

MAYORS' PANEL LEADERSHIP IN REVITALIZING AMERICA'S CITIES

Moderated by Ray Suarez

Mayoral Panelists

John Norquist, Milwaukee

Bret Schundler, Jersey City

Glenda Hood, Orlando

Susan Savage, Tulsa

Roxanne Qualls, Cincinnati

JUNE 5, 1999

Presented at CNU VII: The Wealth of Cities

Robert Davis: American cities and their neighborhoods, and particularly urban neighborhoods, have been leveled by urban renewal, and emptied and disinvested by suburban sprawl. Their rebirth, rather than their renewal, as Roberta Gratz puts it, requires knitting together and reweaving the colorful and complex tapestry of urban life. The mayor's gathered here, and whom you're about to hear from, understand this process. They understand that urban form and texture matter, and so do a hundred other aspects of building community, of making humane settlements.

To moderate this forum, Ray Suarez, NPR star and author of "The Old Neighborhood," a book which puts this emptying of urban neighborhoods into very human perspective will help us to understand what is now going on in our cities.

Ray Suarez, welcome. We're honored to have you here.

Ray Suarez: It's the travails of being a short guy. You are always introduced and do this. I am sure Mayor Norquist has the opposite problem.

It is a great pleasure for me to be invited—even invited—to a gathering like this. I got the program in the mail and started to looking at all of these heavy names. People I have been reading about for years. And then I feel like, gee, they've actually included me in there. It's busman's holiday to moderate a conversation, but okay. However, I get on the program. That works.

I've just come off book tour. And that's been a very interesting experience. In the speeches I have been giving over the past few weeks, I've identified the current class of big city mayors as one of the best in history. It wasn't all that long ago that it was generally considered that city hall was a place for log rollers, feather bedders, a place to stop before heading to federal court and eventually, to jail. It was not a place considered the glowing political heart of our best and brightest. As someone who lived through Marion Berry's last term as mayor of Washington, DC, I can tell you how much any city's efforts to get help and support from others can be swamped by the judgments fair or unfair of one person. The mayor.

The sun king didn't say it, but it has a 21st century application. La ville c'est moi. There is this idea that the mayor embodies the city in a very fundamental way, so that things that otherwise might happen can't happen if you've got a chief executive who operates as a roadblock sitting in that office. So, I'm glad that along with the tool kits, the slide shows, the conversations about cornice height and setback and all those things—tiffs and all that—that we also have taken some

CONGRESS
FOR THE
NEW
URBANISM

time to recognize how much difference a chief executive can make.

Who is sitting in office in city hall is part of urban America's good news in 1999. The bad news, maybe, is that this remarkable class of mayors has less and less to work with in many places in the way of an industrial base, a tax base, transportation networks and private investment. When I was in Cleveland, the former city planner said to me, when things started to go wrong, the cities made a Faustian bargain with the federal government. We'll be the warehouse of the poor, and you'll pay for it. But, now in the 1990's, we're still the warehouse for the poor and they don't want to pay for it anymore.

Mayors still do delight in posing with vast plaster models that show a large swath of the city remade by a massive project. The difference now is that with much degraded corporate bases, a less interested federal government, and better organized community groups, getting that plaster into brick and mortar and glass is now a lot tougher. And that's probably a good thing. No longer being able to rebuild downtown with a wave of the mayoral wand forces the projects to be better designed and their boosters to line up more and more diverse interests before they move ahead.

Many of the cities I've covered in recent years are so desperate for economic activity that they can't be too fussy about that difficult truth. And they come to negotiations already believing that they don't play with a strong hand. For now, the thinking goes let's get them in here and spending money for as many hours as we can manage, before they head home over the city line. But, hungry cities acting as the court jester for suburban America just isn't going to cut it. A resident in a thousand little ways spins off economic activity unmatched by the casual visitor who comes to your IMAX theater, buys a T-shirt and a froze yogurt, and then heads home to pay their taxes elsewhere.

In an ideal city, a chief executive would have the luxury of working with private business to answer a city's needs for balanced development, for balanced employment. But, many cities enter the new century unsure of just how hard they can bargain. The neediness created by decades of abandonment and decline tears away the veil draped by press agents, and travel writers, and optimistic mayors. And a run of good news makes it easy to concentrate heavily on the positive. Just take a look at the pile of clippings about New York's comeback. And then, make believe that the negative isn't there.

When things are going badly, the cities are described less charitably as what they are. Big, hungry monsters. Billions are spent getting food, water, apparel, manufactured items into them, and what they spin off is garbage, sewage, and smog—and our lives, our common lives.

For much of the last fifty years, the cities have been losing every argument. Subject to a default mode assumption that everything they do is wrong or stupid or just staving off the inevitable. We've somehow lost sight of the fact that there is a good reason why they existed in the first place. Our cities when able to deal with their regions on a level playing field get to win occasionally, too. They are economically rational places.

The thing that makes them valuable to us today are the things that brought them to being in the first place. They are the players where buyers can find sellers. Where talent finds projects in need of talent. Where capital seekers find capital. Where enterprises in the new economy can form and break apart. Can bring together people for limited tasks and partnerships, and then send them off seeking new ways to hook up.

Out there on the development perimeter, you can build a multi-acre, single story building and put a shingle over the front door that calls it an incubator. But, that's just a way to force into being what happens in the old city organically everyday.

We've gotten into this terrible habit of talking about urban decline with this weird tone of biological determinism. Tut-tutting over the continual, inevitable course of a disease that was somehow not preventable. The story we tell ourselves had to be this way. Well, it didn't have to be this way.

From Washington, DC, and from the state capitol, and from the county board, came policies that made it possible to continue to leech vitality and investment from our core cities. And then, we concluded that not being able to win a rigged game was in fact a verdict of the marketplace. And that the cities' best days were behind it.

