POLICY AND DESIGN FOR HOUSING

Lessons of the Urban Development Corporation 1968-1975

Discussion Commitment + Policy/Design = Community

Friday April 8, 2005, 5:30pm

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

Commitment + Policy/Design = Community
Friday April 8, 2005, 5:30pm
@ Center for Architecture, 536 LaGuardia Place, New York City

PANELISTS
Theodore Liebman, AIA, Liebman Melting Partnership, Architects and Planners
Former Chief of Architecture, NYS Urban Development Corporation

Karen Phillips, Member, New York City Planning Commission
Former Director of the Abyssinian Development Corporation

Jonathan Rose, Principal, Jonathan Rose Companies
Builder and developer of affordable and sustainable communities

Ronald Shiffman, Director Emeritus,
Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development

MODERATOR
Susan S. Szenasy, Editor in Chief, Metropolis Magazine

RONALD SHIFFMAN: Welcome to what has become the 4th in a series of retrospective, prospective discussions. One of the things that we wanted to do was to take a look at the events of the past, to not only learn from them but also to help formulate policies that might address future issues. Today's panel is called Community + Policies/Design = Change. It's a very complex title, it's probably the wrong title, but what we wanted to do was to take a look at a period of New York City history when the New York State Urban development Corporation functioned between 1968 and 1975. It still functions by the way, but not very well; they use a different name, but they actually built housing. And the reason we're looking at the UDC is because they did two things that are really important not only in recognition of the past but also as a foundation for the future. The first thing is that they brought quality of design into the fabric of social housing. They really looked at how to take talented young architects and established architects and bring their creativity to the field of social housing. But they also demonstrated that government can build, that government can do things, that government can have a social conscience. And so I think it's really important, particularly as we're looking at a severe housing crisis and a need to re-engage in the rehabilitation and the production of low income and affordable housing that we bring to it two things: one is quality and the other is a commitment from our city, state and federal governments that we do bring about these changes. And, you know we have a Mayoral election, we have a Gubernatorial election, we have mid-term Congressional elections coming up. We have too much of a defeatist attitude that we can't change things -- the way to change things is by starting at the base and beginning to build up. So part of this effort is to learn from the past, not to replicate the past (there were some mistakes, many of them), but what do we learn from that past and take so that we can go into the future.

I don't want to take any more of your time. Because I wanted to be on this panel I've asked someone who I think is one of the best moderators I've ever seen since Fred Friendly, and that's going back awhile, and that is Susan Szenasy. Susan was named chief editor of Metropolis Magazine a number of years ago and she's taken that magazine and made it one of the most progressive as well high quality design magazines around. There's a biography of each of the participants on the panel in the handouts, so if you really want to know who we are you can look it up there, but let me turn it over to Susan and let's begin the discussion.

SUSAN SZENASY: Thanks Ron, thanks for having me here and I have a little bit more hair than Fred Friendly ever had. OK, so my charge for tonight is to keep things moving and to define for now how the evening will set up. So here's our plan. We are assuming that what's past is prologue and we're not going to reminisce but we're going to remember constructively, and what we'd like to do is use the past to create some sort of a workable present and future. So the way this will set up is Ted Liebman, will do a special recap of the important salient points of the UDC as social housing developer in New York state. Ron Shiffman, who is incredibly knowledgeable in all of these
areas and who has worked in this area for forty years as has Ted, will supplement anything that Ted might have left out and Ron will also be a panelist of course along with Ted. And then, Karen Phillips will follow on the philosophy and ideas of the City that exist at the City Planning Commission today. Followed by Jonathan Rose, whose is socially and environmentally committed developments are exemplary. So without further ado I'd like to ask Ted to give us a short and concise background on the Urban Development Corporation. Ted.

THEODORE LIEBMAN: I noted the short and concise, short and concise. UDC began in 1968 and essentially ended in 1975. Remember what the times were at that time. It's not this decade, it's many decades ago. The United States in the 60's was basically a place of optimism and a time of vision. In New York in the sixties the suburbs were growing and the cities were beginning to suffer the loss. Families in the sixties were beginning to change. There still was the American dream family but two-parent working families began to become a reality; there were severe housing shortages and a lot of the neighborhoods were truly suffering. It was also a time of war and a time of assassinations and that will come into play a little later in my story. Lindsay is mayor of New York City, a visionary mayor, a liberal republican mayor with a liberal republican, Rockefeller, as governor. Lindsay as mayor did not have a great deal of power in his first term. He asked, through the astute Republican administration, Ed Logue to write a report which was called, "Let There Be Commitment", and that report basically said you can't run a separate housing agency, a separate planning agency, a separate real estate endeavor and separate construction entities. Put them all together, let me put them all together and we'll be able to do something...very akin to UDC. It didn't happen. There were not the votes to make it happen. Rockefeller, the governor, was a liberal republican who had created the State University Construction fund, hired fantastic people, had a State University program that was incomparable. He saw the problems of housing, the needs in housing, and he knew that a bold initiative was needed so he in fact had the UDC legislation written. But the job of getting it through a conservative legislature in Albany was nearly impossible.

Now we turn to the era of war and assassination. The day of the funeral of Martin Luther King

Jr. was the day that Rockefeller was on the phone till 1:30 am; he called each legislator in Albany and got the UDC act passed. It couldn't have happened without all of those layering of events occurring. The UDC legislation itself: it was a public benefit corporation, this was not civil service, and Logue surely ran it like a private corporation. If you didn't perform, you were out. It had great powers: power of eminent domain, power to override local zoning, power to override local building codes, power to issue bonds. In fact, UDC didn't use all the powers very often at all. They used very few of them. However the threat was very powerful in itself. But I won't tell you too much - if I talk about the powers too much then you'll know the end of the story.

So, I'll continue on the UDC side of it. I'm going to read a short passage from, "Another Chance For Cities." This is the first architectural exhibit that happened really a year after UDC got started in 1970. And the words that I'm going to read are almost as if Logue were speaking. "A record of inability of private industry, an inadequacy of public programs to begin the job of community rebuilding and the new community development prompted New York State to establish the UDC. A unique experiment in government structure, UDC, a public benefit corporation, is charged with arresting physical decay in the State, with meeting our housing needs, starting new communities in new ways, giving our cities another chance. Whether such an immense task can be accomplished is far from certain. To start with, essential new legal administrative and financial strategies have been developed. They're new tools so fundamental, the mechanical, the mechanics of large scale modern building, it's as if the wheel and the lever were being used for the first time. The responsibility to operate at a wider scale than ever attempted in planning and building in New York State. Villages, Cities, Counties have artificial boundaries but I'm putting them together, I'm creating the true boundaries, jurisdictions end, we look at what's logical. So must our planning and development house their activities. The UDC in coordination with local governments and their planning groups will work on a regional and even state-wide scale. Through its power to sell bonds, they'll collect appropriations and they'll have the funds immediately available."

What he wanted to do was to hire architects, get designs, find proper sites, get the work done the right way, then bring developers in. Not start construction on a site before you have a plan and get it done in a poor hurried way. He wanted to work through till he had the right design then bring in the person and say this is what you're buying, and a lot of the developers that came in had never worked on such quality design, but since they we're going to get all the subsidies and it was all packaged and it was one-stop shopping and it can start next week, either you sign up or you sign up....that was the way UDC worked.

SUSAN: Can you get to the lessons?

TED: I guess I better get to the lessons, but first I will say that Ed Logue inspired people. He ran it like a private corporation and his focus was on design. Our first rounds of projects were on very difficult sites, and we were following the federal standards, HUD standards. Therefore, I was quite dissatisfied with some of the architecture because it was ordinary but beautiful. In other words, the building types were fairly ordinary. What happened is we began to develop a low-rise, high-density housing prototype. And then we got that built in Marcus Garvey. That prototype and some of the research that I had done in Europe prior to that resulted in a really

new way of looking at and evaluating UDC housing . Much like what we're doing in June in the symposium and the exhibit, where we're having universities do post-construction evaluation as we did then in '72, '73, '74 to really begin to learn from our own experience...so we don't repeat mistakes and so that we make improvements. And that was a very important part of design and design in fact is also livability. We had a live-in program, which Ed Logue was very excited about. Because my wife and I had lived in projects in Europe on our research, he decided that everyone at UDC from the clerk, mail clerk to the president would spend two weeks a year living in a UDC project, and every architect hired would live for two weeks a year in a project so they would understand what low-income people were living in and how to make improvements. And it really gave all the staff a sense of the power of UDC to create good housing.

We developed criteria for housing that would feed information back to us each year so that each architect's brief would have additionally both constraints and opportunities and new social services that we found were needed. We learned a great deal from the live-in program.

SUSAN: What of those criteria remains today?

TED: The criteria, well, let me go on. In 1971 and 1972 we were going up, up, up, learning, learning, learning and not repeating mistakes and doing, really doing better. 1973, Jan 8th, brought the Nixon housing freeze. What this meant, is that from that moment on, although we were going up in what we were building, the powers of UDC were going down and our ability to build more and more each year was going to be less and less each year. So that was the turning point, the cusp. 1973 and '74 had two other setbacks. They were both political. The Nine Towns project - we lost our ability to overrule anything in Westchester because Westchester didn't want us. They needed us because Westchester needed low and moderate and middle income housing, but they didn't want us and the political winds were shifting.

