

# POLICY AND DESIGN FOR HOUSING

Lessons of the Urban Development Corporation 1968-1975

**FUTURE** Housing for People of Limited Income  
Panel 4, June 11, 2005, 3:00 - 4:30PM

# POLICY AND DESIGN FOR HOUSING

Lessons of the Urban Development Corporation 1968-1975

**FUTURE: Housing for People of Limited Income** Panel 4 - 3:00 - 4:30PM

Symposium Saturday June 11, 2005, 9:00am–6:30pm

@ CUNY Graduate Center, 365 Fifth Avenue at 34th Street, New York City

## STUDENT PRESENTATION:

Kym Libman - Student, Environmental Psychology, CUNY Graduate Center

## PANELISTS:

Roland Lewis - Habitat for Humanity; Housing First

Shaun Donovan - Commissioner, NYC Department of Housing Preservation & Development

Mark Carbone - President, Related Apartments Preservation LLC

Stephen Goldsmith - Director, Enterprise Foundation Frederick P. Rose Architectural Fellowship Program

## MODERATOR:

Susan S. Szenasy - Editor in Chief, Metropolis Magazine

TED LIEBMAN: I'm feeling so much more relaxed now that it's near the end of the day. This is our last panel before the wrap up, last night we heard the origins, today we did a little bit of reminiscing from the beginnings to get thinking about the future, and now I would love us to focus on, in this very different climate that we live in today, how we can move forward, not only with Ed Logue coming back, because unfortunately that can't happen, but with structures that we can create now that will make something move forward and not at a snail's pace. Because some of us actually believe that a housing crisis that has been alluded to by Tony Pangaro and others is more than housing alone. It's the total fabric of urban neighborhoods and society. So before the students are introduced I'm going to introduce the moderator for this panel. She's a fantastic moderator, but during the day, when she's not moderating and during the evening when she's not moderating, she runs Metropolis Magazine as editor, and it's a fantastic magazine that continues to surprise me each month with a broad view of design.

SUSAN SZENASY: Thank you Ted. And now we will hear...(applause)...thank you. And by the way my name is Susan Szenasy- you forgot my name, Ted. OK, so we will continue with the good work of the CUNY students and they will show us how they are thinking about the future. So who's up?

KYM LIBMAN: I am. Hi I'm Kym Libman. I'm one of the students in the environmental psychology program here, and Lauren Tenney and Grace Campagna are going to be passing out two handouts that explain the methods we used in our investigations of Marcus Garvey Village and of Roosevelt Island. So for those of you who are curious as to how we're coming up with our assertions, you'll know a little bit more about what we did to learn what we feel that we now know. If you want to take some extra copies or for some reason you don't get one, we'll also have them available on the table at the back. So, I'll be talking about what we learned from our investigations of Marcus Garvey Village and Roosevelt Island: Some Lessons for the Future.

We learned that design and planning count, but can be undermined, and the focus of this presentation will be to highlight some of the issues we found undermining the design and planning of UDC at these two locations. One is the displacement of low income residents, and we've heard a little bit specifically about Roosevelt Island, the concern of the changing economic climate of the island. Also at the end of our last panel, with the buyout of the Mitchell-Lama development there and the eventual attrition of the vouchers, that when residents who are there under affordable housing now may leave, those units are going to be gone. And neglect of social infrastructure: with these developments, particularly in the case of Marcus Garvey Village, UDC was correct in planning places like community centers, day care centers, mews and other areas for community involvement. However, social infrastructure is needed to be in place to help to program those spaces and make sure that they are utilized to create the social fabrics needed to support this development. Design and planning count but can also be undermined by lack of physical maintenance.

These are some pictures that we took of Marcus Garvey Village, and as we heard in the earlier Operations discussion, the way that the development is being maintained is not addressing some of the structural issues. The picture on your right is a picture of a bathroom that the resident had fixed a number of times herself, but the piping in this part of the development had been faulty and was continually leaking. So it's a matter of doing serious fixing and not just patching of the physical structures.

Negative socio-economic changes can also overwhelm the vision, and one of the key findings that we had with Marcus Garvey Village was that in looking at the development in an historical context, the community memory was of the development's opening being sort of a hey-day when it really worked the way UDC had envisioned. Then, as the development changed hands and fell into the climate of the crack epidemic of New York City in the 1980's, the social factors that were challenging to Brownsville at large became intensified by some of the design elements of Marcus Garvey Village.

Design and planning count, but can also be undermined by decreased public investment in the whole community. As we've heard from a number of panelists today, with the Model Cities Program there was supposed to be support for UDC's development by investing in the communities in the neighborhoods where these developments were constructed, and in many cases that investment was never fulfilled. Also, design and planning count, but can be undermined by privatization and fragmentation of responsibility. So here we see, particularly in the case of Marcus Garvey Village, almost 30 years after the development was first occupied it's been turned over to a private owner and a separate sub-contracted management company. With that fragmentation of the responsibility of maintaining the physical and social infrastructure of the development, a lot of UDC's initial social programming visions have not been realized or maintained.

So we'll leave you with a question. How can design and planning work together over the long haul to create socially integrated spaces of democracy and opportunity? And how can we achieve ongoing partnerships among residents, community building, and management? Thank you. [applause]

SUSAN: OK, so this is about the future, and I just wanted to tell you that Ed Logue is not coming back. No matter what we do, he won't be back. He may be in the building, but he's not coming back. OK, I'd like to also say that youth in general is idealistic by nature, especially architecture and design students. I know because I teach them. I teach them all over the country and the minute their idealistic button is pushed, they are there with you. They are ahead of you, and they think about social issues very carefully, and concentratively. I would also like to remind you of the realities of 1960's idealism. Frankly, for most people, other than several people working for the UDC, for most of the American population the youth-quake was about more sex, drugs and rock 'n' roll than about social activism, though there were some on the picket lines. But I think in general we can't generalize. So let's not punish ourselves for not being '60's idealists. There are idealists in every generation.

I'd like to also remind you of the huge technical, technological gap, an ideology gap between the students in the schools and their teachers. When I ask students about what their teachers tell them about sustainability, about social responsibility, they say mostly not much. And when they're asked about how they relate to their teachers on technology, mostly they say the teachers aren't equipped to teach them about technology. So I think those gaps are missing and those gaps are to be remedied and I think there's a lot of work to be done on every level.

We should also remember that affordable housing is no longer just an issue of race and culture, but it is also a huge problem of youth today. None of my editors can afford to live in New York City, or in Manhattan rather. They're all out in the various boroughs, and that's just fine because those boroughs are taking over and they're becoming very exciting places to be. However, I think housing is definitely a youth issue.