Well, for all of us stupids, it's still the economy. And I hope cities can get off the defensive and talk to the rest of the country from a position of strength. All those mayors who are waiting for their indictments to come down, sent their regrets this morning. So, we have the bright boys and girls, who've been getting an A. They all said yes, and came to see us today.

So, let me bring up our panel. [John Norquist], the mayor of Milwaukee, our host. [Glenda Hood], the mayor of Orlando. [Roxanne Qualls], the mayor of Cincinnati. [Susan Savage], the mayor of Tulsa. And [Brett Schundler], the mayor of Jersey City.

The fact that Mayor Norquist is sitting to Mayor Schundler's left is strictly a spatial designation. Nothing else. We've managed to mix the panel. Left. Right. You didn't even know there were any left.

One thing that our guests have in common, is that they've all got great projects to talk about. Things are happening in their cities that are the reverse of the syndrome that we've been talking about since the end of World War II.

Mayor Schundler, I've been reading about a project. It's some of the densest construction I've seen in Jersey in the post-war era. Why don't you talk about the area near the waterfront.

Brett Schundler: The area being described is called Liberty Harbor North. For those who don't know where Jersey City is, it's directly across the Hudson River from lower Manhattan. We have quite a lot of development going along the waterfront's edge. There is a canal that comes off the water, probably about a mile west. And this lines that canal facing—the canal, if you will, is to the south of this land. It's about an 80 acre plot adjoining additional acreage which is available for redevelopment, which is owned by other landowners.

There is a hospital going into some of that adjoining land. But, most of this land will be built with the density effectively of Columbus Avenue in New York City. So, you will have row houses in the center that have parking beneath and behind. And at the corners you'll have much taller buildings with commercial space as well as residential space. There is also a marina in the canal itself, and this entire vista faces south over New York Bay, where you have the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Hood, I want to talk to you about Orlando, because Orlando is never been a place where people, in recent years, have been reluctant to go, reluctant to build, reluctant to spend money. It seems that your problem or your challenge in recent years has been a little different from Jersey City. Not to rebrand, not to rebuild an image, but to try to figure out how to work with an embarrassment of riches, and not end up with something that looks like nobody thought about what was going to be built.

Glenda Hood: You know, we really suffer, don't we in Orlando? Let me tell you. Someone has got to do it.

You're right. When you think of Orlando, you think of us as the tourist destination of the world. Everyone likes to come there. We have over 40 million visitors a year. But, there is a real Orlando, too. Our downtown, our older established neighborhoods. And I think that's the image that we are working very hard to make sure that people have. That they recognize that, yes, we're a tourist destination, but we have a vibrant and vital city. We have a local economy besides the hospitality industry that's very strong. And we've worked hard to diversify that—especially in our high tech area.

I was interested in the sessions yesterday that were talking about different high tech industries.

And Orlando is never mentioned. And yet, we've worked very hard to make sure that it's not only the best kept secret in our own community, but I guess, it is around the country as well.

It is a challenge. And what we try to do is separate ourselves from that. We are going to have a special session following this today, so I hope you sit in on that. But, what we try to do is make sure that in our older, established neighborhoods that we're putting in place all the new urbanism concepts as we continue to annex. And we have been aggressive in annexing, to be able to increase our tax base and to add new lands to our city. That we and those undeveloped areas are also applying those concepts.

And then trying to work very closely with the other governments and the other entities that we're all required to work with. And I hope we get into a little bit more discussion about that, because I think that's one of the greatest challenges that we all have—regardless of whether it's in Orlando where the economy is very strong. Or in another community where they seem to be losing jobs and losing population very rapidly.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Qualls—I like the mix we have of pre-automobile and pre-air conditioning cities with post-automobile and post-air conditioning cities, because—

Roxanne Qualls: Is Cincinnati pre or post?

Ray Suarez: I like to think of Cincinnati, our queen of the Ohio River, as being, well, both, right?

Roxanne Qualls: You're sounding more and more like a politician.

Ray Suarez: But, you've got a very old core. And you want to make that part of your treasure chest, not part of something that you have to apologize for. I saw a lot going on there the last time I visited. Tell us about some projects.

Roxanne Qualls: What we're doing in Cincinnati is a number of projects. We are like many cities, in a situation of having to correct the mistakes of the past while at the same time trying to catch the demographic wave of the future. And one key project that we're doing is in regards to our river front where—this afternoon, there is a session that has to do with stadiums. And a lot of focus on Cincinnati's river front has been on the fact that we are building two new stadiums.

These stadiums, quite frankly, just simply served as an excuse and a mechanism to get what will be well over \$2 billion worth of infrastructure invested in our river front. This means that we can end up with what we hope will be at least 1200 units of housing, mixed income development, and a reclamation of the river front that entails literally a total redesign of an expressway connector that cut our downtown off from what is our best natural asset. That's on top of over, basically, fifteen years of trying to emphasize downtown housing development.

And what we know is that there is a very hot market for downtown housing, whether it's owner occupied or rental. Within the last four or five years we have brought on line well over a thousand units of housing—a mix of owner occupied as well as rental. And what the big challenge is, is to basically find the land for the developers who want to develop in downtown, while at the same time recognizing the value of good design. Because, it's the folks who are moving back into the city who are looking for all of the amenities that the city offers.

Ray Suarez: I'll apologize in advance, if you came up with the name, but Cinergy Center? C-I-N. Oh man.

Roxanne Qualls: Well, actually that is our local utility company that merged with an Indiana utility—

Ray Suarez: So, they bought naming rights.

Roxanne Qualls: And they bought naming rights, yes.

Ray Suarez: Good, then I don't have to apologize to anybody.