In 1974, Rockefeller went to Washington and Malcolm Wilson, who as a governor was much more conservative, and the legislature that had to have their arm twisted by Rockefeller to pass the legislation were now quite ready to clamp down on that ability. The economic downturn in the US, New York State and New York City for sure, really, almost caused a collapse in '74 of UDC, but we, in our little world of going up, up, up in terms of design and criteria, ran the Roosevelt Housing competition, which was attempting, just as we did in low-rise/high-density, to prove that good family housing could occur in very high densities akin to mid- and high-rise housing. We wanted to prove that at double that density, at over 100 units to the acre, one could take on Roosevelt Island and substitute housing on Roosevelt Island that would meet the needs of large families, small families and elderly and in a design that would recognize those differences.

When that competition finished, Alan Melting, my partner now, who was with me at UDC then, and I were fired, our entire unit was disbanded that day and Ed Logue had already left and the headlines read very differently than the laudatory headlines of the first five years. In the last two years there were political problems and finally a collapse of UDC. The lessons to be learned, which I guess we'll try to think about now, but I can only tell you that Ed Logue as a boss and the enthusiasm and the energy during that seven-year period was electric. And when I read or hear on TV about Congress getting housing programs, I can't name three people who work for HUD in

Washington; I could have named probably 500 and read what they were writing in reports because it was important. There was Operation Breakthrough that was trying to deal with technology and may have done it not so well but it tried. I would go down to Washington to criticize HUD then, but only to make it better, and now I don't think I would waste the trip because I don't think their ears could listen.

SUSAN: OK, let's not dwell on the negative. But I would like...

TED: Thank you.

SUSAN: Thank you Ted. It was great and I wish we had four hours because your assessments are really amazing and thank you so much for remembering them and reminding us of them, but I would like Ron to be a little bit more critical of the UDC. You were at the time that this was all happening, a supporter and a critic. Could we get a little bit more of a critic's point of view here?

RONALD SHIFFMAN: I'm going to stand as I have a desire to see people's faces when I speak to them. One of the problems when you're sitting here is you really don't see the folks in the back. I was working in Bedford-Stuyvesant at that time with community-based organizations and it was not as much being a critic but being fearful of any large entity that would come into a community and build without understanding the nature and the wherewithal of the people that lived and worked in those areas. We met Ed Logue, who I both loved, admired and somewhat feared. He was a bulldog and I think Ted, who worked for him, probably felt the same way. We had actually brought in - a community-based group that I worked with in Bed-Stuy - brought Ed in as an advisor later on. And then later on Lindsay brought him in. So in many ways we felt that we brought him into the City first. And it was to educate people locally as to what their options were because they were concerned about the urban renewal programs that at that time were slum clearance programs. And they wanted to build a way of empowering local people to develop plans to rebuild their neighborhoods, not to let them decay and to go into obsolescence.

You have to remember, as Ted said, we saw a large exodus to the suburbs and neglect in the cities, and what developed were very discriminatory patterns of development in the suburbs, or what we referred to as a "white noose" around very rapidly decaying urban cores. And we felt it was critically important to do two things: one was to open the suburbs so that everybody could live there, and second was to also rebuild the center cities so people who remained there and who wanted to stay in the city, could live there and build a good life. And, Ed Logue and UDC began to do that so we admired those goals. Those were really important goals. At the same time, we saw the anti-poverty programs that were beginning to sputter because of some diversion of monies. We began to see Model Cities programs, a commitment by Johnson to rebuild the city, being surrendered to guns versus butter arguments because we got engaged in Vietnam. And we saw in some ways that what we could do was, if we plan properly, we could partner with UDC in building. And in Brownsville, New York, where we saw the emergence of Marcus Garvey houses , what you saw was a partnership between the city, local communities, and UDC in building that housing. And to that degree, it was successful.

One anecdote, which Ted did not talk about, is when Ed Logue and others went to the Nine Towns

in Westchester, that is to Bedford, which is an upscale community, he needed security guards to protect him. Conversely, when he left a meeting in Brownsville in Brooklyn, a poor minority area, the people protected him. That was the difference. There was a commitment to rebuild and a real essence in doing it, behind it. The real issue is, were they really accountable? To some degree, UDC fell short in that it did not build enough integrated housing. They were forced, because of the political dynamics throughout the state, to back off from building in the suburbs. The exhibit that we will have here, beginning on June 11th , will include a series of panels about a frustrated project in Wyandanch, Long Island. The issues there were a shortage of housing and how to engage communities in the rebuilding process? Those issues continue today.

One of the things that I think really is critically important to understand, is that we had a dramatic housing shortage then. A few years later, we were to see the abandonment of many of our neighborhoods and the rebuilding of them at a very low scale. I want to just touch on a couple of things and then turn it over to Karen. Since 1975, when, in essence, the UDC stopped functioning, we didn't see any more housing production. And UDC is only emblematic of the withdrawal of the federal government from housing. The state withdrew, and the federal government withdrew step by step. The one thing that Reagan did when he was elected president following the Nixon administration (with an interlude of Carter in between), the one thing he did is that he stole our dreams. He stole our ability to have confidence in government. And at that time, there was a paradigm change. At that time, we believed government could be about social change. That government could fulfill the goals and aspirations of people no matter what our incomes were. We don't feel that way today and that's the greatest threat, the negative effect that I think I've experienced in my lifetime.

But let me give you a couple of figures. Between 1975 and the year 2000, the average rents in New York City have gone up by 33%, yet incomes have only grown in absolute terms by 3%. Within the state of New York, 500,000 families now pay 50% of their income or more for rent. That's in New York State. 286,000 households have incomes of less than $17,700 and don't live in subsidized housing. New York City's housing shortfall is somewhere between a quarter of a million and a half a million units. We don't really know exactly how many; we don't measure it accurately. The vacancy rate in the year 2002, for all apartments, was 2.94%. For people who earn about $35,000 a year or less, it was less than 1.4%. That means there is no housing out there. And it is not only for low-income people, but for everybody. And yet we have a city that's resurgent. And the real question is, how do we get that recommitment, that re-energizing of both the public sector working with the private sector, working with the not-for-profit groups that are struggling, and that by the way, were born in that period of time. Because a lot of the housing that was built in the 1970s was not only built by UDC, but it was built by not-for-profit housing groups that began to sponsor some of the housing funded by the state and federal governments. And it was also the emergence of the self-help groups that, in many ways, had gone in and preserved and rehabilitated the buildings in their communities. Whether they' re from Melrose Commons, and there are some folks here from Melrose, or whether it is in Bed-Stuy or East New York or Williamsburg/Greenpoint, where the city is not undertaking a massive re-zoning, it was the community-based groups that turned those communities around, that made the fertile soil for the recovery we have today. So how are we going to take our energy and what we know and begin to move it towards solving the problems of those who least can afford housing. And all of

us today can't afford it. I'll stop there.

SUSAN: OK, thank you Ron, now Karen might have some answers for us. She's with the City Planning Commission, and I understand that you're very knowledgeable about the recently passed inclusionary housing initiative. There's a wonderful Pratt publication to that effect that I got through the mail. (I'm giving you a little publicity here.)

RON: That's a great City Limits publication.

SUSAN: OK, so there's some really useful stuff out there. Karen, could you tell us, first of all, about the political climate and the commitment to social and affordable housing in some of the initiatives currently.

KAREN: Yes, Ron, you do set me up, and I hate to disappoint you all, but I'm really not the expert on this particular administration's view of housing and what should be done in the future. I'm very often at odds with them, mainly because I see myself as a person who's been in the trenches trying to do neighborhood building and it's interesting to hear this great history. I feel now that I was always just a little bit too late with everything. I was a little too young for the civil rights movement. I was at Martin Luther King's funeral, and I studied all these things and, of course, studying things that went wrong, but knew that I wanted to do something to help people who didn't have control of their own environments. And even when I came to New York and met Ed Logue and actually had him recommend me for my first job and then worked for the UDC -- after all this great time -- they were doing this great stuff. And I actually came very late to the community development movement -- 20 years after Bed-Stuy and all this great stuff -- to really struggle in Harlem with building a community-based organization. But the political climate was different because, even though there was not a lot of money flowing from Washington in the late 80's when I started developing in Harlem, but there also wasn't a commitment from the city of New York to be in partnership with private sources, which were foundations, corporations and the new private developers who were coming to rebuild. So now, I've taken my time in the trenches building one neighborhood to look over the whole city and bring all this stuff that I know about what really works and what makes strong neighborhoods to a group of people who say, OK, you know we're doing something totally different. And although there is the commitment of the administration to putting money into this big plan about the number of units, the difference is that when I started working in Harlem 60% of all the land from 110th street to 155th was owned by the City of New York. Now, there are no more sites left.

