Greetings CIUS Board Members and friends! This is our XI edition of the CIUS E-newsletter.

One theme of CIUS is to describe and discuss Institutional change brought about through innovations in building, operating and maintaining our infrastructure. Noting that the coming generations of applying infrastructure will be much more responsive to stakeholder concerns than in the previous generation, the expectation is that agencies will approach environmental concerns and community quality of life in positive and aggressive fashion. Indeed, New York State openly designs and discusses “quality communities”; New Jersey discusses “Smart Growth”. In our soon to be released report “20/20 Vision: Smart Growth for the New York Metropolitan Region” (sponsored in part by the Revson Foundation) we give specific examples of both criteria to achieve smart growth and examples of where those criteria have been successfully applied. Part of smart growth is smart building. Green building, a current term for sustainable and environmentally sensitive construction, is becoming part of the institutional approach towards large scale buildings and structures. The MTA is carrying this innovative and sensitive approach to a number of important new structures; we will have more detail in a future newsletter on their exciting approaches. The bottom line, of course, is to integrate new ideas into both practice and the classroom simultaneously. Environmental sensitivity and quality of life should be as much a part of the designer’s handbook as Young’s Modulus. We look forward to your sharing examples of institutional response to and examples of these factors.

R. Paaswell
September 3rd, 2003
In May 2003, a special report “20/20 VISION: SMART GROWTH FOR THE NEW YORK METROPOLITAN REGION AT THE START OF THE 21ST CENTURY.” was released through CIUS. **Funded by the Revson Foundation and also prepared in part by the Citizens Union Foundation,** this study is an indispensable, initial guide and set of tools for implementing the principles of sustainability-smart growth in the future planning of Metropolitan New York. Detailing specific ways how “smart growth” policy can be implemented in New York City and its surrounding suburbs, including encouraging compact, mixed-use development at key points in Jamaica, Queens and on Staten Island; decentralizing economic growth to regional centers; and reducing traffic congestion and pollution. The report advocates:

- Reducing leapfrogging suburban sprawl, which is rapidly lessening the supply of open space and natural landscapes in urban regions
- Concentrating new residential and commercial growth at existing transportation intersections with highway and transit access
- Clustering mixed-use development at existing transit and commuter rail stations
- Rezoning the waterfront in Brooklyn between the Navy Yard and Newtown Creek for residences, commerce and recreation
- Reducing public expenditures for new highways and concentrating public investment on refurbishing existing transit routes and building new ones
- Imposing “impact fees” on development that generates excessive auto use
- Introducing new technology to the TA and MTA, such as computer-assisted announcements at stations, to improve transit service

Twentieth Century planning, while providing for an unsurpassed quality of life for many, has many shortcomings. Suburbanization has often occurred at the expense of inner city vitality; simultaneously, the investments in infrastructure necessary to satisfy our suburban life style have caused inefficiencies and inequities throughout our urban areas. At the close of the twentieth century, “Smart Growth” has become a new rallying call for planning and urban design. The major part of activity on this subject has focused on the undesirable impacts of suburban and exurban “sprawl”, particularly in the newer automobile oriented areas in western states that were developed in the post war era, but the older, north-eastern region of the nation has its own very specific version of sprawl and attendant problems as distinct from the classic examples thereof in the west. The situation is best illustrated by metropolitan areas such as Baltimore, Hartford, Newark, Philadelphia and Providence but also New York City itself in which a severe split-level economy is reflected in affluent suburbs ever further out from the floundering urban core. Relatively recently this issue has been addressed in the east via policy announcements in the States of New Jersey and Maryland and these examples should be examined closely for what they might have to offer in terms of possible models for the Metropolitan New York region.

However, Metropolitan New York has yet to realize a process for regional cooperation to promote smart growth. Many citizens are unaware of, or indifferent to, the issues of sprawl, even though the New York metropolitan area is highly suburbanized. Strong well established systems of infrastructure already exist in these urban centers and yet still the New York metropolitan region keeps spreading further and further outward with it’s three states’ consumption and exceeding almost five times it’s population growth over the last generation, hurting the region’s landscape, economic viability and quality of life Comparisons between New York and western cities such as Los Angeles, Las Vegas and Salt Lake City are often made with the assumption that New York is an example of balanced development in every way that the latter are not. Yet in reality population densities (persons/sq.mi.) are almost the same when compared over the tri-state NY metro area and the Los Angeles metropolitan area (often considered the “worst” example of sprawl.) Even within the city, commuting time from the “outer boroughs” averages at 42.3 minutes for a 7.2-mile distance whereas residents of Los Angeles take about 26 minutes. Greater New York (two hour circle) now contains over 20 million people beset by problems related to sprawl that shape the destinies of center and periphery. The issuance of this new report, sets out to rectify the situation by focusing on how principles of smart growth may be employed as a way for managing and organizing growth in Metropolitan New York. Thus the report covers the following main topics:

- **Elements of Smart Growth and Their Applicability to New York City** The main 14 Elements of Smart Growth in the context of the metropolitan New York Region
- **Smart Growth Tools:** Legislative and Regulatory; Taxation and Financial; Using State Fiscal Policies to Direct Development, Regional Infrastructure Connections, Community Land Trusts.
- **Case Studies of the Application of the elements of smart growth to** two communities in New York City: Staten Island and Downtown Jamaica Queens.
- **Priorities for Smart Growth Development in New York:** Reconcentrating Economic Activity; Improving Transportation and Reclaiming the Waterfront.

This project rests on the premise that the best cure for unchecked sprawl is to redirect development back to existing urban centers where infrastructure systems are already in place. The central role that infrastructure plays in such a proposal cannot be underestimated. The report takes as essential the upgrading or re-use-recycling of existing infrastructure but also the incorporation of new technologies, changes in related institutions and new methods of financing as imperative if New York is to achieve the twin goals of sustainability and centrality in the ever globalizing economy.

The report also includes:

- A comprehensive source list of Organizations Active in Smart Growth both private and public at the National, State and local level, working to implement smart growth.
- A comprehensive selected bibliography on smart growth that provides resources on both the General Background and Elements of Smart Growth as well as major issues related to smart growth at both the national and local levels.

The report, **20/20 VISION: SMART GROWTH FOR THE NEW YORK METROPOLITAN REGION AT THE START OF THE 21ST CENTURY.”** was written by Linda Stone Davidoff, Executive Director of the Citizens Union and Citizens Union Foundation, planning consultant Harry Schwartz, and Robert E. Paaswell, PhD, CIUS Director and Distinguished Professor of Transportation Engineering at City College/CUNY. Researchers included CIUS Assistant Director, Laurence Frommer and Sonya Ahmad, Beth Braun, Niko Flemming and Yaskira E. Paulino. **The report was funded by the Revson Foundation and by CIUS, and prepared in part by the Citizens Union Foundation.**
Eva Hanhardt is the Co-Director of the Planning Center at the Municipal Art Society. The mission of the Planning Center is to support community based planning in low and moderate income communities in New York City. Ms. Hanhardt came to the Municipal Art Society from the New York City Department of Environmental Protection, where she was Director of the Environmental Economic Development Assistance Unit and of the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Environmental Benefits Program.

Previously, Ms. Hanhardt worked for many years as a planner for the New York City Department of City Planning, most recently with the Waterfront Division, where she was one of the principal authors of the Comprehensive Waterfront Plan and Waterfront Zoning Text. She was the founding Executive Director of the Salvadori Educational Center on the Built Environment (CCNY-CUNY) and has held planning positions at the New York City Department of Ports and Trade and the Community Service Society.

Ms. Hanhardt has lectured and taught at a number of universities and is currently an adjunct professor at Pratt Institute's Graduate Center for Planning and the Environment.

FORWARD: Although each neighborhood constitutes a unique situation, in which the pros and cons for infrastructure investments must be weighed out, ultimately New York City's challenge is to identify a set list of criteria that can be used to address these questions universally so as to create a decision process that runs more smoothly and provides the public and developers alike with a knowable process from which they can know what to expect. Below Ms. Hanhardt asks some (sometimes difficult) questions to help New York City's communities and planners work together to develop a criteria/policy for "Infrastructure Oriented Development" that will serve as a model for a truly “New Urban Urbanism”

“Urban New Urbanism”-creating policy for “Infrastructure Oriented Development”

In 1993 Peter Calthorpe wrote The Next American Metropolis: Ecology, Community and the American Dream calling for “Transit Oriented Development” (TOD) through the creation of mixed use communities which provide moderate and higher density housing, with public uses, jobs and services along regional transit systems. In recent years TODs and other infrastructure related Smart Growth neighborhood redevelopment plans.