Mayor Savage, we were talking before the panel about how antigovernment sentiment plays into a lot of the work of being an elected official in the late 90's. This very strong government off of our backs and out of lives talk makes it hard to be the government to people. Yet, they want you to do all of the thing you're supposed to do. How do you operate—especially in a state with tremendous overlapping jurisdictions—where you'll get some of the blame for things that aren't even in your job description and not get the credit for things that are going right?

Susan Savage: In a populous state, like Oklahoma, even though people profess not to want to have government in their lives, you have more government than you do in most places. In the state of Oklahoma, I often say we have three local governments—the cities, the counties and the schools. None of those boundaries overlap—or they overlap, but they're not contiguous or concurrent with each other. They are all separate. They all have constitutional responsibilities. The net effect of that is you either you have to work around that through very cumbersome inter-local agreements or you just wink at the law a little bit and try to get it accomplished.

Anyway, from the standpoint of the orientation people have towards government in the state of Oklahoma, we like to think Tulsa is a little more enlightened. That we are great state of Tulsa is often how we describe ourselves, but it truly is the cultural center of the state, the educational center of the state, and where we tend to use the private sector to drive a lot of the decisions.

We really instituted the type of planning structure that Glenda referenced where you bring governments together. So, you try to overcome some of those barriers that tend to exist in order to get things done. But it makes it tough, because people often rail against government in their lives, yet they do turn to government.

And local government is, on one hand, where you get the most done, and you have the most ability to effect change through zoning, through land use planning, through the variety of financing mechanisms that you need for redevelopment. Yet, it is the level at which people can find you the most easily. They know where you live. They know where you go to the grocery store. They know who your vet is. And they know where your kids go to school. And so, you've got to be able to find a way to in effect to use that to make you as the local government official seem like one of them to accomplish those goals.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Norquist, like every other mayor on the panel this morning, you've got an economic region sitting outside the city lines that wants a lot of the same things that you would like to see in the best of all worlds come into Milwaukee. What's working for Milwaukee now in your quest to talk up the city as the place where that new building, that new employment should go?

John Norquist: I really don't look at economic development like foreign policy, where the city negotiates to have businesses come to Milwaukee as opposed to some place else. I think there is a lot of money and effort spent on that sort of thing, but it usually doesn't lead to growth. I don't think San Jose created Silicon Valley with an aggressive recruitment program, it's just that the ingredients were there and it happened for a variety of other reasons.

I do think that cities have a big advantage right now because of the disorder of development and the edge city over the last fifty years. Cities are strikingly more beautiful and the older streetcar suburbs are strikingly more beautiful than sprawl. The older villages in more rural areas are more beautiful than the sprawl around them.

Even in the case of Detroit—if you look of Detroit and the assemblage of buildings that are left, it's more interesting and beautiful. And there is more places you can take pictures to on postcards in Detroit than you can find Southfield, which is a big, commercial suburb with more office space now than Detroit. But Southfield has time limitations on its building and its very difficult to reuse them.

The one thing that I think really cities need to focus on now is the other things. You have to enhance the physical and take advantage of the people. The federal government may have made us the dumping ground for the poor, as you said, but the diversity in the cities is an advantage. We shouldn't lament that. We should just try to help poor people not be poor.

But, the things that cities need to do to help create those situations is have regulations that foster development. Regulations that do not need to intense negotiations. I don't think development should be like a divorce settlement. It should be something positive. Good planning and zoning can set up a situation where you don't have to argue with developers endlessly.

Education needs to be focused on parents, so that people with the discretion to live where they want can choose to live in the city. and make a respectable choice and not have their friends, my god! You live in the city!

Taxes need to be competitive. And crime needs to be defeated. Cities used to be the place you'd go to get away from highway robbers and wild animals, traditionally. And we really need to make cities so safe that they're thought of as safer than their surroundings. And your home town, New York, has made great progress on that.

Ray Suarez: And is enjoying a lot of the benefit, even though there is a tremendous lag time between the time the stats come down and the time people really start to feel that they're coming down and change their behavior as a reflections of those declining crime statistics.

If [Phil Gramm] gets his way and the community reinvestment act becomes part of our history, is that going to make much difference in any of your cities? Has it been used a tool to help create new investment?

Brett Schundler: In my own experience, it's not a big tool. I think what happens—John hit the nail on the head. What it takes to bring business into the city isn't a superb recruitment team, per se. There are actually commercial Realtors who make substantial amounts of money by helping corporate tenants relocated to a more attractive area.

The way you successfully bring in business is by having a more attractive area. Which means that you want to take advantage of all of the infrastructure you have in place. The beauty of the city. Make sure it is safe. Make sure that the taxes are low. Make sure that schools are good, so people feel good about having their employees in that location. And if you can do those things, the money flows in.

The city right now—Jersey City—has just tremendous amounts of private investment taking place. And I think the community reinvestment act—the way banks actually work with that is they end up investing where they want to, and then they mark up their credits against their community investment act requirements, if you will. But, corporations will always find a way, if they don't want to do something, to delay or figure out some other way to meet the requirement. You can't ultimately, without explicitly dictating—which would move us away, if you will, from a free market economy altogether—to a corporation, you must put your money here. It's not going to happen. They're going to find a way to meet the requirements of a statute that they want to meet the requirements.

John Norquist: Let me just bust in here. Years ago, I was complaining about redlining and I was talking to a banker about it. And I said, redline—look you have the map right up on your wall. That's the city's block grant zone.

I think the CRA act was good at the outset, and I don't think it should be repealed. But, I think that city's need to approach it from the right aspect. And that is, it's a way to draw the bank's attention to the opportunity there is to make money. The most profitable bank for many years in Wisconsin—not every year, but most years in the last ten years, is a bank called First Financial. And they have the best record in terms of percentage of minority loans as a percentage of their portfolio. And they also have been the most profitable bank.