So, we have an administration that says we're going to give this money and we're working very closely in these partnerships with community-based and private developers, but the big ace in the hole that they had before, although they're putting in some money, is the sites with the kind of statistics that Ron's talking about of the rents going up but also the cost of land. And I'm sitting in Harlem and have walked down the street every day and people say, you're the one that started the gentrification. So, no good deed goes unpunished, but, the cost of the land has risen so that even the sites that are there are very difficult to develop if someone has to pay market value for the land. The city takes all the credit for being so wonderful and coming up with this inclusionary zoning, but after two years that I've been on the City Planning Commission, every time we had a

project, I'd ask why can't we use inclusionary zoning? They would just say, "Oh, what we want, what we have doesn't work because it only worked for the very high rise areas in Manhattan and well it just doesn't work." And I'm like, well, let's fix it because we do have this problem. But when they wanted a certain convention and sports complex, they had something that they really wanted. They really kind of yielded to this tremendous pressure and when we talk about the Pratt Report just totally laying out, doing the research, all the background information for them to say, we can adopt this in New York City. So, that was something that was adopted by the City to get the zoning passed for the Hudson Yards, which of course did not as they say, include a stadium, but again it was designed so that that particular entity that they wanted and they continue to want very much could be built. Of course, opening that up, meant that it could also make inclusionary zoning work for other parts of the city. Basically areas with lower density can now use this inclusionary zoning to give incentives for developers to build.

But, from my point of view, and I give all credit to and I'm sure City Planning would like to do their rebuttal, but in my mind when there is privately owned land that is zoned and a lot of it for manufacturing uses that are low density since manufacturing, was not generally in high rise areas, that when we change the zoning for another use and add additional floor area ratio that can be built on that same piece of land, thereby increasing the value for a private developer, we do that with public policy. That policy should also include ways that it helps the public deal with issues that are in crisis right now. And we talk about the demands of housing, but we don't even have a clue about the number of people who are doubled up and as I often see at City Planning, we have people coming from the neighborhoods who say we want to preserve the character, we want it to be just like it is, and we don't want any of those people; and I say to them: " Who are those people?" And also, where are your children going to live? So I assume that they will have to live there with their families because when we down-zone certain areas, it limits the amount that we're building. It's not that I don't want the character maintained, but we have these wonderful lessons, but we do not have the public dollars that we had before. We have some State dollars but not the kind that can change these things. And we do have a City that has committed funds, but again, which is timidly, a lot of times, going after the inclusionary zoning. The major debate here is whether it becomes mandatory that a developer has to do the low-income or the affordable housing to do any development or if it is an incentive.

SUSAN: Does everybody in this room know about inclusionary zoning? Everyone? OK, let's explain the terminology.

KAREN: Inclusionary means that as you develop, you include lower income people in a market rate development that would basically have higher rents or higher sales price than they could afford. That you include within the number of units, a certain amount of low-income or affordable units. And the way that it's currently structured is if you are able to build a larger building on a site, then about 25% of the building would have to be affordable housing. Now, all of it doesn't have to be low-income housing, but some of it can be very low, which is often calculated by the percentage of the median income in New York City, which is about $62,000 a year. That's a median...when you count all the very wealthy people and all the poor people and you average it out, it's about $62,000, which a lot of people don't make. So, it could be down to 80% of that median income, which is like $30,000 for a family of four.

RON: 50% is $31,000 for a family of four.

KAREN: OK, All right, OK, great, I'm glad you have a cheat sheet. So, and then you can have it for people who make at the median income or the people making 150% of the median income, so that's saying a couple that makes $120,000 combined, and, as you probably know, even if you make that, you cannot find an apartment in New York City. Someone told me that the way you do it is 50X one month's rent?

RON: Right.

KAREN: So that tells you how much you have to earn to be able to afford it. So, we do have this in place. It's in place in the Hudson Yards proposal for about 20, I believe 25 or 28% of that housing would have to be affordable to different levels. In Greenpoint/Williamsburg, it's under discussion, very heated discussion in the City Council recently as to how much affordable housing you have in Brooklyn. In Greenpoint/Williamsburg, which is basically already a low-income area, so the people there have to be maintained, but as soon as that vote comes to pass, and I've seen flyers and people saying, buy this lot now, because it's going to be up-zoned. The value of that can go from where you can rent a piece of property for $5/square foot and then you can sell it higher, at perhaps $200/square foot? I have a house in Harlem that I bought totally legally through an affordable housing program. Now, the guys are building on the land in the area at $500/square foot per apartment unit and through HPD programs. I bought my whole house for that same price that somebody will buy an apartment and I have three tenants. And that's in two years. Ron, that's the change.

RON: I just want to put a dimension to this. There are right now, five major areas of the City that are going to be re-zoned: West Chelsea, Hudson Yards, Lower Manhattan, Greenpoint/ Williamsburg, and Long Island City. Out of that, there' s the potential for 76,000 new apartments to be built. With the City's proposals on the table, about 6-10% of that will be affordable to people earning under $94,000.

JONATHAN: Ron, will be or may be?

RON: Right, $94,000, but we say there's no money. $25 billion will be put in infrastructure investment in all these areas. I just wanted to put that in perspective. The City is still putting in money; extend the Number 7 line, build the deck for the Jets, do a variety of other things. So, in a place where we say we don't have money, there's $25 billion that is being spent for infrastructure. It's how we set our priorities.

TED: Ron, can I ask another question? If I buy an apartment in one of these areas as a market rate person and get a mortgage from my bank, can I deduct from my taxes? So, the federal government will subsidize me as a market rate person, for buying an apartment if I can afford it, but its not going to put a dollar into subsidizing any of the poor people that may come under this inclusionary zoning.

RON: And if you bought a football team!

SUSAN: OK, before we go on, I would like to go back to the UDC lessons. Now, it seems to me that, the belief was not just about housing, but the belief was in cities and in people. And that seems to be the missing moment here. It's like we're looking at, someone, somewhere, somehow Ted gave me a huge package of information that I was reading, and one of the pieces of information said, that we are more segregated in our housing than we have ever been before and we seem to have a City that is not about people the way it was or the way the Logue era defined cities. I mean, how do we begin to understand that, and how do we begin to get out of this morass that we're in right now? Anybody with any quick suggestions? I can go into the audience, I have a roving mic, somebody might actually have a brilliant idea. Hold on a second. We will hear from everyone. Don't ask a question. Give a suggestion.

AUDIENCE: Find a way to encourage developers to build for poor people.

SUSAN: And that leads me to Jonathan.

JONATHAN: OK, thank you. That was an easy set-up. The first thing that I should like to say is that we are meeting in this amazing place, which is called the Center for Architecture. It turns out that this place has 1200 meetings a year about architecture and community issues and it's quite an amazing place. And before it was built, nobody thought that anybody wanted to meet about architecture and community issues. So, I want silently for us to applaud it, but also it reflects something that is very important, which is that very often, there is the potential for change that we can't see. And that sometimes we have to take a deep breath have faith and go for it, for something that we deeply believe in. The market study never would have told you how filled this place would have been, but in our hearts, we knew what a demand there was for it. The A.I.A. has actually done an extraordinary thing in building this building.

I was asked to speak about three things, about the public, community and private sectors, which I will, but I'm going to add architecture students to this list and I have some recommendations. So the first thing is, what can the public sector do and obviously one of the most important things is, it can provide resources. The resources ultimately really have to come from the federal government and we have an evil policy in the federal government right now, which is starving every housing and community development program that they can while they are sucking the fat off the land (there's not any fat on the land anymore) for military programs, for Haliburton, etc. So we really need to work as a person, there's no other, it's us, frankly I hate to say this, it's us against them. We really need every community advocate around the country to push as hard as they can for federal housing programs because it's the only, the only thing, the way we can get this done. But anyway, the public realm does allocate these precious resources, and I actually think that the issue of allocation is very, very important. Allocation, where resources are getting allocated and what design and environmentally responsible requirements go with it. So, there's a federal program called the Low-Income Tax Credit program, which funds a great deal of affordable housing. Much of that is allocated nationally, and even in this state in the suburbs to politically connected developers and in fact I think that program needs to be allocated to places of need and it needs to be allocated to projects of great design, and it needs to be allocated to

projects that are committed to be green.

The next thing is that this is not just about housing, it is about rebuilding communities and I very much believe that we need a mixed-use credit enhancement program. So what does that mean? Currently, the government guarantees mortgages for housing programs through the F.H.A. and other programs. And these programs were essentially created in the thirties and forties because we had a desperate housing need at that time. What we really have is a community development need. We need not just housing, but we need places of work. I actually believe we need affordable live/work facilities. If you really look at where the economic future of New York is, it is in the merging of craft and design and marketing and media. We have, especially, if you look at what's happening in Brooklyn, in the furniture world business, astounding world-class furniture being designed by the creative young designers. They're amazing crafts people and we have no vehicle for supporting them economically. So we need mixed-use and live/work housing credit enhancement programs. The last thing is I deeply believe that as neighborhoods gentrify, that we worry a lot about the people who live there, and not about the people who work there, and we actually need a small business ownership program, so that people can buy the stores on their main streets and not get forced out when the neighborhoods gentrify, but actually prosper when the neighborhoods gentrify.

And the last thing is I think inclusionary zoning should be mandatory. That is, when you take a neighborhood like Williamsburg/Greenpoint and you say you're going to increase the density there, there's nothing wrong with saying that 20% of it, or whatever number you pick, is going to be affordable in every new building. You just say it, and then it's done. You don't have to worry about it. And by the way, developers will build it. You know what, I'll tell you what happens. All that happens is the land price gets adjusted to reflect affordability. And so, the projects will get built.