And finally before I ask my first question, I'd like to say that I would like to hope that in the future when we have another remembrance of Ed Logue or somebody else, we will have panelists who are not just either middle-aged white men or in this case all young white men. We need to have experts from every field, every race, every gender, on these panels and everywhere, talking about these issues. Finally, I see the student population, or the between 18 and 25 population, incredibly at ease with crossing racial and cultural boundaries, and so some of those issues that we struggled with in the past 30 years are probably not going to be issues. However, affordability in housing will be an issue for quite a long time.

So I'd like to ask our panelists, one by one, and I'll go by the order in which they're listed on your program, to describe what it is that their organizations contribute to making the future of housing for people with limited income, and that, as I described to you, is an extremely varied population. What is it that their organizations are thinking, or can be doing, are doing, are planning to do, to remedy this housing shortage situation? The first person will be Roland Lewis, who is with Habitat for Humanity.

ROLAND LEWIS: Thank you, Susan. I'm actually also with Housing First, and I think I'm speaking primarily on behalf of Housing First today, although I'll be happy to talk about Habitat as well. For those of you who are not familiar with it, Housing First is an unprecedented coalition of about 300

banks, churches, and housing organizations that got together prior to the last election to put forward a housing program, first to raise the issue of housing to its prominent and just level within the Mayoral campaign of that time, and put forward a realistic program that would allow the Mayoral candidates to respond to and hopefully elaborate on in terms of their own housing programs. It was quite successful. The politicians poll these things often.

When we started our work in the Mayoral campaign, housing was rated around 8 or 9 in terms of issues that the population was concerned about. Everyone knew about the housing crisis but it wasn't up there with education and crime. By the time the Mayoralty election rolled around, first the primary and then the full election, it was number three, a solid number three right behind education and crime. More importantly, each of the Mayoral candidates, including the subsequent winner, Shaun's boss, Mayor Bloomberg, had detailed and aggressive housing programs that they were planning to put forth as part of their campaign and part of their administration.

Shaun will probably speak about the work this administration has done, work Mayor Bloomberg's administration has done to forward housing programs, but there was a lot of work we subsequently did with this administration to make sure housing was intelligently and prominently put forth. Probably the most famous is the new housing marketplace, in which the Mayor, in the depths of a fiscal crisis that New York had not seen in a generation, put forth an incredibly aggressive and holistic housing program that we frankly were pleasantly surprised about. We lobbied and advocated, and they put forward more than we were expecting at that moment. It didn't meet what Susan was talking about in some areas though, not as much as we want for the low income side of the spectrum. But it was a substantial investment in housing, and they continued putting forth programs - not just because Shaun's sitting 12 inches to my right. This administration has made housing a keystone of its work and we appreciate that.

SUSAN: So how does Habitat fit into this?

ROLAND: Habitat is a member of the coalition, the Housing First Coalition, and we build housing with Habitat's style. I think many of you are familiar with the Jimmy Carter style of building with volunteers and sweat equity. We build in the Bronx, Harlem, Queens, Brooklyn. We also do advocacy. We work very hard with sister coalitions and Housing First on the inclusionary zoning program, on Battery Park City on a new policy where, for the first time, the funds that were supposed to be put into housing from Battery Park City revenue are being allocated. So we do advocacy in housing and generation. I'd like to invite all of you to come on June 20th to the New School, where Housing First will be unveiling its new program for this 2005 Mayoral campaign, the election this year. We again are proposing a substantial investment in housing.

As you know, as the students were pointing out, things have changed. We're a country at war. There's a Federal agenda that needs to be addressed. No matter who is Mayor we'll have to work hand-in-glove to try to effect Federal policy that will help New Yorkers. New York has done tremendous work over the last generation. No doubt. Many of the answers lie in Albany and more importantly in Washington D.C. I'll just conclude with a plea that if you're not involved with Housing First, you can be. It is a collection of folks and organizations that care deeply about

housing for all New Yorkers, and I would invite you to come to our general meeting on the 20th and get involved in what will be a robust effort to once again make housing a critical issue for all our leaders, especially the Mayor.

SUSAN: OK, are you the guys who are the unruly crowd when some rent hike is propagated?

ROLAND: No, we're a pretty ruly crowd; we have a lot of banks, and actual developers, a very wide coalition. Some of the folks involved with Housing First of course are part of those demonstrations, but the great thing about Housing First and also about Habitat is that they are big tents. They encompass many different ideologies, and find common ground around investment for more reasons, for economic reasons, for any number of reasons in housing for all New Yorkers.

SUSAN: OK, thank you Roland. Now we will get Shaun Donovan, the Commissioner of New York City Department of Housing Preservation & Development, to talk about this controversial inclusionary housing, and my dread of what's going to happen in Brooklyn, because I can see, I can just see that incredible building stock in the kind of scuzzy wonderfulness of Brooklyn, being white-washed into a new Battery Park City, so put my mind at ease Shaun. [laughter]

SHAUN DONOVAN: How do you recover from that? I was actually going to try, and I'm not sure which question I'm responding to here. You had a question more broadly about what we do, and I was going to give some context as to what my agency does. I'll be happy to talk as much about inclusionary housing as folks would like. We really do four things within the City at the Department of Housing Preservation and Development. First of all, probably the thing were best known for which the folks in the room would recognize, we invest a broad range of dollars into the creation and preservation of affordable housing. The agency has about a billion dollar budget every year, and just over half of that, in the neighborhood of 600 million dollars a year, goes into capital for building or rebuilding affordable housing across the City. So that's an enormously important function. We create or preserve roughly 16,000 apartments around New York City.

Second of all, we play a very important regulatory function, and I think it's a little-recognized but key piece of the overall issues of not just housing affordability but also quality. We get calls literally from every range of tenant in New York City, whether it's because their heat's not working, because they have lead paint problems and their children are being poisoned - a range of different issues for which they call the City's 311 number. We conduct over half-a-million inspections every year in apartments in New York City, and the first step is to work with those owners to get those problems corrected. If the owners do not, we will first of all send emergency repair crews to those units, and we have a large team of legal staff that will actually take those owners to court to try to get them to rectify whatever poor conditions those tenants are dealing with. So that's part of our regulatory function. Also, and I think you've heard about it earlier today, we work very closely with the Department of City Planning and others to devise broader regulatory policies, whether it be inclusionary zoning, whether it be tax incentives, or a range of other things that exercise the regulatory powers of the City to try to create and preserve affordable housing.

Third of all, we are both a kind of research organization, and we like to think of ourselves as a think tank about housing for New York City, also performing an advocacy role. We spend a great deal of time at the State level, but particularly at the Federal level these days, given what's happening in Washington, advocating for a re-strengthening of the Federal role in affordable housing. And then, finally, and this is perhaps amorphous but in context of what we're doing today, given the broad ways that the housing market is changing in New York City and has changed over the last few years, we are a convener of what is now an extremely complex set of players in affordable housing in New York.