Banks that discriminate based on race instead of credit worthiness over time are going to be punished in the marketplace. And they needed to be reminded of that. Maybe CRA reminds them of that. But, it shouldn't be looked at as that the banks should do something nice out of a sense of obligation.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Qualls?

Roxanne Qualls: I think that our experience in Cincinnati is that CRA has been an important mechanism to actually encourage the banks and prod the banks to develop certain tools which do support lending in particularly low-income, minority communities. On the other hand, what is also happening now is that as banking has been deregulated and is much more competitive, what banks are doing on their own is looking at new markets. They are targeting minority markets, women markets with new products because what they are realizing is that they, in essence, have to do some niche development which they in the past, frankly, didn't have to do. And so, I wouldn't support the repeal of CRA, but I think that the dynamic that's occurring right now is much more complex than what a lot of folks on either side of the CRA issue would like most people to believe.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Savage?

Susan Savage: I would add to that because I think in Tulsa, we certainly have found the same thing and the banks are going to be as involved as the banks wish to be. And right now, they are enormously involved. Fifteen years ago, ten years ago, they weren't. But the economy wasn't as healthy as it is today either. So, developing those new markets is really key.

I think the most destructive aspect of repealing the reinvestment act would be the symbolic message that it potentially would send to communities. That this kind of activity is no longer important. CRA is simply a tool that is available. It is one of many that communities use. We ought to keep it.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Hood?

Glenda Hood: I would agree with all the mayors. I would just also say here is an example in our community. We have one neighborhood that is right next to our downtown. And we have been able to bring back all of neighborhoods downtown with the exception of this one called [Paramour]. We have a very intensive initiative underway right now. And I think what the CRA has done is make some of those lending institutions and make our business community realize that they have a responsibility to a neighborhood that we have not been able to get investment to go into in the past. Any by realizing that responsibility, whether they use tools that are available through that act or not, we will see progress being made in the future. And I think that's one of the values in it.

John Norquist: Just one other thing I wanted to say Senator Phil Gramm. He reminds me of the glass eyed banker. Correct?

Brett Schundler: Let me just throw out one other thought there. Something that mayor's can do, however, is if you study your own community, you can see where investment opportunities are that someone who doesn't have as great a familiarity with your community may not notice. So, what we saw in Jersey City, for instance, was an opportunity to dramatically expand reverse mortgage opportunities for multi-families. Because here, the four Fannie Mae would only do reverse mortgages for one family buildings and we don't have many one families in Jersey City. So, we got Fannie Mae to be willing to buy in the secondary market reverse mortgages for multi-families. That made it so that primary lenders in the community were willing to make multifamily reverse mortgages. And that brought a tremendous amount of money in for folks, particularly seniors, who may have been house rich, but cash poor. And it allows them to pay their bills and keep their house in good order and see the properties climb with the overall market.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Schundler, I'm glad you jumped in with that point about what a mayor can do. Because, I think all of you are from strong mayor systems. And while we're talking about the

free market and investment going where it goes, and people wanting to optimize return and all that, the mayor still has a job. Not necessarily as a market maker, nor necessarily bringing institutions to heel and forcing them to build things they otherwise build. But, creating an atmosphere. Creating a matrix. Assembling parcels. Helping bus through the problems that are potential investor may see between them standing here and where they want to get over there.

In your free market view of how a mayor works, how does a mayor do those things and still not become sort of commissar?

Brett Schundler: The first thing you have to do to be effective as a mayor is you have to make your priorities—the citizens' priorities—which are almost never substantial redevelopment issues. The citizens are almost always most concerned about having crime be low, so they will be safe when they go outside. They are almost always concerned about the school system. They are almost always concerned about taxes.

Then, the redevelopment of big, open areas that have been fallowed because of decline and abandonment become a significant. So, if you don't first keep your eye on maintaining political support through having the citizens appreciate that you know what's most important to them and you are committed to addressing those issues, you can't get to first base.

But, if you do do those things, and you maintain the political support and trust of the people, then you have the opportunity to do exactly what you have talked about, Ray. For instance, you know that we have great location advantages. That's why cities grew up where they did in the first place. You do have to do a lot of land aggregation sometimes in areas that have suffered abandonment. Getting that done in advance and getting it planned and zoned, and if you will, some of the initial permitting done, so that when the market cycle turns, then you have an interest in investment.

You can actually have investors immediately jump in and begin to move forward. That's extremely important. That just takes a bit of an understanding as to what it will take for private business to find your city attractive. One of the things it will take is the immediacy of return, because you have done a lot of the work in advance, so that they can rush in and begging to build as quickly as possible.

One of the other things that every mayor can do is that they can make sure that they have an economic development office where when a investor walks in—you don't give them everything they want, but you let them know in advance what they need to do so that they don't have any wasted money, because they've gone down the wrong road. Then, because they know exactly what's required, they can get right to work with a minimum of problems down the pike.

For instance, where you have to go to a board to get an approval. They will already have built the project in a way that it meets with approval when it comes to the board. Or let's say, plan the project. And this is exactly what John Norquist was talking about when he said it shouldn't be like divorce court. It should be that when someone walks in the door, they find someone who is there and ready to be a partner with them. And not an equity partner, they'll get all the money. But, ready to be a partner with them facilitating their success.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Hood, when you find yourself, luckily, as circumstance would have it, the mayor of a city that's a capital magnet, do you also have to try to make sure that the wrong things don't get built? It's not a question of steering people to aggregated parcels, but trying to help them see that what they've got in mind is very bad.

Glenda Hood: That's an easy answer. Absolutely.