Existing infrastructure should help identify areas with development potential. Questions remain, however, on how best to apply this infrastructural availability and needs. Money should be spent on new infrastructure only when and where it is really appropriate. Although each neighborhood constitutes a unique situation, in which the pros and cons for infrastructure investments must be weighed out, ultimately New York City’s challenge is to identify a set list of criteria that can be used to address these questions universally so as to create a decision process that runs more smoothly and provides the public and developers alike with a knowable process from which they can know what to expect. Below Ms. Hanhardt asks some (sometimes difficult) questions to help New York City’s communities and planners work together to develop a criteria/policy for “Infrastructure Oriented Development” that will serve as a model for a truly “New Urban Urbanism”

The time has come that to change! New York must, also, adopt a policy of “Infrastructure Oriented Development” Already the redevelopment plans for Lower Manhattan and the Far West Side recognize the importance of transit investments and mixed use; areas such as Park Slope have been up-zoned to take advantage of underutilized capacity; and there is a growing recognition that adequate infrastructure is crucial to a revitalized waterfront. In addition, in its Briefing Book of Community-based Plans, Planning for All New Yorkers, the Municipal Art Society Planning Center has documented many community-based plans in low and moderate income communities that call for:

- creation of better transit links to and infrastructure investments in isolated areas - especially those along the waterfront in areas such as Red or Hunts Point in the Bronx.
- higher density housing and/or commercial development in areas with existing underutilized infrastructure such as Melrose in the Bronx , Park Slope in Brooklyn or Jamaica in Queens.
- mixed use redevelopment of “brownfield” sites for both housing and jobs in communities such as Greenpoint/Williamsburg in Brooklyn or Hell’s Kitchen in Manhattan.

Given the financial constraints facing New York City today, it is imperative that development plans be linked to a clear understanding of infrastructure availability and needs. Money should be spent on new infrastructure only when and where it is really appropriate. Existing infrastructure should help identify areas with development potential. Questions remain, however, on how best to apply this concept of “Infrastructure Oriented Development” in New York City. What are the costs? What are the benefits? Who benefits? Who is impacted? How can neighborhood context and possible impacts of gentrification such as secondary displacement be addressed?

- Should redevelopment be focused primarily on areas with existing underutilized infrastructure? Upzoning of areas with subway access and capacity could result in providing much needed new housing and jobs without requiring major new infrastructure expenditures.
- Should new development focus on waterfront sites where “market rate development” wants to build but where new transit and other infrastructure related public investments are needed. Is the new tax revenue and the new housing and commercial development adequate to offset the costs of the infrastructure?
- Should mixed use/mixed income development be required in new “brownfields” developments? What happens when the private development community is more interested in single use/single income development?
- What happens when areas that have the best infrastructure are not of “interest to the market”? What should the City do when low and moderate income areas require infrastructure investment or “brownfield” rehabilitation and there is no private sector interest? Are there benefits to the existing population in terms of access to employment and/or improved quality of life that would justify the infrastructure investments?

Ultimately New York City’s challenge is to identify criteria that can be used to address these questions citywide and, given the City’s fiscal crisis, to determine when and where to expend infrastructure funds? The hope is that by working together New York City’s communities and planners can develop a policy for “Infrastructure Oriented Development” that will help revitalize the City and serve as a model for a truly “Urban New Urbanism.”
The East River Habitat Restoration Project

In 1998 responding to the Van Alen Institute’s competition: East River Project: Design Ideas For New York’s Other River (http://www.vanalen.org/competitions/east_river/site.tm) environmental architect and Hunter’s Point Community Coalition leader, Tom Paino, submitted a comprehensive plan for restoration of 26 natural habitat sites on all sides of the East River. “Anabel Cove”, just north of where the Queens West development is now rising will hopefully be the pilot for this impressive undertaking.

“No Able Cove” is a 3.5-acre site located on the East River between a public pier at 44th Drive and the tennis club. (The site lies adjacent to a ferry stop that provides access from a waterfront restaurant to the East Side of Manhattan.)

The undeveloped, under-utilized property is said to be a rest stop for migratory birds and butterflies using the East River as a north/south flyway, and is currently owned by the Department of Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS). The site was once a dock-repair facility under control of the City Department. New York City’s current Greenway Plan proposes the www.nyc.gov/html/dcas/home.html construction of a greenway along the edge of Anable Basin that would connect the public space proposed at “Anable Cove” to Queens West. However, little research has been done on the feasibility of such a greenway. In addition, there have occasionally been suggestions to reuse existing but deteriorating docks for public boating and other recreation.