If you think about the context in which UDC operated, the power of the public sector at that time was very different from what it is today, and there are both good things and bad things about that. You think about not only the way the private sector has increasingly become intertwined with affordable housing, but really a phenomenal development is the whole explosion of the non-profit sector in affordable housing as owners, as managers, a range of different roles that non-profits play today that they didn't 20 or 30 years ago. And we function in some ways as a convener of that, bringing together the many different folks within that community to try and focus on affordable housing. Just one example of that. Last week for a day-and-a-half we met at Gracie Mansion, funded by the Macarthur Foundation, to focus on this issue: what do we do to preserve the more than 200,000 units of privately-owned subsidized affordable housing? Whether it's Mitchell-Lama's, tax credit properties, HPD subsidized properties, those are an enormous resource that we have in New York City. Again, over 200,000 units, closer to 250,000, and as you've heard today, the expiration of those units' contracts is an enormously important issue that we're facing. So we brought together not just the best thinkers from New York City, but also from across the country, with the Macarthur Foundation, to think about what we could be doing more proactively to try and attack the issues around that stock. Those are really the four roles that we play in New York City.

SUSAN: Thank you, Shaun. We will now hear from Mark Carbone, who's the President of Related Apartments Preservation.

MARK: Shaun, what was the end result of the conference? What's the answer?

SHAUN: They were all saved this week. All 250,000 units! [laughter]

MARK CARBONE: First of all, we're one of the proud sponsors of the conference this weekend. Glad to do it. Related is a very large, privately-owned real estate company based here in New York City, although Related owns properties throughout the country, and soon, throughout the world. It's continually growing and expanding, and even though Related is one of the developers of the Time-Warner Center, which is not affordable housing by any stretch of the imagination, Related got its start in affordable housing back in the early '70's, 1972 to be exact, founded by Steven Ross. About six months ago, in preparation for this conference, Nina Liebman gave me a list of all the UDC properties in New York City and New York State. In going through that list I noticed five properties that Related either developed or has recently purchased. We have now restructured and purchased, from one partnership via another partnership, all of those properties. And we have done it in a few different ways, but the common link is that we have invested new

money into the properties, because the properties, as everyone knows, are older and in need of repair in many cases, some minor, some major.

A good example is a property called Walnut Hill in Haverstraw. I think it was the first property that Related developed, back in 1972. Flat roofs, wooden siding that was totally falling apart a couple of years ago, and we purchased the property from the old partnership, and structured it as a 236 decoupling new tax-credit property. Now there are a lot of different things that go into that, I'm not even going to start to explain all of it, other than we were able to combine a few different sources of subsidy including tax abatement, including tax credits, and tax exempt bonds from HFA (New York State Housing Finance Agency), and we were able to put 5 million dollars into the rehabilitation of the property, and it looks fabulous today. It's on the brochure here, and it's in the exhibition. It's called Cosgrove Avenue, called Walnut Hill; it's also called Cosgrove Housing. It was a Mitchell-Lama. We were able to take it out of Mitchell-Lama and preserve and extend the affordability because we entered into the low-income housing tax credit program, which sets a minimum of 15 years, We also got tax credits and bond-funding from New York State Housing, so that carries a 40-year extended affordability time period. That's one of maybe 20 properties we've done that way in the last three years. We've done many in different ways.

Again, I can't go into all the different techniques but that's Related Apartments Preservation, that's our charter, that's our goal in the future. In order to help us and to help other for-profit affordable housing developers, what we're looking for and what we need is a lot more subsidy and a lot more help from the Cities, from the States and especially from the Federal government. Anytime anyone in the government wants to know my specific ideas, Shaun will be glad to sit down and explain it, but the Related Apartments Preservation Division of Related Companies is very proud to be part of affordable housing, and we hope to be doing this for a long time to come, and hopefully be able to lead some other people along and show that it can be done.

SUSAN: How does Related define affordable housing? What's the income group for your affordable housing units?

MARK: We're involved with a lot of Section 8 properties because of the age of the company. We were one of the first companies to get involved in the mid '70's when Section 8 started. We probably own 80 project-based Section 8 properties. We've been involved with many Section 236 decoupling projects, where we receive, as of right, Section 8 vouchers. We bought Manhattan Plaza a year-and-a-half ago, which is one of the largest Mitchell-Lama's, it's one of the only Mitchell-Lama Section 8 projects in the whole country. It's a large project here in Times Square that has a 90% Section 8 project-based contract. The remaining 10% are retained as a Mitchell-Lama type property, and low-income housing tax credits are involved, intertwined in many ways with those types of properties also.

SUSAN: OK, but for my own edification, let's say I just came to work at Metropolis Magazine as a 27-year-old young editor and I'm making \$30,000. Where do I live in New York City?

MARK: Probably not in Manhattan to start, but I think that's one of the problems that we're facing, a lack of a new affordable housing stock coming specifically into New York City, specifically into

Manhattan. We bought Ocean Park Apartments in Far Rockaway, it's a 600-unit Mitchell-Lama; we combined tax abatement from HPD, which was a huge help and enabled us to buy. Again we did a 236 decoupling, but unfortunately for new tenants, that property had a huge waiting list of several thousand tenants, so it's difficult for new people to enter into affordable housing,. So the answer to preserving housing is a lot easier and more clearly defined, more easily answered than the new people trying to enter into the affordable housing arena as tenants.

SUSAN: OK, just as an aside, as the employer of that young editor I have to give her a raise because she cannot afford to live here, and it puts my operating costs at a very high level. Therefore we have to charge more to our advertisers who are probably not going to pay it, so you know where the whole of it goes. We all know where all of it goes, and I'll get off that soapbox right now. OK, next we will have Stephen Goldsmith, who is director of the Enterprise Foundation, the Frederick P. Rose Architectural Fellowship Program. Stephen.

STEPHEN GOLDSMITH: The Frederick P. Rose Architectural Fellowship Program of the Enterprise Foundation was started in 1999 by Jonathan Rose and his family. It is a remarkable program and it is an antidote to the opportunity you have to grab your prozac samples on the way out after the last discussions. These idealistic young professionals throughout the United States are placed in non-profit organizations all over the country. It's a very competitive process. We take new architects, new architects being those just out of school for about 3 to 5 years. We place them in non-profits for a full three years, fully funded with a salary and benefits. They live in the community where they work, and they're engaged in the healing and repairing and transforming of those places. They're doing hands-on architecture. They're doing community organizing. What they're really doing is picking up where those of you who were pioneers in this some thirty years ago, who I wouldn't say left off because your still engaged, but the work that you did really set the tone. You really fertilized the ground for this next generation of practitioners. Remember, these are kids who are now practicing who hate automobiles. I mean think of the shift in time from when people were practicing architecture coming in with Corbu's models 30, 40, 50 years ago, when the love of the automobile was still part of the culture. These are kids who, if they were not architect's today, might be eco-terrorists (with Ron Shiffman and a few other people). (laughter) Instead, they're taking their skills and their passion and putting them to good use all over the country.