Ray Suarez: How do you do that, though? Do you have a statutory power to do that?

Glenda Hood: That's why we have certain standards in place. That's why we have ordinances. That's why we have our growth management plan. Our land development code. We're constantly evolving those and looking for new ways that we can put ordinances in place that guide the

appropriate policies for the future.

We also build that base of support and the ownership through the citizens. Because, as I always say, if the citizens are there ranting and raving that they don't want unsightly or inappropriate types of design to go into their neighborhood, whether it be commercial or residential, then it's going to be much easier for the elected body to make the right decisions and to stand firm. Instead of just making a decision based on which way the winds blowing that day.

And so, we have to include and involve the citizens in developing those guidelines. And in developing the details of those ordinances and policies that are in place. And we've done a lot of that. I mean, first of all, we've involved our citizens in multiple processes as we've developed our ordinances, which I'm sure every other mayor here does.

We do surveys on a yearly basis, as far as a written survey. We have people not only rate our services, but what kinds of things do they want in the future. We do telephone surveys now. We went through a visual preference survey with everyone in the city working with [Tony Nelleson] and his folks.

We also involve people with special planning projects. Like right now, around the excitement of the millennium, we're doing what we call neighborhood horizons, where neighborhoods can design their own plans. Then, with newer properties, redevelopment in our southeast area with our naval training center property, we hold public meetings. Sometimes ad nauseum, I will say. But, to the extent that we can really have the ownership and the buy in from folks, so that it's their plan. And if it's their plan, then it's easy to stand firm. It's easy to tell that developer that what their proposing is not appropriate.

But, I have to tell you, we've been very fortunate that we have an enlightened group in our development community. And I think they for the most part want to guide good urban design and good planning for the future, because unfortunately, we've seen what isn't in that category in Florida for many years. And we recognize that's not the quality of life and that's not the direction we want to take for the future.

Susan Savage: I want to contrast a little bit with what Glenda is saying. Tulsa in the mid-eighties when the oil crisis hit was almost exclusively energy dependent, oil dependent in its economy. We lost 40,000 very good paying jobs in about a two to three year period of time. So, the goal for people in Tulsa became creating new jobs. And development really came to a standstill. We've joked in the community that we have an endangered species that we're currently now seeing back on the urban landscape, and that is the crane.

But, we truly were in a depression that because of the size of cities like Dallas and Houston and other oil dependent communities really wasn't well known. Our goal became to diversify the economy and to recreate those jobs. So, when you spend five to ten years getting to that point, and you accept development and encourage it on almost any terms, then suddenly you find yourselves in the position in which we are in now where we have less than a 3% unemployment rate.

We have an enormously strong economy that is very well diversified. It's primarily small business sector driven that's heavily represented by telecommunications, aerospace, manufacturing, industry—a lot of things that are creating new, good quality jobs.

Suddenly, we look at the city and say, it's a nice city. It's a pretty city. But, we're 200 square miles in size. We have the ability to move out 50 to 60 miles from the core of the city and because of these massive highways, get in and out in 45 to 50 minutes, because everybody drives by exceeding the speed limit by at least 10 miles per hour. where I live, you're going to get run over—

Ray Suarez: That's part of getting off your back, though.

Susan Savage: Getting the government off your back! So, all of sudden, the old manufacturing and energy related industrial sites that are in the urban core—we're looking at those. How do you

redevelop them? How do you use them? What's the matter with our zoning code and our development guidelines? Do they even exist? In many areas we don't even have any kind of development guidelines that speak to what is good quality development.

And at the same time, you are competing with the areas around you who are growing. We're now just pulling inward and looking at issues of infill. Looking at issues of quality. Looking at issues of recognizing that people can live anywhere they want in order to work. They don't necessarily have to live in your city. What do you do to your city to address that? So, we're having to start the community development process anew and reconsider really what that process is. So, it's a little bit of a contrast.

Ray Suarez: 200 square miles. That's an almost unimaginable footprint for a city of your population.

Susan Savage: And that's with 380,000 people. So, when you say that you've got some extra land out there—and people want to get in their cars and drive exactly to their destination. Get out of the car and be able to walk right in the front door. So, parking lots are big deal is Tulsa. And streets.

Ray Suarez: Just by contrast, Brooklyn, with 2.3 million people is 71 square miles. That's amazing.

Mayor Qualls, you wanted to say?

Roxanne Qualls: Ray, just a point of clarification. I'm probably the only mayor up here that is actually on a council manager not an executive system.

But, playing a little bit off of what Brett was saying, but from the opposite perspective in terms of the challenge to any mayor, regardless of the system that you're in. What I would argue is that the primary responsibility is that of all the elected officials, and perhaps of all the people in any city, the mayor is the one person who is supposed to be looking ten to fifteen years out. And they need to be aware of the types of changes that are coming down the line that will impact the city. So, therefore, at the same time dealing with the immediacy of politics, also understanding the long term policy changes as well as then operational changes that need to be made.

And Cincinnati has a bit of the opposite problem from Tulsa. Cincinnati's history in terms of planning, at least that which we would like to tell ourselves, which could be our own conceit, quite frankly, is that at one time Cincinnati was one of the premier cities in terms of urban design and urban planning. But, if that were true, and let's assume it is true, what are grand history has done at this point, has become our greatest obstacle. Because, we have more things on the books. And we have a zoning code at this point that is probably this thick that only two people in the entire city understand and have the ability to interpret.

So, what we're confronted with is actually having to not just procedurally make changes, but at the same time, deal with changing an entire bureaucracy, which has built up—it's a process of [accretion]. Calcification has occurred. And so, undoing that, so that we can actually respond to the market and not stand in the way of the market, while at the same time, insuring good design is our biggest challenge.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Norquist?