The second thing, community: There's a very interesting article that came out, and it's got a lot of ripples; it's called "The Death of Environmentalism". Has anybody heard of it? OK, it's not big in the community development world. It's huge in the environmental world, and the environmental organizations are struggling because their message just isn't getting through. I see the future of the environmental movement as burgeoning and bursting forth like a thousand flowers, right now blooming in the community development world. We are seeing community development organizations taking responsibility under environmental justice. Taking responsibility for toxins in their neighborhoods. Taking responsibility for green building. We're seeing the most green affordable housing coming out of C.D.C's. And what this really is, is saying we are expanding beyond our mandate. Our mandate is no longer housing. It's no longer community development. It is the whole interdependent thing. And I see the future of the environmental movement as burgeoning out of community development organizations, and great lessons for the environmental movement in that. So, let's think further about where the C.D.C. movement needs to go, because the C.D.C's are struggling in many cases. There is a movement, and it's a tough one, and that is to say that community organizations that grew neighborhood by neighborhood may be too small to take on the task before them, and they need to merge and combine in many ways. And that means, egos getting hurt, and that means, it's a tough thing, but the reality is C.D.C.'s need to come to scale to have the economic force and organizational ability to deal with the challenges before them.

A very interesting program is going on in Boston now where the Boston Community Capital Organization is funding with over a million dollars the study of how it might to do that. One example is, all the C.D.C.'s stay in place, but they create one Boston-wide development organization. And in fact, a community development corporation somewhat like U.D.C. that then executes projects for all the individual C.D.C's, and therefore has the buying power, the ability to hire the finest architects, all that stuff, working on behalf of its owners, the community development organizations. Those kind of models need to be looked at.

Last question is, private sector. So in inclusionary zoning, the private sector, we need to separate in our mind, developers and landowners. Landowners want to make the most money off their land. Developers are looking for exactly what Ted said -- they want sites that are ready to go. You give them sites that are ready to go that come with affordable housing requirements, and if the land is at the right price, they're going to build. So the private sector will be harnessed; if the rules are right, they'll follow those rules. Our company happens to partner with community development organizations to build complicated projects, in communities all around America, and we're seeing more of that too. And, particularly, as community development groups become more sophisticated, they can attract private partners.

OK, the last two things, architects and planners. if you look around this room, there's the 185 projects submitted by architects. Architecture is I believe, the most exciting art form in the world today --more exciting than art and sculpture and music and literature. It's astounding. Architecture is entering one of its great periods of design and a commitment, by the way to the environment. It's a great time to be an architect, and I think the architects need to be, and this center shows, how much architecture has influenced. And the final thing is that for students, and particularly students of architecture and community development, I have two pieces of advice. Which is, first of all, you are the leaders of the future, and you should set your goals very high. You should imagine yourselves as the next presidents because you can be that. And you certainly can start things, Ron knows as he's had a lot of engagement with young architects in communities around America, and its astounding. For example, we have a young architect who is working in a community outside of San Diego, in this very poor Hispanic community. And he got the community organized and he came up with a plan that San Diego didn't want; they took it to the Planning Commission. The plan was so powerful it became the model for all community planning in San Diego. This is a guy one year out of college. So, you guys can change the world. Thank you.

SUSAN: I do have a question, a follow up question for Jonathan. So this is very interesting because sustainability and the idea of looking at a larger system than just housing or just one thing and looking at all parts of the system, is changing the way we design, the way we plan, the way you develop, the way everything is going on. And this Boston example seems to be a very strong one. I'm thinking of the UDC, and I'm thinking of regional powerhouses forming for advocacy, for the region's needs. And, anybody on the panel like to address some possibilities in that area of opening up some really strong discussions, never mind the federal government right now because they're not going to help anyway right now. But, we have to wait till we vote them out of office. But in the meantime, how do we grow these regional powerhouses that we need?

JONATHAN: Can I just add one more thing? (Yes) That is the other great thing about the Boston model, is that there is a requirement that all the projects will be green. It's a completely committed to green thing. And by the way, I think that affordable housing will become the first industry in America that will become completely green in, within five years. If you talk about affordable housing, it's just automatically green.

SUSAN: OK, Jonathan, since you build in various regions and you see the strengths of these regions, do you see New York and its region having some of this energy so that we can muster this around here, around our needs here?

JONATHAN: We do have the energy and by the way, we do, you know, the city government is actually very committed to affordable housing and consistently has done its best to use its resources to fund affordable housing. The issues in New York City and in the region are finding sites. It is very hard to find empty sites to build on for anything, and then to build on affordable housing unless you can take manufacturing areas and change them. So the key starts with finding the sites. But I do think in New York City that we need to create a more powerful CDC movement. I think the CDC movement is a little bit in a, others may disagree with me, but if it was more collaborative and if perhaps organizations banded together with a larger buying power, larger political power, I think they might be more effective.

SUSAN: Do we all know what CDC is?

JONATHAN: Community Development Corporation

RON: Well, if I could add, the fact that Williamsburg/Greenpoint had a thousand people out at a City Planning Commission hearing a few months ago, and literally stacked the entire City Council hearing to the point where it was confusing that some of their own people could not get in to the City Council hearing on that day, all demanding inclusionary housing, it's because the CDC's do work together. You had Los Sures Community Housing Corporation and Saint Nicholas Neighborhood Development Corporation, actually supported by a number of others from around the city. So that there really is a coalition of groups and they're beginning to exert their political muscle. The fact that the city is now looking at these issues I think comes from that political base. Can it get stronger? Absolutely. Can it benefit from the kind of ownership of a UDC kind of entity? I think absolutely. In fact, a lot of the groups partner now with Phipps Houses, they partner with groups like yours, they partner with LiISC and Enterprise. But somehow we have to build into this, the checks and balances so that the local plans drive it, so that there is some control they have over the entity. But they also need that entity. I've always felt, and it's not a technical term, but I've felt if we could smoosh together the community-based organizations with the Ed Logues of the world, then we could begin to get the kind of change we need, the community accountability on one level and the driving bulldoggedness to get something done. And I think the two together are a winning combination and I'm really intrigued by that idea.

TED: I'm very concerned about our nation versus our city. Our city is an aberrant city. It's not part of the United States. I just did a study in Houston of how to get housing to be better

addressed. Houston controls some of the housing issues and housing policy through very vibrant, the more the merrier, CDC's. They encourage them. They feed them with lots of money so that they can quietly do their little plans that never can become effective. So the more the merrier. Had they, if they all as Jonathan said, banded into one, they might be able to visit the Mayor and have some influence. But they don't.

SUSAN: But I think our city can't be looked at as an aberrant place, because I think that sort of, that's very comfortable and very...

TED: No, no, what I'm saying is that if we take what we do here and applaud ourselves for some of our accomplishments, there are 49 other states that are not pressuring the federal government to change. Because...

RON: A week ago, upstairs in this same building, there was a group pulled together by the Association of Community Design Centers. It included a group of the Rose Fellows. These are groups that are funded by Jonathan's family that actually work in community groups. There was a discussion going on up there, and I don't remember the names of the individuals, a young Latino from San Francisco, Brad Lander, the guy who took my job, who is absolutely wonderful, half a dozen other folks sitting upstairs from different cities large and small, talking about inclusionary zoning. Learning the techniques, one from another. Talking about how they're pressuring the local government. San Francisco - 14% mandatory. New York City, talking about 23, 25%, what do you call it, not optional, but incentivized. And so what San Francisco was saying, we want mandatory, plus if we bonus it, incentives. And so you're seeing a dialogue taking place between community-based groups. We need to find the money to help facilitate that communication. We need to see a redistribution of some of the foundation monies so that it facilitates that kind of dialogue. The energy is there. The creativity is there. And the young folks are there. You know, it was a pleasure that it wasn't an old white fart talking up there. It was really, somebody, you know, a whole group of people from the neighborhoods beginning to strategize. And change comes about, only by building it up from the bottom up. And I mean that's how the Reich did it, you know, I don't want to emulate them, but they learned from us, they just did it better.

SUSAN: Well, Ed Logue, himself, came from the bottom from what I understand. He did go to Yale, but he did have a tough childhood apparently. So, maybe there's a budding Ed Logue out there among all of you, who kind of come, can come and energize groups. But, I don't want to give up on this regional thing because I really do believe that that's the future of any kind of planning and that obviously includes housing, is that there are resources that we have here; climate, financial talent that is very unique to the northeastern states that could be capitalized and could be made into something very powerful. And development could be thought of as this kind of regional growth issue. So, I'm hoping that we talk a little bit more about that, even if we don't talk about that today. But I hope that everybody kind of starts thinking about that because it is not just a city. It is not just New Jersey. It is not just Connecticut. We are all in this together and the only way that that we're going to make any kind of dent on the federal government is to come together as a group of states and advocate for our needs. I really believe that. Jonathan, what do you think?

JONATHAN: I was just going to say that the states are now the breeding grounds of tremendous creativity. So for example, you mention climate, I don't know if you meant climate change, but since the feds are dead in the water on climate change, we're seeing California and the eastern States, all of our states really create very interesting models of trying to advance the issue of slowing down climate change in place of the feds. Though one word that I think we should all think about, is the word inter-dependence. And inter-dependence is like gravity. You don't have a choice about it. I mean gravity is just a quality of the universe. So is inter-dependence, which is that everything is connected. And so regionalism, really gives us a much more accurate planning model because it, whenever you do something, you are always affecting the things around it anyway. We might as well pay attention to those things.