Mr. Paino and the local Hunters Point Community Coalition (HPCC), have been trying for some years to convince the city to go forward with their proposed design plan to restore the natural ecology of the site and provide public access. The HPCC’s plan is aimed at restoring the natural landscape and marsh plants of Anable Cove and includes the creation of a wildlife viewing walkway. To date DCAS has taken steps to clear the site, removing existing structures and debris. The capital cost of implementing the HPCC plan is estimated to be about $3.5 million. Important first steps include restoration and stabilization of the deteriorated shoreline, wetland restoration, creation of a boardwalk and improving locations for wildlife viewing and youth education. (stewardship would eventually be carried out by student groups. The Anable Cove plan could provide valuable community-based public access and habitat conservation, and could provide an important step in the proposed waterfront greenway along the Long Island City waterfront. For more information please visit the Hunters Point Community Coalition website at http://www.licweb.com/hpcc/
The City College Architectural Center (CCAC), with technical assistance provided by the CUNY Institute for Urban Systems (CIUS), is participating in a program to link design and planning programs in New York State’s public universities with municipalities and neighborhoods selected for Governor Pataki’s “Quality Communities” initiative (http://www.dos.state.ny.us/qcp/qcp2.html). Quality Communities brings together 25 state agencies to work with communities on three areas of focus: downtown revitalization, open space, and technology. As this effort grows, the hope is to involve departments from throughout CUNY in interdisciplinary approaches to working with local communities.

Programs participating in an initial pilot project, working with 12 communities around the state are:

- The Faculty of Landscape Architecture and the Council for Community Design Research, SUNY School of Environmental Sciences and Forestry at Syracuse
- Department of Geography and Urban Planning at SUNY Albany
- The Urban Design Project, School of Architecture and Planning, SUNY Buffalo
- Department of Landscape Architecture at Cornell University
- The SUNY Brownfields Institute

CCAC is serving as the contact for designated communities in the New York Metro area. These are the Village of Hempstead in Nassau County, Mount Vernon in Westchester County, and the neighborhood of East New York, Brooklyn. The first two are dense, compact communities in close proximity to New York City (“inner ring suburbs”) that share many of the challenges typical to older cities. East New York is among the poorest neighborhoods in the city, but it is of late experiencing increased investment. These communities have identified potential projects and ongoing initiatives in housing, adaptive reuse, brownfields, parks, public space and streetscaping. State agencies are developing work plans for how they will assist each of the communities in the pilot project.

For its part, CCAC has been working since January with the City of Mount Vernon, which borders the Bronx, on implementation strategies for development of a downtown Arts District. This initiative was has been identified by the City as a high priority, as it will be anchored by two development projects planned for either end of a proposed arts corridor: 1) a new arena, hotel and convention complex planned to be built over the Metro-North Railroad tracks adjacent to the downtown business district; and 2) the proposed “Hip Hop Gallery,” a museum and cultural center conceived to pay tribute this musical movement with strong roots in Mount Vernon and to encourage new talent through training in music and video production. The district is planned with an expansive vision of the arts and culture, encompassing such activities as beauty arts and fashion, restaurants and catering, an arts high school, recording studios, set shops—all enterprises that contribute to a comprehensive, creative environment.

Working with Mt. Vernon has presented an exciting opportunity, for CCAC. The City has been working for several years to forge a coalition among arts and community development groups, local businesses, institutions and government, which emerged as the Third Street Alliance. Together they produced an Arts District Vision Plan in 2002. To follow up, CCAC is assisting the City’s planning office in assessing the plan against citywide priorities, connections, transportation, access corridors, and development opportunities. Working with a group of students and with input from local stakeholders, the team is currently formulating an overall concept plan and designs for selected projects within the district. As the state develops its agency work plan for Mount Vernon, opportunities for increased involvement by CIUS and other CUNY entities will be identified.
Unfortunately many Americans view the Bronx as the nation’s most prominent symbol of inner city decay. In recent years however, there has much progress reclaiming an already in place system of infrastructure, housing stock, and New York City’s most expansive park system. Additionally new development is under way. In particular, there are a number of plans underway to reclaim former industrial sites along the South Bronx waterfront:

- The idea of a “Yankee Village” originally floated during the tenure of Fernando Ferrer as Bronx Borough President has generated several interesting proposals over the last few years. The best of these plans include a proposal for a waterfront esplanade, parkland, and increased ferry service by incorporating land from a Yankee Stadium parking lot and the Terminal Market.
- The Parks Department’s Bronx River Action Plan includes a proposed Bronx River Greenway Trail that would create, restore, and link open spaces and parks along the river.
- A plan to reclaim the Hunts Point waterfront for a greenway trail would include waterfront access at a city-owned cement plant site located between the Bruckner Expressway and Westchester Avenue and a bridge linking Riverside Park with Soundview Park.
- Baretto Point, a 13-acre brownfield on the East River that was once home to an asphalt factory and a gravel manufacturer, has been earmarked for redevelopment as a waterfront park and pier. However, proximity to the Hunts Point Water Pollution Control Plant, which leaks pollutants may delay its progress.