They're working in such diverse places as Indian reservations, teaching communities how to build homes out of straw bales, a rapidly renewable resource that they have access to in those communities, so site specific. The diversity of housing types, the diversity of housing needs, the diversity of cultural differences requires that we be flexible as you all know. And this flexibility, this endless series of adjustments that the Fellows have to make, is part really of a virtual architectural practice that the Rose Fellowship runs from coast to coast. So we have one Fellow, Nathaniel Corn (name?), working in the Northwest plains. We have a young woman, Katie Swanson (name?), who happened to be at an event at the Center for Architecture, where we had an exhibition of the Rose Fellows work, and she said "my God, look at this incredible storefront and how it's inviting community participation in through this front window. What if I set up a community development corporation like this in Charlottesville, Virginia?" which she has done. And one of the projects that she is working on right now is to see if she can find a way to heal

and repair some of the practices of my fine colleague at Habitat, because sometimes Habitat has been known for not building places of lasting value.

The need to create shelter quickly is very important, and we should always pat ourselves on the back for that, but building places of lasting value, something that Jonathan Rose and his family feel very strongly about, is a priority. So she's raised about \$250,000 in the past year to do an international design competition to take a Habitat project in Charlottesville, which is a series of trailer homes and other dwellings, and find a way to make them greener, try to find a way to make sure that there's public space and social space and connections to schools around it.

These visionary young practitioners are the people I get to work with every day. I have the best job in the world. So what the Rose Fellowship does, Susan, to answer your question, is to take the county's brightest, most talented, holistic thinking practitioners and place them into opportunities where they can work for a full three years, fully funded, with the long-term goal of being leaders in public interest architecture. When Jonathan Rose recruited me for this position, I said you know, I really don't care that much for architects as a rule. I have watched the whorish behavior and the rape of the landscape from coast to coast and Jonathan, if you really want me for this, it's going to be under this context; you know, Philip Johnson's first rule of architecture was, "get the job." That was the first rule of architecture. If I take this job, you have to understand that it's a long term process, maybe a generation, because the first rule of architecture needs to become, "first, do no harm." And we need to have a series of young practitioners who are going to be the leaders of the AIA, locally and nationally, so there is a new ethos and new ethic. So that's what the Rose Fellowship program does out in the field.

SUSAN: Is there an Ed Logue among them?

STEPHEN: There's not one among them.

SUSAN: Now my follow-up question for that. There is an incredible groundswell among these young people that you're talking about. We know some of the same people and they are incredible activists. Not just one person. When they have an idea, they convince a lot more people of their ideas. Do you know of any other organization like the architectural fellowship, the Rose Architectural Fellowship, that is duplicating some of what you do, so that there is more of this?

STEPHEN: Not duplicating, no. The Rose Fellowship is unique that way. But what we are finding is that there is a reinvigoration of public interest architecture and the community development movement. I'll give you some examples. In fact, there was that piece, an editorial in Architectural Record this last month. It said something is in the air, it talked about the work of Design Corp, Brian Bell's group, it talked about Association for Community Design being reinvigorated. It talked about a number of different groups. It even mentioned Architecture for Social Responsibility, I believe, and 1% Solution. These are people who are coming together and finding new alignments, new ways to invest their passion and their interest and their time, so that this healing and repairing that I mentioned can go on. It's not the fellowship process, but there is a national linking of arms if you will, around these issues, a holistic approach.

SUSAN: So, Shaun. How do you get into that daisy chain of arms that everybody's linking? It's a really interesting research organization for you to tap into, some of this great work that the Rose Fellows and others are doing. Are you getting into all of this research or are you doing your pure research aside from what they're doing?

SHAUN: Well, I'll make a couple of comments about it and maybe I'd start with the context of my own experience, because I was actually a graduate student in architecture. One of my summers in architecture school I worked in Ted Liebman's office and ended by writing a paper about Roosevelt Island. And I took a Housing Policy class in my second year at the Kennedy School and ended up becoming hooked, so I became more of a practitioner of the policy side than of architecture, but my experience coming out of school was that I never thought about working in government. To me, the sad thing about the loss of faith in government that we've had more broadly, is that many of the people in this room who thought about a public-spirited career 20 or 30 years ago, thought about the public sector as working for government. At HPD we run a housing fellows program where we get 10 times as many resumes from literally the strongest students you could possibly imagine around the country who want to come and work for very little money at the City housing agency for a few years. Yet there is not nearly as broad a pool today of people thinking about entering public service in the government. They think about entering public service, I think, in terms of going to a non-profit, in the way frankly that I did when I came out of graduate school. I went to work for a group called the Community Preservation Corporation here in New York City. And so I think that we do tap into, to go to your question as much as possible, the work of community groups.

We work very, very closely with the Enterprise Foundation and others. We're trying to do more with the AIA and other groups here to raise the level of design quality in the work that we do. We've done a number of international community charettes that involve not just planners and architects, but also get local community residents into a room for a day or two to really think through, before we begin a project, the issues around planning and design. So we're trying to do that. Personally, what I would like to see more of, is an ability for government to get back to attracting the kind of talent and idealism that we're talking about today. I think more broadly with this, the ethos of the UDC was really about the power of government to do something, and I think for many reasons that has declined in the country, and we need to focus in government on bringing that back.

SUSAN: A little thing. Is there a central web bank of all this information that people can dip into from all ... (end of tape)

SHAUN: (beginning of new tape) ... you know, are there resources available for national? There are too few of them. There are groups like the Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University. The Schill Center here at NYU does some of that, but I'm on the Board of a group called the Campaign for Affordable Housing, which is a national group that's attempting to really play that clearinghouse role, looking at groups like Housing First and others, how you build a movement and campaigns around affordable housing in cities and states across the country, and I think that's one direction that that group is moving, but there aren't enough of the kind of resources that

you're talking about.

SUSAN: OK, now for all of you, and whoever wants to answer this please jump in, and in fact the audience should jump in here too. We have something confronting us that has been confronting us for quite a while, but now is becoming an urgency, and that's environmental degradation and what it actually means for low-income people. If their utility bills are so high that they cannot afford to keep paying them because the houses are built so porously and so poorly it obviously affects their quality of lives beyond the actual housing, affordable housing, that you're providing. So, how are environmental issues falling into all of your programs, and how are you thinking about this?