SUSAN: OK, so I'd like to get back to one more issue and then we'll start with the panel's questions. Jonathan mentioned that architecture is the most exciting art form it is today, it has ever been, and I agree with this. I think everybody who is watching it....

END OF TAPE 1
TAPE 2

AUDIENCE: I agree with you, I mean I think the design profession, I actually am a landscape architect, and I'm not pitting one against the other, but, the one thing that I see in architecture is that there is this heightened kind of celebration of the building, What we see and have been in discussions where people talk about architecture like it is only the building, but what we are talking about is building communities. And I think you, when we talked about even UDC, building not just that building but have that building related to other buildings or that there were day care centers in that building or there were places where they have stores in that building, and its not just a celebration of the architect as, the designer of a building. But it is how we start the interrelationship of design disciplines to look at the environment as a whole and also to work with people like environmentalists and the other kind of sciences to make sure that as we're doing this design, that it is the best environment for people to live in, not because its just a testament to our creativity or doing something that's never been done before in that sort. So, that's just my little plug for people coming out of the schools.

SUSAN: So, I'm still waiting for that assessment from the architects.

TED: If there's any achievement that the UDC had, it had lots, in terms of individual building architecture, but I think it had two great achievements beyond that. One was in its new community thinking, and its new community and new technology. Ed Logue felt that they all go hand in hand. Roosevelt Island was to be a car free island. It was to be an island that would have recreation built into it. It was to be an island that would have a very high density of people living on it, but those people would be 50% of considered low-income. So it would be a truly mixed income community. Schools, as it was designed, were to be part of the fabric of the street. And they were to be small schools where children would move from building to building, class to class, as they grew. And administrative operations of the Board of Education killed that. UDC losing control over the income mix lost that.

So, the goals were originally there to make it what would have been the green new town-in town of the world. And that was the most important project to him and he wanted the architecture to be good as well. What we were doing with the competition, which was the next stage, is trying to develop prototypes for analyzing how people lived in urban dense neighborhoods. Where elderly might be? Where young children might be? How some of the housing's social issues could be addressed? And we did that in the low rise-high density, but we hadn't applied that to the very high densities, and this was going to be a study competition, which would have produced, hopefully, urban prototypes that could be used today. Frankly, we're still working on it, I, myself, just in my own practice. And I believe that architecture is a very celebrated profession now and I think it's a wonderful time. And I think frankly people are thinking of sustainability when they design now. But they are not thinking of people yet. People haven't been included. They're not included in renderings. They're not included in the photographs, and they're not included in the mind of the architect planning.

SUSAN: I think I'd like to clarify that because, not clarify you Ted, but I'd like to clarify my thinking on this. I think architects are thinking about green design and LEED standards, which are different from sustainability. And I think I'd like to argue that sustainability includes social equity as well as green design and green architecture. And I don't think we're doing...

TED: I agree. I agree. I agree

SUSAN: Yes, Ron.

RON: The last two comments almost stole my comments. First of all, I think part of the celebration of architecture has been the celebration of egos of architects. Part of the celebration of architecture has been a rediscovery of some of the fundamentals of design, some of which you know were tried, were tackled by the live and learn experiences of UDC. Some of the work that I see, Jonathan's company, and some of the stuff that Karen has been talking about, and so, we really have to start looking at how we bring that to the fore through green design, as opposed to just meeting LEED standards. One of Jonathan's staff people lectured in one of my classes and showed one of the greatest villages in the world that's totally sustainable, would have one of the lowest LEED ratings. We also have to make LEED, a little bit more accountable to the environments that we want to put it in.

SUSAN: Does everybody know what LEED is?

RON: It's an environmental measure, it's a way of measuring how green a building is, that has been set up by the Green Building Council. But, more important than that, is that we've seen a lot built, both by the private sector and a lot by community based development groups. And I must tell, that as much as I'm an advocate of community based development groups, with rare exceptions, a lot of the stuff that we've been seeing being built, is crap. It's not being designed well. It's not being designed for long lives. They have 30 year mortgages with, a colleague of mine, Rex Curry, used to say, with 20 year lives. In other words, the buildings will die before their mortgages expire. And so it's really important to get back to quality not only in terms of the way we build the buildings, but the way we design them.

One of the things that I saw in one of the early criteria of UDC was that they were looking at the life cycle of the building. And they were beginning to look not only about the way people interacted with the buildings, but how much would it cost over periods of time? It's something we're just rediscovering, that we shouldn't measure how much it costs to build a building, but how much it costs to maintain and operate a building. Because part of affordability is not only opening up that door and turning over the key, but also looking at how much will it take to maintain and operate buildings. Susan Saegert, who just left, and Carmy Bee, both of whom teach at different parts of the City University, has students looking at the UDC experience. Not just to record historically what went on, but what can we learn from that? What can we learn from that to transfer to the next generation of architects, and community planners and community builders? And that's part of what we're trying to do with the upcoming conference and other things. It's part of the dialogue that we have to enter into.

TED: I have two things to say about architecture. One, is that beauty is very important to people. It's not a bad thing to have a beautiful building. And so good architecture, beautiful architecture is also a goal just as many of these other goals are goals. And architects learn those skills as well, and it's important that they... we have a very broad profession, the word design used to mean very few things. It now means many more, and I hope it means even more than that. And the reasonI felt I had to go to Europe to study housing, is not that they build more beautiful housing. It's that they were more serious about the housing they were building in the sixties, when I went. They were evaluating their housing. They were building housing that they felt was being built for their families, even though it was low-income housing. We don't feel that here. We never had that attitude in our federal government that we were building for us. We're always building for them: those people that can't make it without subsidy. And those people were downgraded in applying for subsidies. No one in Holland who needs a little bit of subsidy because they're getting older, or because they've had an extra child and need to educate them, is considered a bad person in society. They're considered a person from Holland. They're considered a normal person. They maybe need some subsidies for the next five years, and then give back by their children's achievements, and by their achievements, a lot more to the overall community.

There was a holistic approach to the way they would even analyze architecture and housing that was very important for me to learn. And part of that live-in experience made Ed Logue see that everyone at UDC had to understand that task of integrating all of these things. And that's why he not only said, every God damn architect is going to live in there so they see the small rooms. Let them figure out how to do it better. But, it's also that the mail clerk understood that the purpose of UDC was to create communities. And we really were doing that. And so the holistic approach is very important but it's important for architects as well. And I won't say more about it, but architecture and beauty is just as important as every one of these other things. They all have to be put in one package. So don't give up that part of design.

SUSAN: There's also something that when you talk about having lived, being asked to live in these places, and I think, frankly I think every architect and interior designer, should when they design a hospital, they should check into the hospital. You know, get some treatment so they'll

know what's going on. No, I mean I'm serious about this. And this is amazing because what you were able to do through that program was understand what empathy is. Empathy in anything is going to lead to something much more productive than some cold factual resolution to it.

TED: I want to mention one other thing here -- other professions that become part of architecture. Before I went on this trip, I asked an environmental psychologist to help me write questions so I could ask properly, and I sat with someone because I would ask someone, how do you like your housing?, that might not be the way to do it. But I didn't have those skills. An environmental psychologist, Susan Saegert, I brought on, I didn't ask her for that because she was much too young, but I hired her, I hired her for housing development strategies for Denver in 1979, and I put an environmental psychologist on my team to look at housing strategies for the downtown in Denver. And she, a developer, and a landscape architect, and us, as architects and planners, were the team. Why were they the team? Because water was an issue. Our landscape architect, Terry Snaddlebach said, you can have a thousand trees in the city, or you can have water, it really was, the green was being measured by water availability. So water became something that was very important. Ecology was very important. The environmental research people, and economic research people said 2000 families will come to downtown Denver in the year 2000. This is in 1979. She gave 10,000 questionnaires to women in the downtown, and found 12,500 families that would move to the downtown immediately if there was a supermarket and a private school built so that would be nearby. Not even a public school. So it demonstrated a need that economic people, development people, government people can't ascertain. You need people asking the right questions. So, it's very interesting. I think you, this integration, which is coming out of this and it's an integration of community-based groups, which have to band together to get government to move, but it also has to redefine how we design our communities so they have a more holistic approach. I frankly don't design green buildings. I prefer designing good buildings. And I think good architecture has to have all of those elements inside it, including having people being happy about it once they're in there.

KAREN: Ted, I just wanted to say that, one of the things that we have to be conscious of in the design profession is that the people that we're designing for. I mean, we need to find ways to have those people, or their children, to understand that they can be a part of the profession and help make decisions about their own environment. You have to understand that the oppression of people means that the first thing is that they don't control how or what conditions that they live in. Or that's their belief and that's the way they function. So, by engaging them in the process and that's the organizing piece, but again how do we as a profession make sure that they are part of what we're doing? Either for sure becoming designers or understanding how to interpret the things that they inherently understand from their culture and their way of living in making design that is sustainable in that way.

I cannot tell you how many times when we were trying to bring quality design to housing that we did with Abyssinian Development Corporation, like for homeless housing, the people that control the money would say well why are you doing it so nice? That's as good as mine is. That way you can't get them out of here. Or just things, but, that community spirit, the community resources said no, this is the way we're going to do it. And one of the things I want to bring up here is that we're all preaching to the choir and how wonderful this is, but we ought to realize some of the

real world things. Jonathan is the most wonderful developer that I know, but one of the things when I went to design school, I came out thinking, if its beautiful, it'll get built.

