm not saying there weren't a lot of good things that happened. We've got lots of examples here, but Brad looked at me before, benevolent dictator was a term I threw out before, when he and I were talking here, there was a strong hand from Ed Logue and from the State about that, and it

did yield lots of good things, but it came with other issues. I don't think that, if we only had planning, Ron, and if we only had the right people in the room, and forgive me but maybe Irene, who represents the community, can speak to that - it seems to me a big issue here. I went through an era when we had a fabulous relationship with HPD working with community groups. We couldn't have rebuilt the communities without them. I just think we need to think about what's the right thing for our time. What are the right pieces that are out there, and we need to be realistic about the politics as well.

IRENE: I'm still stuck on the MTA as a public entity. But, I think what's happening is that we push decision-making down. I think that when people in the neighborhoods drive neighborhood development, more often than not, the right choices get made. I believe the people that live around the Atlantic Yards are very unhappy with that deal. The people that actually live in that neighborhood are opposed to it still.

BRAD: But the people in most neighborhoods in New York City right now would like not to have development in their neighborhoods, right? They're mostly calling for down-zonings.

IRENE: No....

BRAD: I mean all of Staten Island, most of Queens, a substantial amount of the Northeast Bronx, Southern Brooklyn. So I do think this is another challenge. We want to respect. We want livable communities, and I'm not unsympathetic to the challenges created when you can't find a place to park, and when a ten story building goes up next to your three family house, or when stuff is getting torn down that you've lived with, but this is a balance that we don't have any choice but to strike. Unless we want to say to the 4 million immigrants that are coming to the City in the next 30 years that you should live in basements, attics, or the Poconos, we will need an approach that balances, creating livable communities with some hand of government to say....

IRENE: Yes, one of the things I've seen over the past couple of years, which I think shows you how crazy the forces are that are driving neighborhood development, is that in each of these stadium deals, private developers are financing community groups to help them. I'm not saying community groups would not take the same position, and be doing the same work they were doing, but Cablevision bankrolled some of the opposition against the West Side. Again, if I were a community group opposed to it, I'd take the money, but it's telling you what it's come down to.

BRAD: Nobody gave a dime to Los Sures or St. Nicks I think...

IRENE: But I think that there are a lot of forces that are blocking neighborhood voices. I live in Riverdale and I live in a six-story building and I'm less than thrilled that there's a 12-story building going up next to it, but I'm not out there lobbying for ranch homes. I think there are opportunities for appropriate development in the neighborhoods, and the people in that neighborhood might not want a stadium, and maybe they're not seeing that as serving a neighborhood purpose and that's legitimate, and just like some people don't like sanitation dumps, and I know we need these things but, you know, I don't think it's right to just say the neighborhood has no vision in its opposition, you know.

RON: Carlton.

CARLTON: Well, one thing about the Atlantic Yards thing. I live near there and I've heard a whole lot of voices and opinions on it, but it seems to be this vision, suddenly, and maybe this is recently or maybe it has been here a long time, that the City should be static. The truth of the matter is, if you look at the history of the City as a convention, as a social convention, it has never been static. Cities grow and they change. Before the Brooklyn Bridge opened, all that land was farmland, where we're talking about the Atlantic Terminal site, and the Brooklyn Bridge opened in 1879, I think, which was just over a hundred years ago. Most of those houses there were built in the late 1800s and early 1900's, so in that 30-year period the City changed. So are we saying that the City should remain static, that certain communities should be the same, 90 years from now or 100 years from now? I think some portions of the City need to be preserved, but at the same time, I think you need to recognize that the City is growing, and where are people going to live? You have to make choices about where do you increase density? I think most planners would say, that where you have really intense mass transit hubs, that's probably a good location to increase density; maybe if you look at a broader scale, that it is a place where the City shouldn't be as static. But I think whoever that was who said that everything in New York is not in my backyard. It's OK to do it, but not near me, put the stadium out in Coney Island.

RON: Except that, I happen to agree with Irene that when you really work with communities in a planning process, and you engage in a dialectic between the private developers and the community and the government, all three of them playing a part and a role, you can develop plans that respect the need for higher densities, but do it in a way that you achieve the higher densities, that may be in forms that are not high buildings. We could build the same densities, and I think UDC demonstrated this, in low-rise buildings that we do in some of the buildings that stick out as sore thumbs in neighborhoods. We could keep the street patterns open, so that you're not creating these super blocks that lack the connections between Fort Greene and Prospect Heights. There are ways of designing it that could be much more amenable on the street. And I think somehow we have to get back to a situation where there is a balance of power between community-based groups, government and the private sector, and then a true partnership emerges. Then you allow the development to take place. I'm not suggesting that it would have in any way gone anywhere if Ratner didn't initiate it, but perhaps he should propose it, but there is a role for the public realm. And I think we have to reinvent that somehow in ways that are more meaningful. I remember when it could be something. The fact of the matter is that you would not have had a budget at HPD if it weren't for ANHD...

END OF TAPE

RON: And that gave birth to a whole movement that every one of us is praising. And as many units were built by that community-based initiative, from the bottom up, as did from Ed Logue's time. But how do we balance the two? How do you smoosh together a benevolent dictatorship and an active and vigorous democratic base?

TED: I take the opposite view of these guys, and say it's a very easy deal to go back to the way it was. It isn't and it can never happen in the same way. But Ratner's scheme, and I've only seen what I've seen in the paper, is a vision for the Atlantic Terminal area. It may not be the right one, but it's a vision and it will happen. It will happen not because he's powerful. Not because of a lot of politics. It will happen because there's something that people can hold on to and it's a shame that the City Planning Commission under this mayor, or the former mayor, didn't have a vision for that very important site that we knew was an important site 25-30 years ago. No one has really said what should go there. Someone should have said that. We should have planning. We should have planning in a city as important as New York.