John Norquist: I would agree that a lot of progress can be made by redoing codes, reforming them. There's a lot of people that increasingly know how to do that.

There's another lesson, I think, cities have to learn. And you mentioned earlier assembling land. Cities assemble land. They can, but it isn't necessarily good every time they do it. The fine grain of the city can be destroyed as [Fred Koetter] talked about last night.

We had an example here between 4th and 5th and Wisconsin Avenue. Right across the street from

the new convention center is an empty parcel land that has been empty for about twenty years. And this city assembled it. To assemble it, they took out a hotel, several retail stores, a restaurant, about \$2 million worth of property. Assemble the land, and then it's sat there for twenty years.

We appraise it at \$4 million. We had a hotel developer say that he would put a 327 room hotel there if he had the land free. And then a \$9 million dollar subsidy. So, by assembling the land, the city reduced from value from positive \$2 million to negative \$9 million. That's quite an accomplishment.

Ray Suarez: For those of you who are familiar with Chicago. The story of block 37 should be a warning to all. I watched the demolition crews bring down five stores, because they were about to build this great big thing there. And right now, all that is there is a summer camp for art students in the heart of one of America's intact and heavily built downtowns. It's really an amazing thing that block 37 is still there.

Mayor Schundler?

Brett Schundler: This gets down to knowing what your market advantages are and what your market conditions are. If you assemble this huge tract of land, without any sense that there is actually market interest in the land, then you're probably running away with pure hubris. And there is a degree to which planning can sometimes be the search for power without responsibility. You would love to just remake the world without having actually be in touch with what the world is interested in.

As a mayor, my argument would be that you're really responsible to all your citizens. You can't just plan for what you might like to see if you could start from scratch as [Nikolai Ceacescu]. You do have to actually have a sense of not just what your constituents are interested in, but also what the market is interested in. And there are things that you can impose on developers towards meeting what your citizens are interested in. But you can't totally make it out of thin air. You can't say this is what my citizens are interested in, even though you can't make any money. This is what you have to do. It's not going to work.

John Norquist: What adds value? That's a question that should be asked. What adds value? From the public interest meaning the people. And also for the developer. The developer needs to add value or there is no point to it.

Brett Schundler: I'll give one example in that regard. We put what is, I think, all of us in the city think is a lousy—big box retailer and one parcel of land. And some relatively, I would argue in the future, high valued property. But, the fact is, that this one tract, there is an awful lot of land that is available. And the builder there will be for the next ten years putting up one or two office buildings a year, and several high rise apartment buildings a year. So, in short, he has a lot of great land that as fast as he can develop, will get very high rate-ables there. But, there is so much, they could also put some lousy stuff up.

The issue is should we stop him from doing that—making some profit. When he can just easily tear it down in the future and replace it when you have taken the most prime spots and put offices and high rises there. Should you then allow him in the interim to take some back parcel and put a crappy big box retailer, which is as easily taken down in the future and replaced with a high rise, when you have actually filled up all of your other develop-able land?

I would argue yes. Because, it's what the market will pay for right now. He won't put a prime building in that space right now, when he's got so much other space which is better.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Hood?

Glenda Hood: I could sit here, I guess, because I believe Orlando is the newest city of the five represented here and say, we've learned lessons from all of you on how not to do it, as far as assembling properties and all. But, actually we've learned lessons from ourselves, because we're

not very good at that. So, I think there is a better way besides just realizing that it has to be market driven, obviously.

And sometimes, we thought we could drive the market in the past and as I said, didn't do a very good job. But, certainly working again with the developer, not just on design guidelines, but we do do incentives in certain ways. Or we put in place certain funds or dollars that we can assist with. In Florida, we have impact fees. And we can assist and be a little flexible with some of those and other fees that are charged.

We can also ease the process. We've just gone through a major redo of our permitting services office, and trying to make things much more efficient, not only internally, but much easier for that business person and that developer out there. And I think the flexibility is absolutely key. And then obviously, everything has to be in keeping with that vision that Mayor Qualls talked about that we're all responsible for as mayors.

And obviously, having a plan in hand. I don't think we can emphasize that enough, because we're here to talk about leadership. And that's the biggest responsibility on each of our shoulders. Making sure that we do look out into the future. And making sure that we do bring others along and find the appropriate way to do that. Not just with our own staffs and our neighbors, but those who are looking far from the outside inward to what the opportunities for investment may be.

Ray Suarez: I've been asked to leave plenty of time for questions. So, you've really done a tremendous thing by getting up this early. Now, we'll see if you've really been awake for the past 45 minutes.

Yes. Stand up, please

[Unintelligible question from the audience]

Roxanne Qualls: The question was, what is the city of Cincinnati doing with a neighborhood called [Over the Rhine]. Just let me be very brief with the background. Cincinnati, as most cities, has a central business district that is very compact, because it's in a basin. It goes up to about ten blocks, north and south. Then there is a major street. Then you're in Over the Rhine. It is about as close in a neighborhood as you can get.

It was at one time one of the most densely populated neighborhoods in the country. In fact, where you had 40,000 living in, I believe it was about, 2 square miles. Tenements. It was very intense. It's one of the finest concentrations of Italianate architecture in the country.

It has been for 20 years, at least, tied up in the most egregious, political, grass roots, poverty industry versus glassy eyed—to borrow a term—development conflict that one could imagine. The result of which is that it is doing nothing but falling down, literally. We try not tear down the buildings, but at a certain point, if they are not boarded up. If they don't have roofs on. it doesn't matter what the quality of architecture is, for safety's sake, you tear them down.