Below we discuss two of the largest of these proposals; for more information on the others please go to: please go to: http://www.nylcv.org/ecofiles/bronx/html/ccd17.htm

**BRONX RIVER PARK: a proposal to restore the corridor and greenway along the spine of New York’s greenest borough, fostering sustainable communities along the way.**

The Bronx River Alliance serves as a coordinated voice for the creation of a park/greenway along the Bronx River and works in harmonious partnership to protect, improve and restore the corridor and greenway so that they can be healthy ecological, recreational, educational and economic resources for the communities through which the river flows. www.bronxriver.org

The formation of The Alliance is the next step in the effort to restore and protect the Bronx River. The Alliance builds on the 27-year history of restoration work started by Bronx River Restoration Project, Inc. in 1974; strengthened in 1996 with the Bronx River Keeper Program developed in partnership with City of New York/Parks & Recreation and Con Edison; and fortified in 1997 with the formation of the Bronx River Working Group. The Bronx River Working Group, coordinated by Partnerships for Parks and Waterways & Trailways, expanded the effort to include over 60 community groups, government agencies, schools and businesses. The Bronx River Working Group has coordinated work along the New York City section of the River with community groups including Youth Ministries for Peace & Justice, The Point CDC, Sustainable South Bronx, Woodlawn/Wakefield Taxpayers Association, Harding Park Homeowners Association and Mosholu Preservation Corporation. The Bronx River Working Group has secured funding commitments from the Federal, state and local levels totaling over $90 million, most notably $11 million committed by Congressman Serrano, $11 million committed by Governor Pataki and $11 million committed by Mayor Giuliani. The Alliance will provide a coordinated voice for the river as well as the structure and process through which to grow and sustain this important work. To these ends the Bronx River Alliance will:

- Manage, with City of New York/Parks & Recreation, the New York City Bronx River corridor and greenway, implement small scale restoration projects, coordinate larger scale restoration projects and support community-based efforts to organize around the Bronx River.
- Coordinate the implementation of a continuous Bronx River greenway from the New York City border to the East River and coordinate with Westchester and Connecticut authorities to create a contiguous neighborhood district of residences, offices and shopping in an essentially empty area between Yankee Stadium and the Harlem River.
- Develop Bronx River curricula and train teachers to bring the Bronx River into the classroom and promote the Bronx River as an outdoor classroom.

**Yankee Village:** In 1998, when the Bronx’s then Borough President, Fernando Ferrer, called for the creation of a “Yankee Village” to stabilize the area around Yankee stadium, architect John Massengale, who had assisted the team of Andres Duany-Elizabeth Plater Zyberk on the prototypical New Urbanist “Seaside” development in Florida, proposed re-creating a traditional neighborhood district of residences, offices and shopping in an essentially empty area between Yankee Stadium and the Harlem River. Massengale emphasized that housing should be built to help create a contiguous neighborhood from the Harlem River to the Grand Concourse, the Bronx’s grandest boulevard. Right now, the Grand Concourse is completely cut off from the river, and even from the stadium. Many residents have longwanted to see if it is possible to knit it all back together. Massengale has also proposed a plan for easing traffic on the nearby Major Deagan Expressway and the George Washington Bridge by putting a big parking lot next to an infrequently used train station north of the bridge’s interchange, then running shuttle trains to the Stadium and back. This would help Westchester and Connecticut fans to avoid traffic jams at the ballpark. For more information please go to: http://www.massengale.com/pages/yankee1.htm. Recently the New York City Economic Development Corporation retained the firm of Edwards and Kelcey, As part of a mult-firm team, to provide transportation, traffic, and infrastructure services for a comprehensive YANKEE VILLAGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN. For more information on this effort please go to: http://www.ekcorp.com/services/design/plan/yankee.html. In addition, the Office of the current Bronx Borough President Adolfo Carrón is now working on its own plan for Yankee Village. Please see: http://
“Living Green” is not only applicable to rural environments. In fact, the future of “sustainability” and “smart growth” will depend largely on the ability of human beings to live at greater densities where infrastructure already exists, recycling, upgrading and expanding these systems as needed. In addition, construction of new buildings and structures, removal, reuse or recycling of the old, and manufacturing of environmentally sound building materials must be carried out in a manner that is integrated with all urban systems which must also operate on “green” principals. For example, if a “green building” stand in a parking lot full of SUV’s and far from public transportation, how good a job have we done in terms of creating an environmentally sound urban environment? Below is an initial examination of how to re cast traditional urban systems in a more sustainable manner. We will continue discussion of this subject in future editions of our newsletter and invite you, our readers, to send us your comments and ideas to stimulate an on going dialogue on this vital topic.