MARK: I just want to be devil's advocate here. Only because I don't really disagree with Ted, but when we've had planning, we got those super blocks. That was the fad of planning.

TED: It may have been the fad then, but that doesn't mean that that was good planning.

MARK: No it wasn't. All I'm saying is to say planning, plain and simple, would turn over to the City's Planning Department, that's subject to the fads of the time, and I think the dialectic or the debate or whatever you're talking about Ron, in some ways has at least informed a little bit of what Ratner's done. Maybe the weight hasn't been quite right. It is really probably too bad that no one had a separate vision so you have nothing else to hold onto. But, again, my reticence here is not to idealize that if we only did it that way, the world would be perfect, but you have something more to say.

BRAD: Well, no, I think in some ways we are at a pretty good place. I think there is promise in the ways that community groups are relating to development in the moment that we're in. It is a new moment. There is a strong market appetite in the neighborhoods, and people are saying, wow, this is a different climate. What do we do about it? We have concerns about scale. Boy, do we have concerns about affordability and displacement. I think we're a little stuck because there's this big bogeyman of the 1970's -- the City could be abandoned again. So we can't ask too much, but despite that, groups on the ground in every neighborhood we've talked about are saying, OK, it's probably going to be done by private developers. That's the climate that we're in. What are the levers that community groups working with government and trying to gum up the works when the development doesn't work in that neighborhood, is shifted so that it is more accountable.

I think an interesting thing about the Ratner deal is, he went with affordable housing and union jobs as a way to pull the levers of government and neglected design, streetscape, neighborhood retail, traffic. I mean neighborhood-oriented design. He chose to say, if I go with affordable housing and jobs, I can build a coalition that has a lot of sway. And I won't have to pay that much attention to traffic, orientation to the neighborhood, openness of streets, how people get in and out, how it works for its immediate surrounding community. Those folks therefore are up in arms and doing their best to gum up the works. I think we are at a moment of inventing something that's hard. It's a little easier when government is going to do the whole project to work out every bit of design. How community groups hold development accountable on how much of the housing is affordable? On how much the jobs pay? On how the project is laid out and how the design works? It's a new vocabulary. I don't think we have too much choice but to try. I do think

design lags because it's easier to ask for a percent of affordable housing units. It's easier to ask for living wage jobs than it is to say, let's sit down and figure out whether the design works for the neighborhood. But that's where we're going to be for the next ten years.

TED: In this case, I think what will happen is there will be some community input before the plan is finalized. And there will probably be better connections, but I feel badly that it was not something that was a vision, that the program was not originally a vision of the City because I think the City should be directing some of these activities. I just think that that's a responsibility of the City.

RON: With all its weaknesses, the Greenpoint/Williamsburg plan, which the City now passed in the re-zoning, came out of a community-initiated planning process, which did call for much higher densities. Not as high as it wound up, but it did call for higher densities. It called for a number of other things. It called for public transportation. It called for open space, which it's getting, but not as much as it needs. And it also called for other kinds of public facilities. What scared me when I looked at today's newspaper and I saw the result of all these ad hoc applications, 24,000 housing units, is, yes, it was 10-story buildings next to two- story buildings, and, yes, we need that housing, but it wasn't being done in a way that knows whether there'll be enough seats in the schools surrounding them? Whether the kids moving into those buildings will have places to recreate and to play? Whether they'll be able to go out on safe streets? Whether they'll be able to breathe clean air? I think that's also a responsibility. And one of the things that's really missing in the last few years, and I can understand why, because it's the post Reagan legacy, and the Bush legacy, is that government is no longer considered us. And we are government. I mean government is the collective voice for all of us. And the one way to make government responsive is through organizing and through community-based groups. We have to begin to get faith again in the vehicles that begin to implement that. We've talked a lot up here and I want to know if there are people in the audience who have comments to make and questions to ask of the panelists.

AUDIENCE: Thanks so much. I teach at Fordham University. Lived in New York for nine years now but I am a native of Minnesota. I want to encourage this group to be more hopeful in thinking about some of the empowering legislation, for instance, that New York could develop. Something that the states I've lived in and come from have done. And to remind you, that in our last presidential election, the outcome was actually very close. People weren't actually voting primarily on the question whether citizens should have a say in developing communities. Ted seems to me exactly right in saying that this needs to become a more important issue in future elections. But Carlton, remember Texas is not normal compared with the rest of the states. Most people have zoning and even have state level requirements for citizen participation in community design. So I think we should be hopeful that, as many folks have said, this is a new era, markets are factors, and at the same time, markets aren't some other alien beings. They aren't creatures from Mars. They are human beings acting in various ways. And citizens sitting down together and having conversations are another way that citizens can interact. So maybe we can think in terms of creating some new kind of functional legislation that would bring together these effective uses of markets with appropriate educative uses of citizens voices, where people know stuff about schools and needs and possibilities in neighborhoods so that poor urban planners

aren't stuck with having to figure out everything all by themselves and make more super blocks as Mark was worrying about. But instead, can actually learn from markets and citizens in a little bit more effective communicative process like those in play in most states in the United States of America.

MARK: I'd like to make just a comment about that. I think that was really helpful to come back to some of those issues, but, while we talked a little bit pessimistically in your terms here, let's not forget we have the most vibrant community organizations in the country here. We have many organizations worrying about our schools. Some might argue, we have too many and that's why we have gridlock, and we can have that debate, but one of the wonderful things is, we'll we have the right balance that Ron is talking about here as these things are not done in a vacuum. There are lots of concerned citizens. There are lots of people in the neighborhoods and maybe we could have started with a better blueprint for the Atlantic Yards, but there's been a lot of shaping, and it's still to come. There will be more. And so, we shouldn't sound like there's nothing going on that's representing those other interests because we do have a lot of that.