We have worked with ULI. We are in the midst to develop a process and a program to proceed with the redevelopment of Over the Rhine. It is already probably two years behind schedule, because once again, the politics. However, I think that we're at a critical phase. Either in fifteen years, it won't exist, or in fifteen years, it will be redeveloped. Because, there is also some entrepreneurial spirit, quite frankly, that showed itself and redeveloped one of the main streets in Over the Rhine, without city assistance, virtually. It's moving to the west. And we're beginning to see some entrepreneurs actually bypass the political process.

John Norquist: Are you getting the artist, cafe latte, bohemian types in there?

Roxanne Qualls: Is that a good thing or a bad thing?

Ray Suarez: I was just going to ask.

John Norquist: If they pay taxes, it's good.

Roxanne Qualls: So, the description is not necessarily a pejorative, it's just—

Ray Suarez: —to the point.

Roxanne Qualls: What we're doing is we're getting a real mix of folks in there. We're getting young, professionals in there. There in that area on that one main street. There have been a lot of loft conversions. And the interesting thing, is that the situation is that it becomes this conflict and fight between low income housing advocates, and again, glassy eyed developers.

But the irony of it is, is that because of the total disinvestment in that neighborhood—yes, you did have people living in certain buildings that were undeveloped at \$50 a month rent. But, the reality of their lives was that there was often times no real plumbing. That the electrical was on the verge of causing major fires. So, when the places were redone, the rents went up to a startling \$350 a month. And that's the level of the conflict, which is just ludicrous. But, that's a political issue that has to be undone and unraveled for the sake of that entire neighborhood.

Ray Suarez: Yes.

Audience Member: One of the key ingredient of good planning and good economy in the city is mass transportation. So, I would like to know from the mayor, how she sees her role as the strong mayor in parroting up the interests of [NPO's] [CIRNPO], the regional planning council, county commission and business interests and citizens in trying to achieve within the next hundred years.

Ray Suarez: For those of you who didn't hear the question. It was the mass transit question and it was directed at Mayor Hood.

Glenda Hood: And I'll try and be brief. I also happen to be chair of our regional transportation authority right now. Where are you from?

Audience Member: Fort Lauderdale.

Glenda Hood: Fort Lauderdale. Okay, so you know our situation then. That's why.

Ray Suarez: And Fort Lauderdale, is, of course, a very mass transit intense market. By contrast.

Glenda Hood: We all know in the Sun Belt, we have our love affair with the automobile. Thank goodness for all of you, you have made us realize that we absolutely have to design our cities for people and not the car. But, that's an interesting balance that we have to keep.

Specifically, my role is to make sure as I look out into the future, that we are dealing with every aspect that makes a city work. And mass transit is absolutely one of the most important things. Accessibility into our downtown, into our other activity centers, which is the way we develop our community with the density and intensity in those different activity centers, like around our airport. Our tourism area where are convention center and most of our hotels are.

And we are right now in a very interesting discussion time as far as moving forward with the first leg of a regional light rail system. And for those of you who are in communities that have light rail systems and provide that choice when it comes to transportation, you know that there's always very healthy debate about that. And I will tell you I can stand up and show you my scars and bruises, because I feel very alone.

And the reason I feel alone is because it is not politically expedient for a lot of other elected officials, because they're testing which way the winds blowing today. And so they'll vote this way today, and that way another day, based on now what a few very vocal supporters may say. And they're really not looking pass their nose. And I'm sorry to be so blunt, but that's the way I see it.

The other part of that is the fact that the business community—it's very hard to get the business community motivated and stand up and take a position when it comes to providing choices like light rail in the future.

Light rail is not the be all end all by any means. We have to expand our bus system. We have to continue to make improvements to our highways and byways, and look for pedestrian ways and bike-ways and everything else that's a part of the overall package. But, I feel that the reason business community isn't as engaged—and I was very pleased yesterday in that session to hear from the Silicon Valley Manufacturers Council speaker that they are involved. And they do come together and push on those elected officials to make a decision. I wish I had that in my community. But, I think times are good. Transportation issues aren't sexy. It's an imperative. And people just think, let government handle that and let government make those decisions. If we don't get this choice today, we'll get it later on. Or they'll come up with something else.

So, it's very difficult right now, but it is absolutely my role to look out into the future and lead in that respect as far as I'm concerned.

Ray Suarez: Life might get a little easier when gas is no longer cheaper than milk.

Glenda Hood: And I think what we have to do is we have to show people what it truly is going to cost them financially and otherwise if they don't provide the choices when it comes to transportation.

Ray Suarez: Given that your region is so intensely settled by older Americans—

Glenda Hood: Not my region.

Ray Suarez: But, your part of the country. I keep looking to Florida as a place that might have a chance of getting it a little sooner, because the idea of having 10 million drivers over 85 just doesn't seem very palatable. States seem very reluctant to change licensing requirements and it's just not a very easy place to live without a car.

Glenda Hood: I don't ever like to correct anyone who is in any way, shape or form, associated with the media, however, our median age is about 33 years of age.

Ray Suarez: No, I understand that.

John Norquist: Mickey is about 70.

Glenda Hood: You're not supposed to tell his age.

I understand what you're saying, but really, we are, as far as a major metropolitan area, one of the youngest. Most of the older population is along the coast in Florida. But, I'm more scared of the tourists, quite honestly, that has their map unfolded laying across their steering wheel as they're going 75 miles an hour down the interstate. That's what scares me the most.

But, you're right—

[Abrupt end of conversation]

[End of side A]

Glenda Hood: —who is when we do. And that's very difficult. But, it's not a debate unlike what every other community has gone through this has had.

Brett Schundler: I want to suggest you have to be less ideological about this issue on both sides. This is one of the most ideologically driven debates going. People who are against mass transit are religiously against mass transit. And people who are for mass transit are religiously for it and anti-

car, and yet, every single one of them owns a car.