The construction industry and the manufacturing base that supports that industry has always been an important part of New York City’s economy. In the post 9/11 climate, the demand for new construction, especially in Lower Manhattan, will inevitably increase. However, what sets this demand apart from previous building cycles is there is an overwhelming desire to build “green”; erecting structures that are at the very least energy efficient and employ recycled and recyclable materials, and which are built in thoughtful and sustainable means taking into consideration the economic, social and environmental effects of the structure. Building green will cut operating costs, improve the quality of the environment and create markets for new products and services that will spawn new industries and create healthy, stable jobs in New York City’s manufacturing sector. While green building has gained a lot of momentum across the country, it has yet to truly get going in New York City save a few prominent examples such as Conde Nast’s 4 Times Square. The three main obstacles for green building are inertia, financing and access to materials.

The City in collaboration with architects, builders, manufacturers, labor organizations and other private sector stakeholders itself can play a major role in overcoming those three factors by doing the following:

1. Adopt green design standards for all new City construction.
2. Establish an information clearinghouse on green technologies.
3. Expand Environmental Management System assistance
4. Create a financial assistance package for manufacturers of green building products located or locating in New York City.
5. Preserve manufacturing space for green manufacturers.
6. Create a Labor/Management Committee to expedite construction and resolve conflicting requirements.

There is a growing recognition that incorporating green technologies and products into the construction industry is inevitable. By the City leading the way in bringing suppliers closer to the increasing demand source, the financing of building green will be much more feasible. A green building initiative will support two major components of New York City’s economy, construction and manufacturing. It will increase jobs, specifically safe, healthier jobs, and set the stage for a City supported by efficient, non-polluting, sustainable buildings.

For more information, please contact: Jennifer Roth, Director of Research, New York Industrial Retention Network (NYIRN)
Tel.) 718 624-6800 X 12 E-mail: jroth@nyirn.org

The project has four main goals. The first goal is to encourage the developers of JFK Corporate Square to incorporate building deconstruction and the U.S. Green Building Council’s LEED standards into their plans for JFK Corporate Square. Second, NY WaSteMatch will provide nonprofit housing agencies and general and demolition contractors with training in how to develop deconstruction services. Third, NY WaSteMatch will coordinate overall efforts to promote deconstruction and green building to various sectors of New York’s real estate industry. The final goal of the project is to offer training and tools that will enable developers and contractors to solicit bids for deconstruction services, measure and report the environmental and economic benefits of deconstruction projects, maximize recovery and recycling of construction and demolition (C&D) waste, and purchase used or environmentally preferable building materials.

For more information, please contact: Josh Rosenfield. Program Manager, NY WaSteMatch
Tel.212-442-5219 E-mail: jrosenfield@itac.org.
Underlying any successful plan for an economically diverse and sustainable New York City are basic land use issues. With tremendous real estate pressures in many parts of the City, establishing a workable balance between the needs of residential, commercial, and industrial uses — and finding ways to make land for each of these uses affordable — will make a crucial difference in the sustainability of New York’s economy. This article discusses several techniques for maintaining a diversity of uses in a market that favors commercial and high-end residential development. While some of these techniques are already used on a limited basis in New York City, others are more prevalent in other parts of the country.

**THE TWO TYPES OF "COMMUNITY LAND TRUSTS" (CLT’S)**

A) Conservation Trusts: Perhaps the best-known type of land trust is the conservation land trust, which has been used by both national and local groups to acquire and protect open space and agricultural land. Notable national groups include the American Farmland Trust, the Land Trust Alliance, the Nature Conservancy, the Open Space Institute, and the Trust for Public Land. Nearby examples include the Westchester Land Trust, the Open Space Preservation Trust of Long Island, and the New York Restoration Project, a group financed by singer/actress Bette Midler that in conjunction with the Trust for Public Land preserved about 120 community gardens in New York City in 1999.

B) Housing and Community Development Oriented Community Land Trusts: CLT’s can also be used to preserve affordable housing or other uses for which market forces do not meet the demand. CLT’s are most frequently used to preserve low- and moderate-income housing, but have also been used to develop community facilities, neighborhood retail, and open spaces, such as in the case of the Burlington Community Land Trust in Burlington, VT. Examples of low-income housing CLT’s closer to home include Residents for Equitable Affordable Permanent Shelter (REAPS) in Yonkers, NY, the Walsh Park Benevolent Corporation, in Fishers Island, NY, and Rehabilitation in Action to Improve Neighborhoods (RAIN) low-income housing trust on Manhattan’s Lower East Side. Most community land trusts have resale or recapture provisions that ensure the long-term affordability of the housing built on land trust-owned land.