AUDIENCE: First I was glad to hear somebody mention the service industry because those are many of the people looking for housing who are already commuting two hours from the Pocanos. It's the teachers, the firemen, the cops, nurses and shoe salesmen. So that's a big group of New Yorkers we need to think about. But one thing I also wanted to encourage or I don't hear very often when we talk about revitalization, but there's a difference between revitalization and gentrification, and I don't think there's enough difference made when we have these discussions about community development and housing. That's just a statement.

BRAD: I think that's exactly right and I mean I'm not pessimistic. I think the future of the City is very optimistic in a certain way, but I think it is an increasingly polarized one. I mean the economy that we live in is a service economy that's got a set of pretty small number of pretty high end jobs and a pretty large number of very low wage jobs, and how we meet that need, and we can meet it by reducing people's housing quality rights - more of them can live in basements and attics and in the Pocanos. If we have ambitions for a City that is not increasingly unequal as it grows, we'll have to do something about it, and that will include saying in neighborhoods where the market is gentrifying and creating a much less mixed income community than we might want, are we willing to do some things to hold on to it? Are we willing to continue to have rent regulations? Are we willing to require that affordable housing is developed? And I don't think there's any way of escaping, I'm sorry we come back to the Atlantic Yards all the time, that the alternative to the Ratner plan, is much more likely a lower density, much more market rate development. That's unfortunately in a lot of neighborhoods, what leaving them alone is going to mean in the economy to come, and that's part of what we have to grapple with. Neighborhoods have got to be invested in the dialogue.

IRENE: I think the distinction between revitalization and gentrification is a really important one. And this is why I get back to why neighborhood voices need to shape neighborhood development because there isn't a broad template that just fits on every neighborhood. We would take different banks on community tours at different times, and you could see that in certain parts of Harlem years ago, where the neighborhood was devastated, they need to bring back the middle

class. Today they need to keep the housing in parts of Harlem for the people that live there. And there are different strategies. The Lower East Side was the same thing. Years ago you were trying to bring people back into the neighborhood. Now you're fighting tooth and nail so that working people and the people that live there can stay there.

MARK: I'll just add here Housing First is one of the major advocacy groups, which is an umbrella group that includes a wide range from homeless to developers to the financial service sector, and the issue that you raised is very much on the agenda that it just came out with today, which is preserving the diversity of our neighborhoods, because we're the forces of the economic development here. We could lose a lot about what New York City is about,

IRENE: And one of our biggest concerns at ANHD, which we didn't talk about tonight, but it is preserving the existing housing. We think the affordable stock is seriously threatened today, which is why you need Los Sures and other groups that are working with the existing housing. That's what we've got to look at. That's the part that's most at risk.

TED: One more thing. Private housing makes more money than partially subsidized housing often. Private developers on their own will build the highest and best income for themselves. I make my money doing market rate housing. However, someone has to think of the long run, and there have been visions in The City Ascendant, the book by Bobby Wagner Jr. There are visions, horrible visions of New York City, with the poor clawing at the city as it becomes a bastion for the rich. And we don't want that. Nobody wants that. And yet, it is not the private developer acting alone that is going to make something else happen in the long run. The long run has to be very important and that has to have some public pressure.

AUDIENCE: Thinking back on what Ted talked about on Roosevelt Island and the vision of Roosevelt Island, I agree with you on that. The other thing that happened with Roosevelt Island, and I don't know if it was Ed Logue but it was done definitely under UDC, but the five developments that were created are State Mitchell-Lama's, and three of them are rentals and two of them are co-operatives. Now the three rentals have different owners. They've each made application to leave the program. However, one of the attorneys did his homework. He found out that, and this is the vision that I talk about that I'd like to know how you think can be replicated, the UDC created a master plan for the Island, not for each individual building, and the master plan states that 75% of the units on the island, from that day to the future, must be affordable. And it was a mix of 25% for middle income, a percentage for low and moderate income and Section 8 income, and then 25% market rate. This has an impact on every development that occurs, including the ones that are occurring now in Southtown, which is either market rate or 80/20. There's a very major impact on whether these units can actually be built.

Now this is an agreement with the State and the City, to be monitored by the New York City Comptroller, and any modification must be agreed upon by all three entities. The only modification that occurred, and this is a 99 year agreement, the only modification that occurred was 10 years ago, when for some strange reason, they eliminated, I think it was a 5% set-aside for senior housing, and they added the 5% for people whose income was Section 8 eligible. So it was still low income and I guess they put seniors in all categories, as not to pigeonhole them.

Now, this was a vision from the '70's, where the State and the City worked together. Obviously we can't do it on that level now, because there is no land now, but how do you think that you can get the City and the State to work together to create another program because one of the big things that I agree with Irene on, is that preservation is a hell of a lot cheaper than creation. And what we need to do now is to preserve what exists, rather than think about building 65,000 new units. Actually it's 35,000 I think. 35 is another amount for preservation.

RON: I think we need to do both. Does anybody want to comment or is that a statement?

BRAD: Fortunately we have somebody from the New York City Comptroller's office here. How come we're not having 75% affordable housing on Roosevelt Island?

AUDIENCE: Please, I just want to thank you for putting me on the spot. Actually if you haven't talked to our office, have you talked to them or our colleagues or...?

AUDIENCE: The elected officials of Roosevelt Island wrote a letter to the Comptroller in April and we haven't gotten a response yet as far as I know.

AUDIENCE: OK, we'll talk in the morning and I promise you I'll take care of this.

BRAD: Think of this as a housing litmus test for 2009.