ROLAND: Let me answer; I can actually give a partial defense of Habitat too. Habitat New York has taken on advocacy positions, and Habitat International, our parent organization from Georgia, is following suit. One of the areas that we've been working very steadily on, with lots of success on the building side and on advocacy side, is green building. We built the first energy star rated homes here in New York that are built like thermoses. They were the first energy star low-income housing actually in New York, and we're in the design phase of a building on Atlantic Avenue in Brooklyn that will be LEED or close to LEED, it'll be enterprise LEED. There's an enterprise that's a slightly different environmental standard in terms of sustainability and energy conservation. So it is something that is even in Habitat. I agree with a lot of the design issues you mentioned regarding how Habitat is built across the country. It's now become an issue of (unintelligible), in terms of design and energy conservation for us as builders and us as advocates.

SUSAN: Anybody else on this sustainability question?

STEPHEN: About 8 months ago, the Enterprise Foundation announced a new program called the Green Communities Initiative. It's a 500 million dollar pool of funds, equity, that will be given in grants that will go to non-profits to help them to begin greening their projects. What began to grow in this evolution of consciousness about how we build human settlements is that if our mission is to create safe affordable decent housing, how can we build affordable housing that is not also green? How can it be possible to build affordable housing that does not link the sites to transit and those places that don't have transit? How can we separate people so far that they're required to use automobiles, which may be substandard automobiles in some parts of the country, to get to their jobs? This connection is to make sure that we're designing with all of the systems. We design within social systems, so by the energy costs, we're working on that sort of thing. We're designing within economic systems, and we're designing within environmental systems. It's this linkage, this integration of this elegant design process, that the Green Communities Initiative focuses on. And Rose Fellows has been very instrumental in doing training around the country in this new program.

SUSAN: Could I ask one more question? Regarding the buildings themselves, I know that a lot of effort is now being made to qualify them for this rating program that has been devised by the US Green Building Council, which is a wonderful thing. But beyond that, we know that low-income communities have unusually high rates of respiratory diseases like asthma, and that has a lot to do with planning and what's around them and what kind of noxious industries or whatever it is

that's producing it, or the paints that are producing it in those houses, or whatever is producing those illnesses. What sort of thinking goes on about remedying that, because it obviously also adds to our health-care costs?

STEPHEN: Well, I think what we're getting at, Susan, is that this is a way of thinking about building. So you can come into building green as an environmental issue. You can come into building green as an energy issue. You can come into building green as a public health issue. And I think many, probably including the Board of the Enterprise Foundation from listening to some of their conversations, see the green side of this as public health, and of course one of the side benefits is environmental health, but these are public health issues for exactly the reasons we've described.

SHAUN: I would add a couple of things. First, on the earlier question, we have worked very hard, closely with Enterprise Foundation, to really look at our specifications, not just on new construction where I think the LEED standards are really making a significant difference. We recently opened the largest green affordable housing project in the country on Fifth Avenue in Harlem, so there is a lot of focus on the new construction. There also has to be more focus, and we're beginning to do that on the specifications for rehabilitation. And often, you know, there are very small things you can do that make a big difference in the long run. Where I think the biggest challenge is, is to think about how to get the private sector, particularly the financial community, to integrate thinking about green design in the day-to-day work that they do, because ultimately, economically, there are enormous benefits, whether it be lower utility bills, or the renovations that need to be done a decade or two down the line, things that the financial community does not currently recognize when they look at how a building operates.

So one of the things that we're focused on is how you get a bank to say, if you do this, whether it's energy star or other standards upon construction, we'll actually allow you to have a bigger loan. Or we'll recognize that the utility bills will be lower and so we'll adjust the rents accordingly. So there is a range of things that you can do, which are not the sexy things that people talk about around green design, that ultimately can be catalytic and really drive this not just into folks who think they're being green, but to the folks who never actually think about it, developers who are really just looking at the bottom line. The other thing that has been our real focus at HPD is lead poisoning. And we've made an enormous amount of progress. Lead poisoning in the City has dropped by 80% over the last 8 years. It's very, very focused in the lowest income communities, in what we call the lead belt, in Brooklyn and other communities, and a lot of it involves the very basic work of replacing windows, replacing any of the basic components, doors, other kinds of friction surfaces when you're doing that kind of renovation. But it's often with small contractors and it's very, very difficult to get that education done though we do a lot. We'll do 27,000 lead classes this year for small contractors and small owners about how to do renovations in a safe way. And that's a very important part of what HPD is doing on that issue.

SUSAN: OK, Mark what is Related doing about these issues specifically?

MARK: I think for every property we've purchased and renovated we've replaced windows. That's number one, the best way to cut down on utility bills. We do master metering in any case

that we can so that we can have more control over energy use. And, as Shaun mentioned, the lead paint issue: although it's sort of a problem and a pain for private developers, I think in the long run it's helpful for everyone to eradicate the problem, and we've done that in the buildings where we've needed to.

SUSAN: Now, what struck us all along in doing these presentations is the kind of social consciousness that was expressed in the work of the UDC, and we all applaud that. I believe, and apparently all of us on this panel believe, that environmental awareness and the need to remake our world, essentially our modern world, into a more post-industrial, healthy world, is a real social issue around which social consciousness is being built. Do you all have any comments to make on that issue, so that this seems to be a renewed commitment to some sort of a larger idea? I think the UDC worked because it was a larger idea. It wasn't just about building housing. Ed Logue worked because he had a vision of a larger idea, of a better idea of what humanity could be, and I think the environmental issues that are the concerns of so many young people today are representing that larger idea. Do you agree with that, and can we, in your estimation, build on that a new momentum?

ROLAND: I agree with what you said. This is a conversation we're having at Housing First, not just about the environmental and green issues, although that's a piece of it. It's what will capture imagination as we roll out a campaign and a program. One idea I think is fundamental to New York is what you've spoken of earlier, Susan, that young employee and mixed-income neighborhoods. I'm very happy that, as was originally intended, Mayor Bloomberg got money from Battery Park City that should have gone to affordable housing. A wrong that was never righted, however, was the fact that Battery Park City was supposed to be a mixed-income community to begin with, but that's gone. I look at some of these statistics often, and one just blew me away the other day. Everyone knows that there is an extremely low vacancy rate, but the vacancy rate in the outer boroughs is actually much lower. It's lower than I ever expected. It's about 1.4%, 1.3% in the poorer neighborhoods of New York. So there's no housing available even in those neighborhoods. There's less and less; you cannot live in Manhattan, as Mark said a few minutes ago. So I think that's a big idea that's very resonant with New Yorkers, as is the environmental idea of having a sustainable community. The last thing I'll say on this is that David Owen (name?) wrote a wonderful article I'm sure many of us read in the New Yorker about sustainability and how energy-efficient our city is. The fact that living in this city is an environmental statement itself, relative to the suburbs and exurbs and other areas also. That's something we can rally around, so I think you've got something there, Susan.