**Similar Programs:** In inner cities, government-operated programs such as those run by New York City’s Department of Housing, Preservation and Development (HPD) Alternative Management Program (DAMP) play a similar role. Buildings are seized from delinquent landlords and turned over to tenants (often a sweat equity component is involved) as low cost co-ops. As with the community land trust model, these programs have resale or recapture provisions that allow only a modest mark up for re-sale to ensure the long-term affordability of the housing for low income tenants. In the Not for Profit Housing Sector, community groups such as East Brooklyn Congregations (EBC), recognizing that higher rates of homeownership help stabilize and strengthen communities, have worked with New York City’s HPD to create the Brooklyn Nehemiah Program. Over the past 15 years this program has created nearly 3,000 single-family homes in the East New York section of Brooklyn. To keep the homes affordable, the City provides the land and HPD provides a subsidy of up to $20,000 for each home. Programs such as this have engendered varying reactions from housing advocates depending on how much they adhere to resale or recapture provisions.

**Manufacturing Preservation Districts:** In the past two decades, cities across the U.S. have begun using industrial protection zoning to prevent residential or commercial conversion in areas subject to substantial development pressure. Some of the oldest such zoning programs are Chicago’s planned manufacturing districts (PMDs), established in the late 1980s. Both the Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED) Council and the City’s Planning and Development Department, were instrumental in implementing retention and development strategies in Chicago. By prohibiting residential and most commercial uses in its four PMDs, in conjunction with a variety of other industrial development programs, Chicago has been able to retain space for resilient industries that provide decent jobs and promote a diverse economy. Setting clear restrictions on use lessens speculation and offers assurance to existing businesses that they will be able to afford to stay in the area. This is especially important for manufacturing businesses, which often install heavy equipment that is subject to high relocation costs.

**Brownfield Redevelopment:** The redevelopment of brownfields in depressed communities can bring new residents and economic activity to those communities while also accommodating uses that might be priced out of other areas. After many years of legislative gridlock, this year for the first time, a three-way agreement was reached among leaders in Albany on a compromise bill (DiNapoli-Marcellino. A9120/. S5702) However, at the eleventh hour the State Senate and State Assembly failed to pass identical bills before the legislative session ended in June. It is now widely anticipated that State leaders will come back to Albany in the fall and pass a comprehensive bill that is aimed at the cleanup and reuse of NY’s thousands of acres of brownfields. Much of the debate over what final state legislation should look like has centered on the issues of cleanup requirements and liability protection, but there has also been good progress on the critical issue of community planning and involvement. New funding for area-wide planning around brownfields, and properties located in these “Brownfield Opportunity Areas” would have priority for an existing Bond Act Brownfields Program dollars. The DiNapoli-Marcellino bill also contains $135 million in new tax credits (although not linked to implementation of community plans) as these tax credits certainly could be used for that purpose) for soil and groundwater cleanup and to subside insurance premiums. Tying financial incentives and resources for brownfields to community redevelopment plans addresses several goals simultaneously: while providing funding for brownfield cleanup and meeting a community’s development goals, it can also accommodate uses such as manufacturing and low and moderate-income housing that are less likely to be accommodated by the market.

**Conclusion:** Land trusts, manufacturing preservation zones and brownfield redevelopment can protect a diversity of uses in areas subject to speculation and escalating land values, but can also promote development in areas where the market would not go. The tools discussed in this article are specifically designed for a high-pressure real estate environment such as New York City. Different circumstances affect different development parcels and communities, and a case-by-case assessment is necessary to determine what approaches might work where, but when taken as a whole, these strategies can result in a local economy that is far more prepared to weather the ups and downs of the economic cycle. Policy makers should explore opportunities to expand the use of these and other programs in the City.
CIUS Board Member Martin Hanlon, associate professor, Department of Urban Studies and director of the M.A. in Social Sciences program and graduate advisor for the M.A. in Urban Affairs program at Queens College of the City University of New York. Dr. Hanlon is currently directing a new research project; Highway Demolition and Neighborhood Renewal: Creating Community through Freeway Demolition, that examines efforts to heal the wounds inflicted on communities nation wide under the post war interstate highway program. We are very pleased to have a contribution from Dr. Hanlon to this edition of our newsletter on this important subject.