AUDIENCE: I am not running for Mayor particularly but I'll try to work on this -- we'll talk in the morning and I'll get an answer for you. But I actually did have a question for the panel, so do you want me to wait? There have been a lot of changes at the national level. Bank consolidation and federal pre-emption, predatory lending, and changes to CRA. How have you addressed them or tried to compensate for them since those changes have a lot of impact on low and moderate-income communities?

IRENE: That's an issue of really deep concern for us at ANHD, and Mark can speak to this in a minute, but what we've seen in the past few years as government has stepped up more again in the neighborhoods, the banks have stepped out a bit of community development. While I'm sure they're financing the large developers, the community-based groups are having increasing difficulty getting loans from area banks. I think that the mega banks are less able to work on a neighborhood level, the way the smaller banks were. We think that CRA, with what was called financial, what was modernization, banks have branched out into a lot of new businesses, not covered by CRA. The laws have been weakened. They haven't been enforced as aggressively as we would hope. And now with the federal pre-emption of the national banks, we don't have recourse to state regulators. So it's a real concern. And I think it's a bigger issue than the role of government in the neighborhoods.

RON: Well it is the role of government. CRA is on the federal level.

IRENE: Well yes. To deregulate the banks....

RON: The history of CRA came from community-based groups that forced government to issue regulations on the federal level. Senator Proxmire, he's gone.

MARK: Gail Cincotta.

IRENE: We met with a mid-size bank in the past month and that bank had only given five community development loans to New York area non-profits in three years. It's the sixth largest multi-family lender in loan income neighborhoods in New York City. This is what we're seeing.

BRAD: There is another answer in what do we do to deal with it -- we try to elect a different president, I mean so it's not a secret.

MARK: I cannot comment on this. Irene and I disagree about some of this, but there are some banks that have taken a very strong position to preserve CRA as it is, and you'll know that mine does, and I won't do a commercial here again, but you all heard the name before, and so I think there is a strong commitment amongst the banks to continue to help revitalize and strengthen communities. With regard to predatory lending, the banks also have gotten more involved and quite honestly, what CRA is, is a vehicle. Gail Cincotta, and most of us knew her as the mother of CRA, many years ago sat down and what she said was, there's no advocates for the poor. What I want to do is make the financial services industry, particularly banks, come to the table and advocate for that. And I think that's very successful. In the areas of predatory lending, banks have been embarrassed and gotten much more involved in policing themselves, or policing others out there because we are major sources of capital to other lenders. So, I'm actually encouraged by the direction that things are going. In terms of pre-emptions, which is a very technical topic that everybody here might not understand, the result is whether there is for national banks, one set of rules across the country that is done out of Washington, whether the Office of Thrift Supervision or OCC, whether that's the right way for this country to go, given that we are a lot of states, or whether there should be separate regulations in each state that national banks would then have to adjust to, is a debate that's going on. I don't think we're going to have that here, but so just people understand those are the two sides of that issue.

RON: Thanks.

AUDIENCE: Hi, really just a wonderful program. My name is Nica Pope, and I sit on Community Board 8, I guess for the past 12 years, representing the Upper East Side, as well as Roosevelt Island. And I'm Chairperson of the Housing Committee on Community Board 8, and as quiet as it's kept, we do need affordable housing on the Upper East Side. And I'm a Roosevelt Island resident since 1975. I would like to clarify an issue and that is the generalization that people are against development. I think it's very critical to talk with people and, being on Community Board 8, I know what I look for when it comes to development. And I know what people are looking for, and the first thing is, is whether or not eventually, they're going to lose their housing. It's so simple when it comes, and that's basically what it's all about. With this new development, how will it impact where I live and will I still be able to live in this community? And secondly, will I be able to maintain the continuing interconnectedness with my neighbors? Will I also be able to be connected with the newcomers? And case in point, Mark had mentioned that at one point

Roosevelt Island had seen down time, and you know what, I was President of the Roosevelt Island Resident's Association during, I think, one of Roosevelt Island's lowest points, and I can remember the initial phase of Roosevelt Island now, at one end of that phase as a new development.

At another end of the island is another new development, so now, you have in the middle old Roosevelt Island, and a new development on one end, and a new development on that end, and you know what, I was never opposed to those developments. I was so happy to see those developments, but I will tell you, I brought people out in the streets because on one end of the Island, is called River Road. It's on Main Street. It has a new name, River Road. It's built in a new shape. It's not connected to the community in any way. On the other end is River Walk. It's not connected to the initial phase of Roosevelt Island and now the challenge is for the community to connect those two bookends, if you will, to residents, many of them who've been there since 1975. And now, the fear is, when you talk about development, it never is, you know what, I'm totally opposed to having this new building. I mean, really, it's good to have new blood. You know I think that's generally what the thinking is. It's how it's going to be integrated and also how is it going to impact me? Will having a $2,000 apartment a half a block, or a quarter a block away, mean that I am going to lose my apartment or can no longer afford to stay in my apartment? So, I think it's important not to necessarily paint with one brush that we are opposed to development, or that communities X, Y, and Z are opposed to development. I think that when you talk to people, you'll find that once those two or three issues are there, and I think Lee Chong did talk about that, in a sense, once you deal with those two or three issues, specifically no, this will not mean that you will lose your apartment. I mean I know that the reality says something different, but that to me is why people are opposed to development sometimes.

RON: Thank you. Does anyone want to comment?