We have to understand the financing. He does that from both sides. Now, and part of it is maybe you're not a developer but to understand it enough so that you can participate in that discussion, and be able to influence change. We have to understand how to beat them at their own game. It's the way I look at it. And we're dealing with a community and a world that does not see the things the way that we would like them to be. It's a different perspective, but we have to get them to understand like Jonathan talked about we're all in this together. That there is a consequence to not taking care of the issues that we have at hand. And I, I mean in this day and time you don't want to scare people to say, what can happen, but the power of people standing up, who are now realizing, wait a minute, I'm going to be forced out of my house. And it's happening every day. When they realize that their very existence is being threatened in neighborhoods that they care about. Or their grandmothers have grown up and on and on like in Greenpoint/Williamsburg, that have real strong ethnic cultural neighborhoods, that are going to be destroyed because the price of land is going to go up and yes, I know a lot of these students out here want to live in Greenpoint/Williamsburg and other resources can come to bear, but when people realize, and some of my commissioners say, oh my God those people are coming and yelling. If that's the only power you have, you have to use it. And we haven't seen people using it in extreme methods, but they're using it at this point of standing up, speaking out that housing is very important to them, and the politicians listen because the only resources they have are from those public sources.

And people say, oh well, you know that's the welfare state, or that, but that is the equity of their ancestors, a people who could not and did not earn what they should or could in this country and now that money is going to provide for them. So, we should be aware that there is that force that is moving. I mean, just people overcrowded, what that breeds in terms of the destruction of the family, and it goes on and on. But, if we don't do housing that has economic diversity, we'll have all the poor people in one place and all the wealthy people in the other. I was terrible misquoted in the Washington Post article talking about the changes in Harlem, but just even what's happening in the Lower East Side, and this kind of built up resentment is because you have the poor people living here and the rich people living somewhere else, and encroaching on that area. So, it comes out of some very different ways that I don't understand. I'm not an environmental psychologist, but we have to look at the potential of what can happen, and the economy is not going to keep better and these pressures are going to continue to build.

RON: If I could just...there are two things I want to say. One of them is, I have always grown up feeling that New York City was one of the cities with the greatest equity. However, we are now reaching the point where New York City has the most segregated census tracts in the county, and that is something I think is an outrage for any New Yorker. And unless we do something, the market forces are going to continue to make that pattern of segregation even worse than it is today. The other point, and I want to build on what Karen just said, which is the power of people, and I think Peter Stand is in the audience, and Peter eulogized one of my heroes, Yolanda Garcia, a month or so ago, who unfortunately died way before her time.

I remember when Yolanda organized to protect their homes in Melrose in the South Bronx, and

what came out of that effort. And when the community first took control of the design and the planning process, every bureaucrat, every architect, every developer, was shaking. But I'll tell you, months later, working with Peter and others, what Yolanda was able to do is she worked with them, learned from them, helped educate them to the point where you got a group, designers and developers and communities working side by side demanding sustainable change. Great architecture, better architecture, I mean they had limitations on what they were able to do, but they tried to move that whole dynamic in a different way. And a couple of the planners in the City Planning Department that were yelling at us for even talking to them, I was on the Commission at that time, basically came and said, these folks liberated us. They allowed us to start thinking again as planners. And I'm saying this because as developers and as students and as architects, you can't be afraid of people. If you really work with them, you can change the nature of the dynamic. You have natural allies there. The same thing is happening with the Rose Fellows. When you put the Rose Fellows in with good community-based groups, they're both learning from each other and they're beginning to come to a new level of respect for design. And I think that what we have to do is begin to infuse some of the values that Ted brings to the profession into what communities are doing with what they build.

SUSAN: We have a question in the back here. Identity yourself please.

AUDIENCE: I'm George Haikalis, and this is more of a comment than a question, but it's about green transportation, letting people know it's sort of my thing, and affordable housing. One of the great natural advantages we have in New York is a tremendous transit system 24/7 subway system. If we design housing so that we take advantage of that, which means don't provide for automobiles in neighborhoods that are well-served by public transit. Encourage people who want to move to those neighborhoods to take a pledge not to own a car and be car-free. Half the population of the city has cars anyway. Why not not build the garage because the driveway is the loss of open space. Accompanying that is some really solid measures to try discourage auto use in the center of the city, particularly a London congestion-pricing scheme. And think of it as part of a affordable housing scheme, because it really fits together. I agree with Ted's comment about the auto-free Roosevelt Island, which is anything but auto-free, in fact its design with the narrow canyon street doesn't work the way they set it out, but it really still could be auto-free if we really worked on it.

SUSAN: So what is the answer to that? I mean that's a huge question because of the jobs they're getting, getting the jobs without driving three hours in a traffic jam and all of that has to do with housing.

RON: A number of years ago when we worked on a community initiated plan that was the basis for the re-zoning action in Williamsburg and Greenpoint, we proposed along the water's edge, that would run from Greenpoint to Red Hook and connect to downtown Brooklyn subways, as well as Queens subways, a light rail system. And we proposed that before the development of the housing. We were borrowing from something the Dutch do. They require that the transit be in place before the large-scale development. 20,000 units, 10,000 units, 40,000 people will be there. No mass transit other than the G train, and those of you who know the G train, it goes nowhere, that's what the G stands for. At any rate, when you have that in place, then you're beginning to set

the patterns of the future. Instead, and if you look at the details, and I'm not blaming Karen, she's our ally on the commission, you look at the details of city planning, how they articulated these above ground parking garages that will be hidden by the buildings surrounding them. They went to all the detail of designing the parking garages without ever thinking about the mass transit. That's the disconnect between planning and building and development. We now use our planning tools as zoning. It's not planning. It's not investment. It's not creativity.

JONATHAN: I just want to say that the place for density is adjacent to mass transit, and so for example as we build the Second Avenue subway we should be zoning higher density at every node on the subway.

KAREN: I just want to comment that one of the questions that I've started asking at City Planning, what is the overall policy toward parking? And what we're seeing is that parking is becoming so valuable below 60th street that developers are coming in to take cellars out of the buildings and are able to get a permit from us to go down to put in additional parking. Now, even if they're building buildings, that could be accessory parking, which if it's for someone to park their car that they're going to need to leave on the weekends. But what this parking is for, is for people to drive their Hummer from the suburbs into Downtown and Midtown so that they can park, and they don't care what it costs. But it's so valuable, again, back to understanding the numbers, so valuable to the developers and the owners of the building, is that they will come, take the time and energy to come before us and get a special permit to do this kind of thing, parking that is for commercial parking. So, again, and until somebody says something, it'll just keep going until it becomes a problem.

SUSAN: So we're getting back to the system again. Do these piecemeal fixes remedy the problem, and we really need to really analyze the whole system thinking about not just housing but what supports it. Do you have a question?

AUDIENCE: I'm Judy Burney, and I've lived on Roosevelt Island for only 27 years of its 30 year existence. Yes, it's going to be 30 years old this month for the people that live there. Mr. Liebman you came there. The buildings are phenomenal if you don't mind the exterior. The apartments on Roosevelt Island, the original 2000 units, are probably the best-designed apartments, for the money, that we have in the City.

TED: By fabulous architects, Jose Luis Sert; Sert, Jackson Associates and John Johansen.

AUDIENCE: Right, and also we have skip-stop up architecture, if you want to explain skip-stop up to people. It saves a lot of hallways and it's very green. We won't discuss the electric heat...

TED: And it's impossible now to build skip-stop elevators because of laws that we like, as well as A.D.A.

AUDIENCE: But also, we won't discuss the electric heat. You'll have to discuss that with Jonathan. Now, but, I want to invite everyone to come to Roosevelt Island because I meet so many people who work there and stuff and are in your field, the architecture and design field, and you

don't come back to see your projects. You have to come and walk around 10, 20 years later. And you'll see that our schools are changed from little schools to a big public school. We do have cars, but we also have a hospital that is on the southern end of the island and their staff says, we're not going to drive and park in a garage. Kids are pretty good. Our social life on the island is phenomenal. Our shopping stinks; it just never worked.

TED: Are there any poor people that live on the island?

AUDIENCE: Yes, and that's my next question. My next problem is that, all the landlords of the original buildings and one Mitchell-Lama co-op, wants to go private. Our 1000 units of UDC section 236 housing, the landlord wants to take it out of the subsidy program. So 80% of the people would have no problem because they would qualify for another program, but as they move out, those are vacant, those are decontrolled apartments; 1000 units of affordable housing will go market rate. And two other Mitchell-Lama rental buildings have just been sold and they're also trying to co-op them too, hopefully to a tenant-sponsored buyout. So there are 2000 units of housing that would take probably 20,000 to build now to replace that eventually are going to go out of these programs and it's a tragedy because where are these people, the replacements of these people going to go? It's a wonderful community, as (unintelligible name) here knows, and he's worked with us a lot on our sales point. And I just want to remind everyone, there are communities, there are small towns. They do succeed. Ed Logue was very visionary and I don't think it would have got built without Ed Logue, and you and your guys, and...