“GREEN” OPTIONS FOR THE SHERIDAN AND GOWANUS EXPRESSWAYS

The construction of urban freeways under the post war interstate highway program had a devastating impact on cities throughout the United States. Upwards of one million people were displaced by highway construction, many of whom were low-income residents of minority communities. Many of the urban expressways that were built during the peak years of the interstate highway program in the 1950s and 1960s are now falling apart. Reconstruction of these aging roadways will cost billions and will mean years of disruption for motorists and residents of neighborhoods along expressway corridors. In New York City, two major expressway projects have led to serious consideration of “green” alternatives. Some community groups have called for the demolition of underutilized freeways, replacing them with needed parkland such as with the Sheridan Expressway in the Bronx. Others have called for replacing blight-inducing elevated freeways with tunneled segments, as with the Gowanus Expressway in Brooklyn or covering depressed freeways with landscaped decks as with the Cross Bronx Expressway.

In the SOUTH BRONX, a coalition of local community groups, environmentalists and advocacy planners are fighting NYSDOT’s plans for the upgrading of the 1.2-mile SHERIDAN EXPRESSWAY (I-895), which runs along the Bronx River corridor. The Southern Bronx River Watershed Alliance has developed plans for demapping and demolishing the Sheridan. The group argues that the Sheridan is little used and the loss of traffic capacity can be absorbed easily by nearby limited access highways and arterial streets. The redeveloped 28-acre Sheridan corridor would provide much-needed park land and recreation areas, enhance the restoration of the Bronx River, (see article on page five) and allow for the construction of up to a thousand units of housing. At present, community groups are pressing NYSDOT to include the Community Alternative Plan, as it is known, in the EIS process.

BROOKLYN’S GOWANUS EXPRESSWAY (I-278) is a Robert Moses-era road that carries 200,000 vehicles a day and is one of New York City’s most critical links to the Interstate highway system. Local organizations, including the Gowanus Expressway Community Coalition, backed by the Regional Plan Association, have pressed NYSDOT into considering replacing the badly deteriorated elevated expressway with a 4.6-mile tunnel. Several tunneling options are now under consideration in the EIS process. While the tunneling options are more expensive than reconstructing the Gowanus on its present alignment (NYSDOT and the RPA differ on the magnitude of the cost difference), the social and economic benefits to the Sunset Park section of Brooklyn, reductions in air pollution, and opportunities for the revival of Brooklyn’s western waterfront, provide compelling arguments for a tunnel. A tunnel would also be far less disruptive to residents and businesses along the Gowanus than an eight-year reconstruction of the elevated expressway. It would also heal the massive wound to Brooklyn caused by Moses’ Gowanus.

CONCLUSION: Many other U.S. cities have already pioneered notable efforts towards this important trend in neighborhood revitalization as with the Embarcadero in San Francisco, the roadways around Washington D.C.’s Kennedy Center and perhaps most significantly, Boston’s “Big Dig.” In the near future New York City will have the choice to take advantage of similar opportunities to knit back together the fabric of communities that were fractured by the post war interstate highway program.
THREE CORNERSTONES OF CIUS

TECHNOLOGY: The emerging wide scale applications of computers and communications technologies will create more centralized control and more real-time information to be used by infrastructure managers and users.

INSTITUTIONS: Institutions developed in the 20th century to build infrastructure now must transform to operate, control and finance the next generation of infrastructure.

FINANCE: Modernization and capital expansion demanded by new technologies and institutional change will call for new methods of financing, which itself will impact infrastructure institutions.

The CUNY Institute for Urban Systems (CIUS) has as its primary goal the shaping of these forces and their impacts, while simultaneously providing leadership through policy advisement and practice.

CUNY is a natural home for the Institute. The Institute’s Board of Directors is composed of distinguished faculty from a number of CUNY campuses. With strong schools of engineering and architecture, and noted programs in urban planning, law and management, CIUS is linking academic and business to provide solutions to the problems of aging infrastructure.

Mission of the CUNY Institute for Urban Systems (CIUS)

WHAT WE DO

I. RESEARCH: CIUS is conducting research in current investment in infrastructure and how it is affected by new technology, institutional change and innovative financing.

Under the guidance of distinguished faculty, CUNY graduate and undergraduate students conduct research and participate in the work of the Institute, which enriches their academic experience, preparing them for careers in urban planning, transportation management, infrastructure financing and other related fields.

II. EDUCATION / TRAINING: In addition to research, an integral CIUS objective is to provide education and training for new infrastructure professionals. This objective will be achieved in two ways:

a) academic programs to prepare students, from certificate programs to four-year degree programs,

b) infrastructure training through professional development programs to aid employers train or retrain both management and labor.

III. CIUS FELLOWS: a prominent group of regional professionals work with CIUS faculty and students defining the cutting edge of infrastructure uses.