SHAUN: I want to pick up on something that Roland said, because I believe that if you look at what seems to be the loss of faith in the ability of government to make change, particularly positive change, particularly in affordable housing, you think about the image of public housing for many people across the country. They perceive so many negative consequences of what many would think of as the failure of public housing. I don't want to agree with that evaluation but certainly there is a very broad perception in the average population in America that our experiment with public housing was a failure. One of the few positive things that I think has grown out of that, in a lot of the work including William Julius Wilson writing about Chicago and other neighborhoods, is a growing recognition in affordable housing about the value of

mixed-income neighborhoods, mixed-income housing. And I think, for me personally, one of the things that has been so satisfying about this discussion around inclusionary housing is that it is fundamentally about creating new neighborhoods that are integrated from the beginning.

Much of the focus has been on the Hope 6 Program, the demolition of existing public housing, but there has been very little focus on the more constructive aspect of it, rather than the destructive aspect. How can you look at places where you will create new neighborhoods, and from the very beginning, create integrated neighborhoods, both on an economic and on a racial basis? That is the great hope of doing something like inclusionary zoning, and if you think about the model of UDC, it was appropriate for its time when government was the tool, and there was a faith in the ability to do things with government that we frankly don't have today. Inclusionary zoning is a tool that uses the regulatory power of government, but latches onto the power of the private market, and uses that power and directs it towards a public good, which I think we all recognize is the benefit of creating mixed-income neighborhoods.

SUSAN: Ron Shiffman has a question. I believe he's heading for the microphone. While he makes his way up there, some observations about the social side. Just a couple please.

STEPHEN: We see this constantly with the Rose Fellows at every level of intervention. We see it where they, maybe working in neighborhoods where there is a vacant lot, an infill site that may be in dispute, or maybe a brownfield, and they'll realize that this is connective tissue in the neighborhood and they'll organize the community, young and old, to turn it into a community garden, just to hold it there. In a different way, it becomes a social space. That kind of an intervention by itself, even though it may be insignificant in architectural terms, becomes significant in the terms of the neighborhood. So at every level, in every way, they check their work against economy, environment, and social justice.

SUSAN: Ron Shiffman.

RON SHIFFMAN: I really welcome Shaun's comments about inclusionary zoning and the fact that it can bring about mixed-income and mixed racially-integrated communities. I'm a bit concerned however about 3 things that relate to it. First of all, I'm concerned about almost the acceptance - I'm not talking about Shaun alone, I'm talking about all of us - of the fact that Manhattan will become almost exclusively for the wealthy. I'm concerned about the fact that even inclusionary zoning, which is something I'm a strong advocate of, will require, the way we are proceeding, bigger and bigger buildings, buildings that may be a contradiction to the built environment in many communities, in order to induce the private sector to come in there. I'm wondering whether there aren't methods of requiring inclusionary requirements or incentivizing inclusionary requirements that don't lead to the overbuilding, which, for instance, is occurring in Greenpoint/Williamsburg. Albeit a victory, it's still a funny one.

I'm a bit concerned about how we're allowing the rebuilding of Lower Manhattan, an area where in an emergency we came together as a city. I met Susan there in the post-9/11 period, but we came together on 9/11 no matter what our income was, and now we're allowing housing to be built today in Lower Manhattan that a fireman, a policeman, a teacher, can't afford to live in. It's

somewhat a contradiction to me of what happened there, and about the symbolism that we're sending out. And I'm wondering if there's some leadership that we can see from the City towards the State and towards others, to make sure that the kinds of development that we build have the vision - not only Ed Logue's vision, but a vision I think we all have, embedded from the '60's and the '70's and the '80's - about building places where we can all live, no matter what our income, of communities of quality. I'm just wondering if there's anything we can hope for, from this administration, from Habitat, from Housing First, from Enterprise, from others, that will incentivize the kind of building that brings about these communities and begins to put a greater amount of moral suasion into what we're doing, and not just sit back and accept Manhattan for the wealthy.

SHAUN: A couple things on that, Ron. First of all, one of the things that's been missed in all the news about the stadium is that there was a rezoning of Manhattan's Far West Side that is actually going to create close to 14,000 apartments (we estimate that Greenpoint/Williamsburg will create about 11,000 apartments) and there was a very substantial inclusionary program. It was actually the very first; it was passed before Greenpoint/Williamsburg, so it was the very first of the really significant shifts in New York City's inclusionary policy. We expect to get close to 30% of the units that are developed there available for affordable housing, the large majority of them dedicated to the lowest income groups, roughly for a family of four making \$30,000-40,000 a year, so you are talking about firefighters and others who are comparable. Possibly within this week, but maybe next week, the City Council is going to be voting on rezoning for West Chelsea, which is just south of the Hudson Yards rezoning, that will also include a substantial inclusionary component. So certainly from our perspective, we're not ceding the view that inclusionary zoning can work only for boroughs other than Manhattan. In fact, ironically because of the way that it works, the stronger the market, the more effective a tool it is. So I actually see it as precisely targeted at the strongest markets in the City, like Manhattan.

Second of all, we could have a very long debate, and I don't want to go down that road, on density. But just recognize that much of what we did in Greenpoint/Williamsburg was actually a down-zoning in the sense that we put height limits on the existing neighborhoods in Greenpoint/Williamsburg that were not there before. There are a number of very, very tall buildings going up now that are completely inconsistent with the scale of those neighborhoods, that will not be able to be built in the future because of the changes that were made. So I do think that there is some sort of fine-tuned thinking about the context of the neighborhoods in the re-zonings. Mostly what people have focused on is the tall buildings on the waterfront (and I will admit that I grew up on the 36th floor of an apartment building; I feel that I turned out OK despite growing up in a tall building). There is a real tradition of density and height in New York, that when done right and done well is not just OK, but actually can be glorious architecturally. So there's a very subtle extended discussion we can have about scale and the way to insert density into the City.