TED: And, I must tell you. Thank god he's not alive to see what's happening, because he would be out there moving the cars off the street into motorgate and he would not have permitted to go from 49% low-income from 50...

RON: Maybe he should be alive.

TED: He should be alive, but he's not.

SUSAN: Maybe he's in the building

AUDIENCE: Well, maybe I'll follow up from that. My name's Mike Wallace, and I'm intrigued by the notion of UDC owned by CDC's. And I want to ask questions to go both backward and forward on that issue. Going backward, I'm wondering because it does seem to me and, you know, I don't know much about it, but it does seem to me that UDC was a very top down organization. Listen to the way we're discussing what Logue would have allowed and what we thought Logue would allow. And I'm wondering if in fact UDC had originally been based on this alternative, seems to me model, based on a coalition of community organizations, how would it have affected, in your opinion, its history, Would he have conceivably have had the political resources that would have allowed him to survive longer than it did? Would it have changed the nature of the projects that were constructed? Looking forward, I'm curious to know what people think of political obstacles that stand in the way of actually achieving something like that. Why is it in fact that Boston seems to be farther along this road, if that's correct, than we are? Would in fact, such looking forward, would such an organization be able to schmooze together with the Logues, or is in fact

there some conceivable antithetical relationship between them? Is this another Moses/Jacobs dichotomy? And just a specific thing, what does the current administration and/or the City Planning Association think about this kind of possibility? Do they react, do they think about it at all? Do they react with horror? How can we in fact, possibly move this thing forward?

RON: Well, let me answer in a couple ways. First of all, Ed Logue is not Robert Moses, because Robert Moses was an avowed racist, and Ed Logue was not a racist. And I think, values come into play. They were both egotistical and powerful individuals and to that point, I agree. And so, that is an issue, but we have to remember that there was a community. I'll give you one example -- it's a preview of one of the exhibits we're going to have. A community called Wyandanch, Long Island; a black community surrounded by white communities, very low-income white. It was a community that had desperate housing conditions. It had been discriminated by everybody else in the town of Babylon (I think that's the town.) And they got together, led by a black minister, a thousand people came out and joined forces with UDC to sponsor housing. All right, in that community that would have been low-rise garden apartments. I think it was 180 apartments. It was defeated by a vote of 3 to 2 by the town board that was predominately white. So we needed an entity that could override local zoning ordinances in order to achieve some agreed upon values of our society. And I still believe we need that power, the same way we needed to send in troops to open up some schools. On the other hand, you know, when it came to planning and working with communities, particularly in Boston and other places where he did bulldoze neighborhoods, that was wrong. So, how do you find the balance between the two? And the checks and balances I think are really important. And, that's why I'd like to see the two smooshed together.

But I do believe that there are sometimes, regional and societal values that need to be able to overcome local zoning ordinances, because without that, you continue to have the exclusionary policies that were taking place in this state, and led to a lot of the problems we wound up having in the cities. The other thing that is part of the exhibit, is that Levittown was built in that time, and its white population, 98 %, no then it was a hundred percent white; today, 2005, it's 98% white. So, the dynamics have not changed. We still need to be able to influence some opportunities by having those powers. Saying that all, I do believe that you can develop a balance of power, where you have strong judiciary, executive and legislative bodies. And you can do that in the same way when you work on a community-based level. I don't think we would have been able to do it in '68, because we didn't have a strong community base. Today we have a strong community structure. We have a whole intermediary structure with LISC and Enterprise and the work that some of the banks have now done., so there is an infrastructure through which we can now begin to launch this kind of effort where you would have a balance of power between the community-based organizations and a top-down entity like UDC.

TED: I love the idea of UDC-CDC equation, putting them together, but my fear is that you're worried too much about the Ed Logue kind of person. Frankly, any CDC that's worth its salt, has an Ed Logue in it. Any organization that accomplishes anything, be it public or private, has a visionary, or it doesn't go anywhere, it just stays there. Most cities that improve have mayors with a vision or for a period of time have a mayor with a vision. Most federal governments when they do something good, they have a president that at least can think about good things. So I

think that there always has to be some power and sometimes the power can be a person who lives within a low-income housing project and sees that there's something wrong and organizes people and gets them together and becomes the powerhouse for that group, and they can achieve great things. And I think it's a very interesting idea and I don't think we should let it go, but we should bring it back. It's the idea of CDC's becoming the new UDC, because the federal government would support it and it gave the UDC its power. Its power was the flow of money to it. That's no longer there. So we have to find another way. It has to come from another source.

SUSAN; And we had a question back here.

AUDIENCE: Hi, I'm Majora Carter from Sustainable South Bronx, and my questions relate to a whole bunch of things you've been talking about, and in particular, the leadership that you've been talking about is something that I think is completely lacking in terms of creating the kind of extraordinary vision that we have, whether its community in terms of green developers, sustainable development, whatever you want to call it. And I just have a question, if any of you could speak to your knowledge that there actually is a sustainability office, within the city administration right now. And that's what I was afraid of quite frankly, the reports that I heard have not been particularly encouraging at all in terms of actually thinking that green and sustainable development are something that we can actually be doing. Whether it's economically viable or is this something that is actually going to take hold in this city. And so in terms of developing the kind of policies, whether you have a strong mayor who's saying this needs to happen, right now, or it will happen soon, the way that Daley did. In the interim, what do you think we can be doing? Groups like mine that are happening, they're all over the place, at this point, developing relationships with the government, with other agencies, etc.

KAREN: I didn't know that there was a sustainability office in the city government, and I mean I'm not a city employee and I'm not a full-time person with the City of New York. But, I would say that the vision that we need is for people to realize that by not having green buildings, or taking care of our environment now, we pay later. You can pay me now, or you pay me later. It's got to come down to costs. With Sustainable South Bronx, one of the things we have is eloquent speakers who are talking about this new waste treatment plant that the city is trying to implement to put in a different system of dealing with our garbage. And these people really made an eloquent plea in front of the City Planning Commission to say why we needed to change the way we're doing it. But we do need vision to say, in doing that we need to think of recycling and set policies that will let people know that things that will help our environment will eventually save us money. And it's not all about what you're spending today. And of course, that is educating the politicians because they only think about what do we spend between now and the next time I'm elected. So how do we get behind that to say it's not that sustainability is just something cute or just to put on your building as a marketing tool, it is saying that we will be here later in an environment that will be better for us than if we keep going the way we are. And, how do we figure out how to prove that in terms of a financial look? What the real costs are?

JONATHAN: First of all, in terms of affordable housing, Enterprise Foundations has a wonderful program called Green Communities. You can go to their web site, www.enterprisefoundation.org.

It's right there on the homepage on the upper right hand side. And they're providing grants for people to buy, to hire architects and special consultants to do green building. JP Morgan Chase and other banks have contributed over $550 million or committed equity to the program. There's a package, all the financing to help create green affordable housing, and provide technical assistance. So, it's extraordinarily achievable. The only other two things I want you all to remember, is that essentially, this year or next year, the world will reach its peak oil production, and every year thereafter, it's going to go down, and we'll run out of oil around 2038, 2040, somewhere in there. And so this issue is going to become more and more real to people as we run out of oil. And the last thing is that we are actually in the middle of the sixth great extinction. It's the only extinction caused by human beings, and we have to make the decisions really, really quickly, because we are destroying the biosphere. And you can think of the entire universe, this might be the only planet that has life. We don't know. An astounding miracle of creation, and we are about to snuff it out if we don't change quickly.

SUSAN: Before, before we go to your question, there's the other issue here when oil prices go up the way you describe them, the affordable housing is not going to be affordable to anyone, because who can heat their homes with the current systems that are built into those houses?

JONATHAN: That's right. That's why all new affordable housing has to be green.

SUSAN: Exactly.

AUDIENCE: Hi, I guess my question is to anyone on the panel. I'm Nicole Smith. I have my Master's from Hunter College in the Urban Affairs Department. I guess going back to the issue of space and we're talking about how space is becoming rather limited, are there any other alternative models besides just trying to look for new sites on which to build completely new buildings? Are there any talks about finding space within existing housing complexes, or anything like that? As space has become such an issue, like what are some alternative models to deal with space in existing, even residential buildings, that have higher vacancy rates because of the fact that people who have a lot more money can live in them , so the vacancy rates are higher for those people?

KAREN: I'm not sure I understand the vacancy rate, but one of the things that is being done right now in terms of looking at sites, and I'm an appointee of the Public Advocate, Betsy Gottbaum, and she is working on a study, which she's doing with funds from the City Council, to look at some of these affordable housing issues. Unfortunately, it hasn't been released, so I don't want to get into a lot of trouble, even though her staff person just left and she'd never know, but one of the things that even the City is doing with HPD and New York City Housing Authority, they're looking at Housing Authority sites that were developed the kind of tower in the garden, where we had lots of space around them, but they're right now looking at taking the parking lots in them to build housing on. And it may be lower rise housing, but they're looking at that in a number of areas, and trying to figure out how many units that can be. Now, I heard one politician who said right away, well why should we take the open space away from the poor people? And you know, we've done a lot of studies to say that that theory about the house in the garden, where we destroyed the infrastructure of the street and that people own their step and they, there was

a definition to this never neverland, that maybe that wasn't the best design that could have been created for that time. But, you know, a lot of them, you can still see the street pattern that goes through it, but now there's kind of a amorphous park with fifteen playgrounds in one area. So it's going to be not politically savvy to take down this playground, but there's a lot of land there and a lot of extra floor area that can be used and built there. The other thing is that, Betsey's study is looking at areas like some of the outer boroughs where we have commercial strips and because of zoning, they have these one-story, commercial buildings, but a lot of those, and there are a lot of models where you have housing over that commercial space. So, there is a potential for building out in residential neighborhoods already that are maybe lower density, but what they would get would be not such noxious uses behind the housing, and make a more pleasant shopping street and give a better transition from auto supply or warehouse to the apartments or houses that are behind it. So, those are things that will be coming out later, but that's part of the things that public advocates do.