AUDIENCE: I'm Jody Kass, director of a non-profit called New Partners for Community Revitalization, focusing on brownfields revitalization in low and moderate-income communities. What I'm hearing as the central question is really what's next for the non-profit infrastructure that is so tremendous in New York City, given the new landscape, given that we've got these new market driven realities and privately owned land where it used to be publicly owned. Traditionally there has been a role that community based organizations had built for themselves through the various programs that had really revitalized these neighborhoods. And the challenge is how do you get community-based organizations to a role that is not reactive, but active. And I think it's such a tremendous difference when were talking about the Atlantic Yards. It's really a reactive role and what I think the challenge and the opportunity is, is how do you create new tools, use some of the resources that are out there -- there's the Battery Park City money or other funds -- to then say, we're going to now create new programs or new resources, or whatever it might be, whether it's land trusts or other things like that, but brand new stuff, to say this is how we can get the community's vision into how we're going to grow as a neighborhood.

BRAD: There are a lot of promising examples going on. There are a surprising number of community development groups building mixed-income housing, recognizing they'll not even be able to afford to pay the land costs unless some chunk of what's built is market rate. So the

thinking could be to do 1/3 market, 1/3 moderate to middle and 1/3 low, and you have a lot of groups doing that. I think you have groups trying to figure out how to make inclusionary zoning enable them to drive development. You have people figuring out that we have to build a lot of new schools. Could we build those in ways that strengthen neighborhoods? So Site Facilites, Global Corporation, El Puente and Community League in the Heights are all trying to build neighborhood schools. You have people saying markets are not going to produce affordable child-care in our neighborhood. What would be the mechanism? So, there is a lot of promise, innovation in the neighborhoods and they're figuring out what to do on brownfields and how they relate to that. So, I think you still see a ton of innovation in the neighborhoods. I guess I don't think you can rely in this marketplace on neighborhood innovation without some sort of public power, whether it's the money to pay market costs for land, which is an awfully big subsidy, or regulating developers, which is an awfully big political lift. But this is what we need, a promising set of folk, coming up with compelling things people want in neighborhoods, and enough of a vision that people are willing to either pay enough money or regulate development to drive it. So I think that's exactly right. I mean I think we don't need to say there isn't that kind of innovation taking place.

MARK: I'll give a radical response to that which is the presumption in the way Brad answered it, about community groups being developers. Well, they weren't before the Mayor's ten year plan, because there wasn't any money to do development. They became very dependent on it and some of them became very, very good at it. You have to think now whether that is the best role, or the only role that they can play because I think there is a huge advocacy, organizing role.
I think Ron has pointed out in many cases that the rules we live by here are a result of community groups advocating for something, whether it was CRA or now for housing inspections. There are a lot of other pieces here, and if there is going to be a development role, then government needs to develop an improved policy on the new ones. There are conversations about whether these programs will provide the deeper pockets and give community groups an opportunity to stay in the development? But I don't think development is the only way to think about the impact.

IRENE: First I just want to thank the lady who spoke about Roosevelt Island. You just made the point about why community voices need to be heard. You made your case. I agree we need new tools. Community groups need new tools to develop in a new landscape, but another thought I want to put on the table. Some of my stronger developers would tell you, we can build housing under the existing programs, but we can't build housing for poor people under the existing programs. We can build middle income housing, which is what this stuff is geared to, but that's not our purpose. So maybe we need tools, but I think what we need more is subsidy to enable us to build the housing for working class and poor people.

RON: I just want to pick up on something that Mark said by going back to an article written by the founder of ANHD, a guy by the name of Bob Shur, who unfortunately died too many years ago. Bob wrote an article, I think it's still a classic one called, "Back to Basics", which appeared in City Limits. Some of you should go back into the archives and read it. He was lamenting the fact that too many of the community-based groups became developers, because what they did then is they lost their advocacy voice. And as a result, government lost their accountability. I think that's a really important new role, an emerging role, or an old role that community-based groups really need to develop. Many groups have been able to walk the fine line between the two. During the

Giuliani years, it was very hard because we had a very vicious local government.

BRAD: While I'm an enormous believer in community organizing in all its fashions, I do think that ceding the decisions about the details of development to the private sector has a deep cost, and that unless a UDC, or a not-for-profit group in some cases, or the State in some way, has eyes on, a lot of corners get cut. And I don't think we want private developers building our schools, our child- care centers, and every one of our communities. How we bring public sense to design sensibility in all of these things is a hard question. The more and more developers make all those decisions, the less we're going to come out with things we're inspired by.

AUDIENCE: My name is Jeremy Stand. I work for Nos Quedamos in the South Bronx. I'm one of those community-based not-for-profit developers that you mentioned a couple of times. I'd like to first thank the person who made such a strong case for connectedness, and go back, Brad, to something you said earlier about Ratner putting together a coalition that was able to sacrifice design and orientation to the neighborhood to get this affordable housing. I'm a big proponent of affordable housing, working in the South Bronx, but I don't think it was a good trade-off, and I think part of this conversation has gotten somewhat away from the community aspects in all this development. Yes, it's good to have affordable housing. We need affordable housing, but saying, I give you 40% or whatever of affordable housing, doesn't mean it's going to work as in the case that was mentioned earlier where affordable housing has failed spectacularly. Unfortunately, this is what we see a lot. Maybe we wouldn't have gotten as much. Maybe it would have been lower density, but the fact that in communities such as the South Bronx, which burned to the ground, there was nothing left, the community still survived. We have to look at that and wonder, how was that able to survive? How are these people able to take over these buildings and revitalize them? Where does the community come from that is now being renewed and revitalized?

BRAD: One, I don't doubt that people in this room believe in a vision of development that I share and am inspired by. Two, I think you absolutely have to do the work of going out into neighborhoods and building positive community visions, but I guess I would encourage people to go to a few more community meetings in Bayside, or Bensonhurst or the South Shore of Staten Island, not to mention the suburbs of this region, who use exclusionary zoning and community power to build exclusive neighborhoods, and so I just think we have to be honest. We can believe in grass roots community development and neighborhood visions that are diverse, but if we valorize community voice in planning and development decisions above some issues of equity, inclusion and social justice, we'll have an increasingly polarized country where neighborhoods get to say, we don't want any affordable housing and we don't have to take it, and plenty of them are in New York City and they're surely throughout the region.