From my perspective though, the thing that gets missed is that the City gained close to 700,000 people during the 1990's. That's more people than live in the entire City of Boston. We have to figure out places to build in New York City, and politically it is very difficult. Everybody will recognize the need to build but nobody will want it done in their neighborhood. So we have to figure out ways to create density and insert a huge number of housing units to keep up with the population expansion that we have in New York City. And that to me is the most fundamental

affordable housing issue, the incredible lack of supply that we have. We built more housing units last year than we have in 32 years, since 1972, since the time of UDC, but we're still not keeping up with the enormous demand that we have. So we have to figure out where we can rezone, where we can find places to appropriately put density.

RON SHIFFMAN: I have a good friend, happens to be a planner from abroad, who talks about the genetic footprint of communities, and I'm not talking about lower densities, I'm talking about different forms for buildings based on their areas. I think we could have come up with a much more appropriate footprint and building type for Greenpoint/Williamsburg without compromising the integrity of their genetic footprint. What I was referring to earlier was really the liberty-bond money that is flowing in from the Federal government into the rebuilding of lower Manhattan, which is being used primarily for people who earn over \$100,000 a year. I'm not debating with you because I know where you stand, and I think it's not far from where I stand on that issue. I do think you have more land now. You now have the stadium site to build housing on, and if you thought about how to rebuild it maybe we could take some of the platform money and invest it in affordable housing.

MARK: Let me just add something else. Another thorn in some people's sides, the private sector, is this whole Mitchell-Lama issue in New York City. You could do another seminar, two days of sessions on Mitchell-Lamas and what's happening today. I think that a lot of what's happening is a travesty for the affordable housing business because people are opting out, buying out of these properties, these projects, right and left. There was a bit of an uproar a few years ago, and it seems to have died down. I don't follow it too closely because unfortunately it's very difficult for us, as affordable housing area, to buy these types of projects because the prices are going through the roof; owners are looking for atmospheric prices. Just as an example, there's a great property in northern Manhattan, not too far north, and we were approached by the owner to buy it because they knew we bought Manhattan Plaza, about 250 units, and we thought we could afford to pay 40 million dollars for it. They're looking for over 200 million dollars for the property.

So, when I heard that, I said thanks a lot for your time and we just parted ways. Now he'll be buying out very shortly because he's already in the middle of the process, and those will be 250 units of existing affordable housing that pretty quickly will leave the stock. You can talk about building new housing till you're blue in the face, and I think that's difficult in Manhattan, but you've got some existing affordable housing especially through the Mitchell-Lama program. I just don't think enough has been done to figure out how to bridge the gap between the current owners who want to opt out and cash in, and people like us and others who would like to buy it, but just can't figure out how to make the numbers work. That's a big issue that we're all facing, and I'm sure that the City and State realize it. I just don't know what the answer is, although I have a few different suggestions, but I guess that's for another place and time.

SUSAN: Anybody have any suggestions on this? No? OK, next question.

AUDIENCE: OK, first I'm telling you where I'm coming from. I started by being an architect, then I went to construction, then I went to project management, and then I came back to being an

architect with all that baggage. And I second Ron actually; I've been involved on-and-off with HPD, first as a volunteer during the '80's and '70's when people used to take-over buildings, so the City decided they might as well take them; we'll give them to them if they rehab them. But those days are gone from HPD. One of the last requests for proposals that they issued was to build on empty lots in Manhattan, Bronx, and Brooklyn, with only 10% of what you call affordable housing within the project. And later that 10% was further reduced in reality, because at one point when their requests for proposal were presented, the land was basically given away to the tenants or to the people that were going to buy those apartments. At that particular time HPD decided that it was not going to give away any more of the land. It decided to sell it for a very low price, but sold it nevertheless, which meant that that 10% of affordable housing within that development was way, way low.

SUSAN: Is there a question here?

AUDIENCE: Yes; nevertheless, the low income minimum was \$40,000. My question is what Susan was saying before: what do the people who start working and make \$30,000 a year do in a housing environment like this?

SHAUN: Two answers to that. There was a period in time where the City changed its policy and started considering price as part of how it disposed of its land for affordable housing. So if somebody came in and responded to a request for proposals, we actually did place a higher value on a higher price that somebody was willing to pay for it; they received a higher score. We've changed that. We'll be coming out with our last big request for proposals within the next month, and we will go back to not valuing sales price so that we can maximize the amount of affordability. And I can promise you, you will see no developments that only have 10% affordable housing; that will not be included in any of our competitions.

The answer to your question of where we are going to find places for people making \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year to live is the whole range of solutions and programs that we've been talking about today. It's figuring out how to preserve existing affordable housing, whether it's Section 8, which can be affordable to someone making \$5,000 a year, or \$10,000 a year. Tax credit properties, which are affordable generally to a family of four making between \$30,000 and \$40,000 a year, preserving Mitchell-Lamas which have a higher income range, all of these have to be done together including the inclusionary zoning that we talked about. One important piece of inclusionary zoning is that it is permanently affordable. I think we have learned some lessons about the expiration of these subsidies, and what happens afterward. For many people working in government, they know they'll be retired at the point that the subsidies expire, so we tend not to think about those things. But in the inclusionary policy we are making those permanently affordable, which will avoid these kinds of expirations and the opt-outs or the buy-outs that we're talking about.

SUSAN: A question here.

ELIZABETH KAMELL: Hi, I think we can talk about making housing affordable, I think we can talk about making it inclusionary, about financing it, and doing a lot of other things. But I don't think

we would be here today talking about the UDC if they hadn't also promoted talent, young talent, and gone out and found architects that were exceptional in many cases. So my question to you, whether it's the City or any other developer, either of a non-profit or a for-profit kind, what do you do to go out and find talent and promote them and make housing that is exceptional and extraordinary, rather than just built?

SUSAN: OK, who wants to get that, who wants to jump into that first? Young talent; I know Shaun is getting all the questions but I think others need to get into this too. Young talent?

STEPHEN: Well, clearly the Rose Fellowship is about young talent. We can only fund about 5% of the applications that we get every year. You know, I think I answered the question too quickly when you asked is there an Ed Logue among them. In some ways they're all Ed Logues. I'm not from your country, I don't know enough about UDC and Ed Logue but I hear various stories so I don't want to pin his legacy on them, but in terms of leadership and design sensibility and design excellence, the Rose Fellows are there. They go through a very rigorous process to become a Rose Fellow. Paul Siegel is on our selection process. He can vouch for the fact that this is highly competitive. But we have one Fellow amongst us; her name is Jess Wendover (name?). Her long-term goal is to be head of GSA. You saw the GSA exhibition perhaps at the Center for Architecture a few months ago. There was a lot of design excellence there. When she becomes the head of the GSA (this is a 'when', not an 'if' question) she is the sort of Barbara Jordan voice. For those of you who are too young to remember, Barbara Jordan was a Congresswoman from Texas, a very smart outspoken advocate for all of us. Jess is going to bring those same social justice issues to the GSA, combine them with the design excellence side, and in probably 2023, that's my guess, you'll see her emerge.