TED: I applaud the Housing Authority for doing what it's doing. It's clearly better than the Hope 6 program, which rips down and replaces with low-density suburban housing in many locations in the country. So we in New York have a better model. However, New York does not go into some of the neighborhoods, which they're protecting, because they want to be protected, and their down-zoning certain neighborhoods where they could be increasing the amount of housing stock in those neighborhoods, but the people living there, don't want it. So there's a lot of protectionism in zoning in New York City as there is everywhere in the country, and those people vote. And therefore, our elected officials must continue to get elected. What I think has been very important here is I've learned a couple of very new ideas that are probably going to be the kinds of things that will come out in the 2 days starting June 10th, where an exhibit, an extraordinary exhibit with three universities analyzing UDC's good and bad, really looking at the positive qualities and researching a number of projects. Plus, a symposium that's going to bring people who are real experts and thinkers, not only about the past, but on the future for housing. And this is sort of like a test case, gathering, but you'll see these, this is the way that you can sign up...

RON: We'll tell at the end

TED: Oh, we're going to tell at the end? OK

RON: Yes, I just wanted to say that a lot of the areas that will be available are areas that for many years have been not used for manufacturing. So we're seeing a lot of manufacturing zones in the city being re-zoned to residential. Having said that, we have to be very careful. And that means that a lot of those zones still have jobs. Greenpoint/Williamsburg re-zoning, there are 4,000 jobs and a lot of manufacturing jobs. A lot of them are traditional manufacturing jobs. Many of them are the jobs that Jonathan mentioned earlier like the carpenters, woodworkers, and they're related to the art and design community in the city of New York. We have to make them clean jobs. We have to make them safer jobs, but we can't do away with the concept of livelihood as well as residential. To have a city that has only one form of economy is a mistake. There's one last thing I want to say about visionaries, and I'm sorry Mike left because I think it's really important that we have visionaries, but visionaries, always, also have to be accountable, because unaccountable visionaries create big nightmares for a lot of other people. So it's important to

bring a balance to that whole system.

AUDIENCE: I'm Annette Baum. I guess this is for Ted or anyone else who wants to take it. You said that the city is aberrant, but I see it as acting an awful lot like the suburbs right now, in that, we're allowing big boxes that suck up a hell of a lot of land and I think it's an issue that nobody is talking about here, and we need to talk about it because they're knocking down homes and multi-story buildings that could be turned into homes. And they're buildings IKEAS, and parking lots for IKEAS and Wal-marts and Home Deports and Lowes. These things really don't lend themselves to New York City and the spaces that we have, and what we want to do with these big spaces.

SUSAN: Who wants to address that?

TED: Well, I'll answer you directly in just saying that when I lived in Brooklyn and I heard about big boxes coming near me, I was just as reactionary as anyone else about that, however, I love having Home Depot on 23rd Street. I think it's unbelievable that it fit itself into a building and packed itself in. So, I think there are two sides to that story, but the most important thing that you're saying, is that we shouldn't ever lose housing, we shouldn't ever lose good industry. We don't have to lose any of these things. Where is the creativity that will allow us to have more of the things that we need without losing the things that don't want to lose. There should be solutions to that. And they can be planning and architectural solutions as well as financing solutions to make things piggyback on each other. No one should fear density. Jonathan knows that I don't fear density and he doesn't fear density. Density is something that brings people together and we now live in a world where suburban life is impossible for community; people need each other, and they need to be living closer to each other. And I think that there are enormous opportunities in building more density, in building more lively, more active cities. New York is a wonderful city because of its density, and it has a long way to go before it achieves its maximum.

SUSAN: Do you want to address that suburbanization issue?

RON: Well, yes, I think that the suburbanization of many parts of our city, particularly in parts of the South Bronx and parts of East New York and Brownsville, was something that was totally uncalled for. I'm talking about one family housing, where one of the low points of Ed Logue's career was Charlotte Street, where he built one family houses...

TED: And every Nehemiah Project in the first ten years...destroyed the neighborhoods

RON: And the Nehemiah houses...and a lot of the Partnership houses, which was too low for the infrastructure that surrounded it. It's interesting, the first community-based plan in New York City that was ever initiated and passed, was the Community Board 3 in the South Bronx, and their major proposal was a minimum density. Not a maximum density, but a minimum density, because they didn't like the fact that their shopping streets were decimated. They didn't like the fact that they were forced from walking streets to automobiles to go shopping. It's not the big boxes that are the problem, if they fit into 23rd Street, because they come in and fit the genetic footprint, but

when they come in sprawling and taking up the valuable land, and then force you to drive and take people away from the normal pattern of walking in our streets. Not only is it unhealthy, but it is also downright inappropriate for the City of New York. And I couldn't agree with you more. There are places in New York that are totally dependent on the automobile, maybe in one or two such places you can see these large superstores. I think on 23rd Street, they're acceptable, but at any rate, there's still a place for them, but they've got to fit our pattern of development, and be appropriate to our patterns.

JONATHAN: So, there's actually a value in big box retail, and there's a huge value in the New York City market and we can absolutely dictate design standards and design guidelines. I've been now saying for almost fifteen years, imagine this is a big box store, and you took the street and you said you can't have a parking lot in front, its got to be behind, no parking if you're near transit, and you took the whole street face and you lined it small local retail, you could use the big box to actually enhance and support the small local retails, and if that's the rules for how you move to New York City, those are the rules they're going to follow. So what we need to do from a planning point of view, is determine what are values are, make those values explicit, determine functional design guidelines for executing them, and then stick to it, not give variances.

SUSAN: And not rollover every time somebody comes in and takes all the street numbers off of Third Avenue. Have you tried to find an address on Third Avenue?

JONATHAN: That's an endemic problem in New York City. Why people don't put street numbers, I find this odd. It's the architecture profession (laughter)

SUSAN: You can find them by driving to some corner somewhere, in the suburbs. Here, we rely on numbers. (To audience member) You have a question. You're very unhappy.

AUDIENCE: I'm a proud resident of Mitchell-Lama, so I'm very grateful, but I still can't figure out, in the age of capitalism and commerce, I mean why should they care about poor people in the city when they can sell land at the highest rate. I don't know how you can change the mindset. And one more thing, the thing that was done, on I think 116th Street, where they built one family houses in an area that could have used more high-rise development in that area, they built one family houses. Anyway, so how are you going to convince these people that the highest priced real estate in the country, to get (unintelligible).

TED: Because of long term goals and long term values versus immediate profits and short term gains. Because we are going to be here for a very long time in this city and it should be both for the public good and the private good to have things done properly. Unfortunately, the Nehemiah Houses were built by a church group for good people who needed housing, and it decimated neighborhoods and for the first year or two, you could empathize with them. But the greater good of the City was really lost when that happened. And so it's tragedy upon tragedy because we took infrastructure and under used it and the City can't do that.

RON: Any more questions?

SUSAN: One more

AUDIENCE: One very good question: Long Island City, across the river from Roosevelt Island is being decimated by development. They are coming in and tearing down beautiful landmark eligible Victorian houses and putting up, all I can say is, brick boxes, of 6, 8, 10, 12 units curb to curb construction, no lawn, no nothing, and all of Long Island City it seems, now especially since they down-zoned, the rest is so much (unintelligible) the other part of the borough, Astoria and Long Island City, its just going to be rampaged with bad development.

TED: Scream about it

AUDIENCE: I promise I will.

RON: Not only that but Long Island City is probably the largest concentration of union-based industrial jobs and unless we do something to protect it, will be weakened dramatically, the manufacturing economy of the City. Let me thank Susan for moderating the panel. (applause) Let me thank my fellow panelists for participating. (applause). And before you leave, this is going to be a sort of unabashed plug for a conference that will be held on June 11th at the CUNY Graduate Center and an exhibition that will open here on June 10th, that will both celebrate and learn from the work of the Urban Development Corporation. These walls will have that exhibit. We've been working hard with Ted and Nina Liebman, and a bunch of others, Susan Saegert, and a number of other people, I can't remember everybody's name, but they really have worked hard. Judy Edelman and Jerry Maltz are here, and the AIA folks have been contributing to it as well. The exhibition here will run from June 10 to September 10th. There will be also some other sessions in September. The idea is to look at, learn about it, get excited about it, learn that there is a role for government to play, and maybe a different role. Some of the ideas that were brought forth by Jonathan, are some of the kinds of creativity we want to see discussed during those sessions. And we would like you all, not only to come, but to bring about a half dozen friends with you. And so, there are some flyers outside. We have all your e-mails. You'll get inundated by e-mails, and I've used the network to get to others. And thank you all for coming. (applause)

END OF TAPE 2