AUDIENCE (same as previous): I agree with what you're saying, but I think you're going a little bit to an extreme. I think the work in the South Bronx is a good example of this in that Nos Quedamos was not only about the community. The community wanted a voice, but it didn't want to work alone. And I think that there are a number of examples around where, unfortunately, what we see is the failures, where this process is breaking down and where there's controversy, such as the West Side Stadium and the Atlantic Yards. But there are a lot of examples in this City where the community has worked with the City, has worked with the State, has worked with all these

various agencies, and really formed a working collaboration. So when we're talking about what new tools can we use, I think we need to look at where there have already been successes, and there have been a number. There are people now, not just community groups, but the coalitions looking to say, now that we see that development is possible from the for-profit and non-profit field working together, how can we get the City to actually do some of what it says it's doing in terms of getting more planning support to the community so that the community can effectively create these joint plans and then work together with officials.

MARK: I'm sure there is some irony here, and I'm not quite sure what to read into it, but your Nos Quedamos organization started because the City had a plan.

RON: The City had a plan. The community reacted to that plan. Yolanda Garcia organized against that plan and then they came up with their own plan. And I think what that points out is that, what comes about that's positive, comes about when there is this critical tension between community and government that eventually evolves into a partnership for the development, which is the stage they're at now. What Yolanda fought for, very hard, was higher densities. What Yolanda fought for was quality design and brought it about in part because she partnered with the Pratt Center. She partnered with Jeremy's father, who's an architect, and a number of other people who really worked very, very closely with her and brought those resources in. Nobody's ever saying that community-based groups don't have to adhere to broader principles, like social, economic and environmental justice issues. I think that's part of it. I think it's the tension between principles and local needs, which really informs us, so that we get better plans for Bensonhurst that fit the area.

I remember the fight that Mayor Lindsay had for affordable housing in Forest Hills. When he tried to come in with housing that was totally alien, he had a broad spectrum of people that were opposed to what he was doing. When he isolated it and began to do infill housing and housing that was more appropriate to the context and the fabric of that community then he only had the crazies opposing him. And I think it's important to develop principles like higher density, principles like equity and justice and balance them against local issues. And sometimes you have to override local concerns. There's a board in the next room. I think it's an important one about Wyandanch, Long Island, where a thousand low-income folks petitioned the State and UDC to build affordable housing there. It lost by a vote of 3 to 2 in the larger community. The symbolism of that vote, however, had repercussions throughout the State. UDC had the right to override local zoning ordinances for the purposes of integration and once that took place in the Nine Towns up in Westchester, that led the State legislature to emasculate the UDC and they couldn't use their power of eminent domain for that principle. And I for one believe that there are certain powers of government that have to be used for principles. I think we again have to look at this balance. How do you begin to get government to have this balance and still be accountable? I think the issue is accountability here. There is Eva and then there's a question in the back.

AUDIENCE: Just very quickly I wanted to comment on what Ron said and then I have another point. If people look at the City of Seattle, they actually began with a conference on planning process to create those principles. They then did a bottom up planning process where the communities worked on creating each of the neighborhood plans and they now have

committed City money, through the City Council and through the Mayor, for the implementation of these plans. And one of the reasons they had to do it this way was because they were growing. They were burgeoning, and communities were not responding to a top down approach, and they had actually been able to grow and develop. There are successful models of a bottom up process. Communities do have visions. They do have plans. I have to tell you that there is planning going on in the City, and much of it is happening in the communities. The point that I wanted to make however was about a discussion that I've been hearing, and that is about the role of government. The federal government for one, but let's say the federal, state, and local government functions as a developer, as financer or incentivizer and as regulator. And it seems to me that we are in a political moment where government as developer may not be what is politically feasible, but I've not known or seen in Washington or anywhere, someone who gives up pork. It's called incentives, and it has been used by government for good and for bad. Look at the history of FHA, and what it did and how it influenced housing policy. And the third is regulation. Through regulations you can say, you can't get that pork, unless you include communities, unless you include affordable housing, unless you do other things. Part of the mission needs to be to force government to get its strength back. Because I think that that is government's role. I tend, personally, and forgive me, I used to work for government, to prefer it not to be the developer. But they can say that funding goes to groups that work with community-based organizations, or it's not that hard, not having the land. Land is not the only power that government has and I think we need to realize that.

AUDIENCE: Your example of Welfare Island or Roosevelt Island is a good example of planning, and Ted you were involved in that. But there was a more recent one that I think takes up the issue that Ron was bringing up about doing plans, and that is Riverside South, where we didn't get the mile high TV studio that Donald Trump wanted to build and I think we remember what that picture looked like of the building going up. But then community organizations, The Municipal Art Society, a number of environmental organizations, Richard Kahan and several other people came up with a plan, developed a plan after Trump threw his hands up and said he was going to fight several lawsuits or whatever it was. I think you were there at the City Planning Commission, and it went through a very public process, and I think it's been successful enough to be sold, profitable to ...

TED: It hasn't been sold to me as a good piece of New York City.

AUDIENCE: It hasn't been finished yet.

TED: I think I have seen enough to realize that it's compromise after compromise after compromise. That's why, I think it's something we all have to deal with, what we get excited about is lowering, pushing, touching, as opposed to a vision of a whole thing that's correct. And I know it's difficult to achieve and I know it's politically difficult, but we better start electing people that will have the strength to allow community's visions and true visions to be carried out as models, not as compromises.