SUSAN: How is Related dealing with the young architect, the young talent issue?

MARK: We have about 15 people in my group, and everyone but me and one of the Fellows is under 35, so I think we've got that covered.

SUSAN: There's a lot of young talent.

MARK: Well, it's also about having a good company to work for, having a good vision, and being incentive-based, both economically and also to fulfill certain professional goals. So Related is a pretty young company. We'll be around a long time.

SUSAN: OK.

ROLAND: We have a lot of folks that work in our organization for the national service, Americore and Vista, and it's a remarkable talent pool of young people. It's grown a lot through the Clinton and Bush administrations, and they go onto Harvard and Yale and I think will do great public service work over time.

SUSAN: So I guess we're saying that there are a lot more outlets for young talent than we might have seen about 10 or 15 years ago. OK, next question over there.

AUDIENCE: Great. This is for the entire panel if anyone wants to jump in. My name is Nicole Smith. I'm actually a graduate student at Hunter College in the Planning Department, not an architect, but someone who is very interested in these issues. My question is related to the perpetuity of keeping the affordable housing stock. It seems that while it makes sense to engage the business community because they have the majority of the resources to get a lot of the building done, how is the government working with them to make sure that once they do what private developers do, build especially with 80/20 mixes, to actually keep the housing stock that is affordable, permanently affordable? Can you just address some of the particular programs, or what are the political ...? You want to jump in?

MARK: Let me jump in before Shaun does because I actually want to praise Shaun here. He helped to come up with a great program called the HUD Mark-up-to-Market program. For those of you familiar with Section 8, Section 8 like most other affordable housing programs had a certain set maturity date, sunset provision. The first Section 8s were built in the mid-late '70s; some were for 20 years, some were for 30 years, some were for 40. Twenty years from the middle of the '70s put us into the middle of the '90s, and people started to realize that somewhere in the '90s Section 8 was going to disappear. What are we going to do with all these Section 8 contracts that are expiring?

In most of the Section 8 properties the rents were actually above market, so that was a bit of a challenge. We had to figure out what to do with the underlying financing. A small percentage, mostly in Manhattan Section 8 projects, had rents way below market, so what would you do with those people once the contracts expired? So it was modified to a certain extent to allow for the mark-up to market, and Related has owned three properties in Manhattan, and now we've purchased Manhattan Plaza, that's our fourth. For the three that were already there, we were able to extend the contracts for 20 years, an additional 20 years, and raise our rents up to market, so that we were able to participate in the economic benefits and therefore those properties were extended for 20 years with affordable units. It couldn't extend for any more because that program is not there, but hopefully Section 8 will still be around in 20 years, and we'll be able at that time to extend for another 20 years. So that was a big help for extending the affordability.

SUSAN: OK, we have one last question, and then we'll have to wrap up.

AUDIENCE: I don't know that I deserve to be the last question, but here I go, because it really is a question. I'm Stuart Pertz. I was one of the young architects a long time ago being nurtured by UDC, and I don't know how I got the work and I don't know how I did the work, but the question has nothing to do with what I know in fact, but just what I see, that we've been talking about inclusionary issues, and we've talking about the social services, or not talking much about the social services, that support those who are included, which worries me because the fact that someone is trying to survive on a relatively low income means that they also have other social conditions and family conditions that make it hard for them to survive. It's not only the young people that work for you, who will ultimately get better, but many of the people who are at a much

later point in their lives and still earning that kind of money and can't quite figure out how the world should work. So there's that. How do we do that and who focuses on that, and how do we do that in the case of privately-owned housing, and also how do we deal with the public housing stock that we have, which is not inclusionary? In other words, it doesn't include people who are not at the income limits that public housing determines. How do we balance that out? I don't expect an easy answer or a quick one, but I think the social policy issue and the concern about this legacy of public housing that still segregates an enormous amount of the City in what are dysfunctional communities needs to be addressed as part of this, because if we solve the problem of the future, it doesn't help that we've dragged along the problems of the past.

ROLAND: Just a couple of things. The inclusionary zoning we talked about before was a remarkable achievement on the West Side and in Williamsburg. Housing First and I and a lot of folks think the great work that Shaun and others did to craft these should be applied Citywide to make the mixed-income component uniform throughout the City, going forward with a social policy that can be translated to all parts of the City. On public housing: my wife grew up in public housing as a working-class person, and as Shaun was relating a little while ago, it was and in some large part still is, mixed-income housing. That's the reason it has succeeded while others have failed around the country. So I think that's a recurrent theme that I'm hearing here, a lot about mixed income, and public housing also needs to be promoted and put forth in public policy in the City and elsewhere.

SHAUN: New York City is unusual in its public housing in that it is much more mixed-income than in lots of other places around the country, partly because the New York City Housing Authority got good at bending the rules, or not telling Washington what it was doing necessarily. But there's a subset of developments that are failing, have failed, and we are working quite closely with the Housing Authority on those. There are about a dozen projects that are on the drawing boards or are under construction right now, where we're doing a combination of renovation and some new construction within those developments. Interestingly, the perception generally about the tower-in-the-park is that it's very high density, and we all, all the architects and planners in the audience, know that that's actually not true. So there is available development capacity on many of these sites.

We're looking at integrating home ownership in some cases, to provide for many public housing residents, particularly with today's interest rates, who can afford to buy a home. We're looking at integrating senior housing with services, so that a senior living in a 2- or 3-bedroom unit can allow it to be freed-up for one of the hundreds of thousands of people with a family on the waiting list. Things like that can be done that are very productive. With the few that are failing - there's Marcum Gardens (name?) in Staten Island and some others - we're actually doing demolition and rebuilding on a mixed-income model. So I think in the long run you're talking about the potential for 10,000 units or more to be developed either next to or on the sites of current public housing developments. It's exciting work that's happening. NPR and others have done some stories about it, but there hasn't been a lot of focus on it within the housing community.

SUSAN: It seems like the question is a huge one, and maybe someone should apply for a Macarthur Foundation award to study this. What you're asking is absolutely essential, so there

needs to be further study just as there needs to be further study of Ed Logue in all design and architecture schools. Learning history of architecture is really inspiring when you have people like Ted Liebman and Ed Logue and Ron Shiffman and the whole crew who were part of this. I think what we're seeing though, this panel suggests, is that there are many Ed Logues in the making, and they will probably be Asian-Americans, they'll probably be Hispanic-Americans, they'll be women, they'll be these beautiful mixtures of all kinds of races that we're seeing develop around us. So I think the history is inspiring and it will go on. Thank you. [applause]

END