RON: I am sort of torn. I agree with you about it's being a poor compromise. I think it's not beautiful. It would have been a lot worse had it been built the way Trump envisioned it. What

does work well, is if you do go into the buildings, they are economically integrated, and they are integrated in such a way as they were the first inclusionary requirement in the City of New York. I don't know how they're doing it in the later stages. The earlier stages, when I did visit it, were mixed, and Linda Davidoff was very pleased with the result, with the park; it eventually comes together. It should have all been there at the beginning rather than at the end. Building things piecemeal, the way we do it, as opposed to exacting and maybe using other kinds of tax increment financing for building the park first would have been a lot better. But it is on private land. It is probably closer to the model that we're going to wind up seeing at Atlantic Terminal and other places, and it's a good one to look at, because it was as Ted said, compromise, compromise, and compromise. There's a statement in the back and we have to take two more questions and let's go with Pratt Area Community Council.

AUDIENCE: Hi my name is Deb Howard. I'm with Pratt Area Community Council, and I'm one of the local community organizations that is directly affected, our neighborhood is directly affected by Ratner's plan. So I will say a few things, I wasn't going to, but I am. Number one, Ted, one thing you said was that politics are not involved with this situation, and I think you're totally wrong because Empire State Development Corporation is a tenant of Forest City Ratner. So I mean the connection is there. Plus you have a developer who owns and has developed 94% of the corporate floor space of downtown Brooklyn. The thing that I think the community is most upset about is more that there isn't a competitive bid process, where there isn't community, city planning process or City Council involvement, because there's going to be no ULURP. Because that's what Empire State Development has already agreed to with Ratner in their MOU. So, it's more that community boards just can't be heard in terms of planning.

It's too bad that the MTA didn't do that dream of having a competitive bidding process that was meaningful, and that they didn't think in terms of here's a great site, let's think about it, but in the two years since the yards were first announced, the community has gone through the community planning process. It wasn't as extensive, it was a very minor one, because it wasn't very well funded, but it was a volunteer effort in fact called the Unity Plan. Then, there have been several other versions of it, in which we're seeing that density is important and in fact, I would even say that in a planning sense the Nets having the arena, which only represents 11% of the site, would make sense. It's like Madison Square Garden. You have a major transportation hub there. So planning-wise regionally, it does make sense to do the arena. But that's not what the project is really about. It's about 28, 35 stories, or 17 buildings that are 35 and 60 stories high, and this is really, extremely out of context with the existing neighborhood. So when you have the tallest building in Brooklyn being the Williamsburg Bank building, which is 29 stories, you know it's just a little out of context. And as I said there is a planning document that the community has worked on and has been ignored, but I do think the community does understand density has to happen on that site, but they want to see the issue of schools addressed. The issue of services addressed. Water and sewer addressed. In traffic and transportation, there is a huge problem already at the corner of Flatbush, Atlantic and Fourth Avenues. So that's my piece on that. Anyway, the real issue here is that, in a certain sense, you have the State usurping the role of City government in this context, and really overriding. So UDC may have been great on a State level for some things, but I think in this instance, the State is not playing a very responsible role in terms of what will happen on that site.

AUDIENCE: OK, the Brooklyn Bridge opened in 1883, sorry. Dan Wylie. I happen to work for a Congresswomen, Nadia Velazquez, but this doesn't reflect her. I think we've seen a lot of examples of planning where what ends up, even when there is community planning, what ends up isn't what the community planned. I think we're living in an era of neo-liberalism where there is a distrust of planning and big government, but it is a false ideology because we're seeing an era where neo-liberalism now is very proactive in not having what you would assume would be a free market, but really rigging it. And I think this has begun since the fiscal crisis. We had mention of Battery Park City. Now we all know that Battery Park City was originally designed to have a third low-income, a third moderate and upper income housing, and that plan was thrown out with the rescue plan after the fiscal crisis. But we have other plans like for instance, the Brooklyn Bridge Park, where there was a pretty extensive community planning process in which they came up with a master plan. Then the Governor and the Mayor signed an agreement that they will build this park and they will hand it over to the Empire State Development Corporation, which will create a subsidiary, which will oversee the park. And now we see a little hiatus, and all of a sudden they come back with a plan where you have luxury housing going up because we want to have the park to be self-sustaining. It's going to cost 15 million dollars a year instead of half of that, so all of a sudden community groups are up in arms over these, over a 30-story building that they didn't plan. So, I'm just wondering what you thought. I understand Brad's perspective that what we can get we can get in the era of you got small government but you know we're seeing a polarized situation where you have a lot of gentrification that's happened. A lot of low income people who haven't gotten theirs. And then you have these big developers, I don't care if it's Ratner or IKEA, who come in and they make promises to those who've been excluded, and those who may have benefited from the market and, let's be honest, the gentrifiers are the ones who have opposed IKEA in Red Hook and the ones who...

BRAD: Who are opposing Ratner and who are opposing the current plan for Brooklyn Bridge Park.

AUDIENCE: ...and, well, that's true too.

BRAD: Yes

AUDIENCE: So, it's complex, but I just don't think that what we have here is a healthy situation because when we rely on developers, I don't quite see how developers are the new social welfare policy. I don't really see, and I'll give the mike back, but I don't really see how that works, because if you look at the Court Street development, the Mitchell-Lama, the first Artists Housing, where people were forced out because they opted out of the Mitchell-Lama program, in Walentas' building, the Borough President came up with a deal where they get full first dibs on the affordable housing. None of those people got into that affordable housing.

RON: Let's take the last comment and then we'll ask for closing comments from everybody on the panel.

AUDIENCE: Hi, I'm with Community Board 2, which covers part of the Atlantic Yards, which spans 3 community boards. I've been working with the community based planning task force which works at the Urban Center at the Municipal Art Society, and I think one of the things that we've identified that we are seeking obviously to publicize, is that there actually is no planning in this City. The developers see an opportunity, whether it's big or small, I mean it could just be a small six-family or it could be a Ratnerville of 17 skyscrapers, but the problem is, this City has no plan. We have zoning, which is not planning, and then of course as soon as someone gets a vision, they come and ask for a change in zoning. That's what happening. And I think what we're working at, pushing for is, (another person mentioned Seattle as a model, and there are others, Rochester, New York, to get a little closer on this side of the continent), where communities make plans not to react to a developer, who, all of a sudden, comes with his vision, but to make general plans, what zoning is appropriate. We've been trying that I know, like the DUMBO neighborhood is looking at that before every block by piece is re-zoned, most of it has been re-zoned, block by block in response to developers. No plan on the part of the City.

What we're looking for is that each community, each neighborhood, (however you define those, people need to know who they identify with as a neighborhood), makes a plan, obviously it would be under the auspices for approval of, as we have now with the 197A, the City Planning Commission and the City Council. So this would guard against one neighborhood deciding, we don't do garbage, send that over there. Yes everybody does garbage and everybody does inclusionary housing and why I think the community certainly is reacting against the Ratner thing and why we reacted in the past -- I mean I've been on the Community Board since 1992, and we've had a lot of problems on Community Board 2 -- is the fact that, even if the particular development is not in itself objectionable, without planning the development plops down with none of the infrastructure to make it fit in. There is the traffic, they don't consider, where's the traffic going to go when you triple the population in a quarter mile area? There are no plans. That's a city function. That's not a private developer that does traffic and roads. Where's the schools and this is where we need planning. We feel that planning should come from the bottom up, but obviously it will be filtered through City Planning Department and the City Council to be sure that no one zones out the undesirables. And that's what we're working on and we'll be happy to talk with you.

RON: OK. I think what we've heard from a number of people is that there is a call for planning --that there is a need for some accountability and responsibility to broader issues. So starting with you Irene, do you want to make any last comments on how we might achieve that, and let's go straight across the table and make your final comments and then we will thank everybody and break up.

IRENE: I have nothing earthshaking, but I think there is room for optimism. I think communities are getting better organized all the time and there are wonderful projects going up all over the place.

MARK: I agree with that and the other optimistic thing is we did not solve all the world's problems here, so you can have another panel and find these solutions.

RON: I'm too tired.

BRAD: I appreciate all the corrective feedback. I am a deep believer in the role of communities in planning, developing and organizing in their neighborhoods. I'm optimistic about the City's future, but I do think that there is some inward looking to do. I think Dan's point at the end, that the set of folks who are opposed to the Brooklyn Atlantic Yards development, the Brooklyn Bridge Park in its current form, and the IKEA, are trying to hold onto something great, and we have to think really proactively about how to share that in a City that's going to change dramatically in the next 25 years. While community planning is one of the answers, how to connect, I don't think it's so obvious that it would be informed by a commitment that we share the burdens of energy and waste equally. That we equally share the need to include affordable housing. That we create meaningfully equal schools that create opportunities for immigrant kids in Woodside and Sunnyside. That is a hard question. And that the right balance between the power of Ed Logue to make mixed income places and the vision of neighborhoods to inform what they want isn't simple. But there's still plenty of reason for optimism despite the challenges.

CARLTON: New York is still a very segregated City, both economically, racially and any other way you can think about. By the 2020 census, New York City is expected to be 75% made up of people who don't trace their origins to Western Europe, so it's going to become a much more diverse City, and one of the things that we have to do, is start putting in place planning infrastructure at the 197a level plan, at the City Council, and electing officials that recognize that this is a City that is going to change drastically, by in large, in our lifetimes. And if we don't start making those changes now, then we won't be prepared to be a competitive City and what we will see is, the return of the downturn of the '70's in this City because we failed today to make the plans to make ourselves ready for the next 20 years.

TED: I was brought on this panel for a very specific reason because I was the relic of the benevolent dictatorship, but I must say, what you don't know about me is that I was on Ruth Messinger's Columbus Circle task force, and after ten years of very hard work, accomplished nothing. When the Port Authority wanted to build 2000 units of housing on the Brooklyn waterfront, we fought it, and I was on a Community Board's subcommittee that voted 37 to nothing against the Port Authority plan, which started the Brooklyn Bridge Park Coalition, which 17 years later, finally got some funding, when it was my dream about Brooklyn Bridge Park. And now it is being tweaked and there has to be, right now I'm not involved so I don't know the proper reaction, but the end result was, there is not a wall of privatized waterfront. There will be a public waterfront. And that was a victory and that showed me in 17 years that that was worth the effort.

RON: Well I think, my only closing comment is I want to build on something Brad said, that there are issues of social, economic, environmental justice, and I think planning for that, is solely and should be the responsibility of the City as a whole. And the City's got to start doing that. They weren't the ones who demanded that of Ratner, and neither was the State. And so what we need to do is get the kind of political leadership that Ted talks about and I think we all dream about, that begins to do that kind of planning, to make sure that the schools are in place, or that there are educational opportunities for the new generation of immigrants and others that will be developing this City. And at the same time that we develop these City-wide perspectives in planning, much

the way Minneapolis and Seattle and other places are beginning to do it, we need to also begin to work on the infrastructure that we have, that really revitalizes our communities, the community-based organizations and engage them in a planning process. Perhaps by bringing the two together, we can recreate that kind of dynamic that existed, I think not only in Ed Logue's days, but also in the days of the community-based development movement. We're not going to solve all the problems. We're going to leave a lot of problems unfortunately for the next generation. They're going to have to clean up after us. At any rate, I don't think we solved much today, but I want to thank each and every one of our panelists for what was really an engaging discussion. I want to thank the audience for staying as long as they did, and thank you all for coming.

END