It makes me want to pull my hair out. We're putting in a light rail right now in Jersey City, which is absolutely, critically essential for the redevelopment of our waterfront. We have an older city. Extremely high density. 250,000 people in about 11 square miles.

John Norquist: Just for [Whitney Gold] from the Milwaukee Journal. Republican mayor, Brett Schundler, for light rail. thinks it's absolutely essential. Note that.

Ray Suarez: I think we just heard an audio footnote.

Brett Schundler: And I think we have to be that way with regard to roadways, too. Now, let me give you an example. This light rail that we have will ultimately go down to Newark Airport and will go up to the area of the Giants' Stadium. And there will be Park and Rides for people. They can leave their cars. And it will take them to our waterfront, where, again, you have very high density development. You're talking about 60 story office buildings next to each other. You don't have parking lots when this is built out. What you'll have is some parking decks.

But, there won't be nearly enough parking spots for all the people. so, they'll be getting there by light rail, which is the only way that you would be able to get them to the waterfront without massive congestion, given that we have an older city, again, with narrower streets. That said, all the people who are living in the apartment buildings on the waterfront also want to be able to have a car and get out. Now, if you take a train and get to the western Park and Ride, what are you supposed to do? Walk the rest of way, if you decide to go to a park? That's ridiculous. They have to have a way to get out also.

Now, one of the things we're doing is we're taking an abandoned railroad cut and we're trying to put in an expressway there, which allows someone from the west to get right to the waterfront bypassing the Holland Tunnel access roads, which are always congested because of the number of people to New York City. We are not expanding the Holland Tunnel. You're not going to have any more through traffic than you have today. Because, the bottle neck of the Holland Tunnel is going to be the same size as it is.

What this is is really an expressway to our waterfront. So, those of us who live downtown in the east side of Jersey City, when we want to go west, we can actually get there without having to mix in with the New York exiting traffic and all the congestion that represents. And what that congestion produces is people leaving that New York access road and going on to our local roads, because of utter frustration. And that creates a lot of aggravation for us. We have a lot of passing traffic on our local roads. We want people on our local roads to actually be locally interested drivers. And those of us who are on the east and want to go west, or have people on the west who want to visit us directly on the east, we want them to get there quickly.

Now, this roadway we're going to build out is in an abandoned railroad cut that is basically invisible to the public. And yet, there are the anti-car crowd that want to put another light rail spur through there, even though we already have a light rail stop where this cut ends. It won't bring any added value.

So, in short, you have to deal with all the transportation alternatives. in a city, we have to be less ideological. We have to take advantage with regard to transit. And in Jersey City, that means not just subways like the PATH train, and the new light rail. It also means ferries, which are just exploding. And as they are growing in usage, you are knitting the two sides of the Hudson together, which is largely accounting for the explosive growth we're having on our waterfront. The fact that there is no longer a sense of geographic separation between our two communities.

But, you're not going to get to a point where roads are not necessary. And you're never going to get to that point where people don't want cars at all. Those people living on our very high density areas are going to still want to be able to get out of the city and do so without aggravation.

And I might add that within five years, you're hydrocarbon body cars are going to be doubling the fuel efficiency of your current generation of cars. And in about fifteen, you'll probably be to the point where you will have very little gas and very little pollution from cars at all. So, this is not an environmental problem, if you ask me. That problem is going to be solved by technological advancements in automotive engineering.

Ray Suarez: Mayor Savage?

Susan Savage: I always feel like I'm down at this end of table either whining or adding a new perspective to this.

Ray Suarez: Both very important roles, I should point out.

Susan Savage: I live in a state where the population is under 3 million people. 23% of the residents of the state reside in the city of Tulsa. 200 square miles—you have heard that. Oklahoma has historically been a donor state to—so when you talk about this issue of mass transit and transportation in general, it is perhaps the most political discussion you will ever have. Certainly at the state level and the federal level, because if you're sitting over there in that state legislature and you can get a new road in your county, then you've done something for the folks. And slapping down a little slab of asphalt or concrete makes everybody feel like they can actually point and say, look what I did.

So, the battle inherent in my part of the country, is not only cultural, because I'm in a city that's barely 100 years old. And people grew up around the automobile. Or the city grew up around the automobile. Even though 50% of our population now is comprised of people who've moved in from other areas looking for work. We've got a lot of people coming from big cities on the east coast and from the west coast, who are saying either build bigger roads or do something with your transit system.

But, it's not on the radar screen for most of the public. And it is certainly not on the radar screen for the people who are making decisions about where the transportation dollars go. Either at the federal level or most especially, at the state level. Tulsa is a donor city. In addition, Tulsa and Oklahoma City are—within the state, we get 77 cents, historically, of every dollar that's returned to the state for transportation.

We're going to fight that battle in the next few years at the legislature. If you don't think we're going to get hammered—it is going to be tough. But, we're trying to address transportation needs with a bus system that we either have to pay for at the local level, and we do most of that. Or we're going to have to find a new funding source to expand the service at all. So, it's extremely political. And when you're dealing in a state that typically a large percentage of the funds go to help support other regions, it doesn't give folks much incentive to do much more about it.

Ray Suarez: I am honor bound or duty bound to keep this thing on track. And we are done. But, you understand now why people are putting away their blow dryers and their Bally loafers and running for mayor instead of Congress. These five people will make being mayor hip again. Thank you very much.

[End of interview]

[Female speaker asking audience to stay in the auditorium]

John Norquist: We have a member and two guests. [Bill Lind], who has come to several CNU's. He's a conservative. He works for the Free Congress Foundation. And [Paul Weyrich], who is his boss is here from the Free Congress Foundation. Paul is very conservative. Somebody accused him once of wanting to return the country to the 19th century. And his response was, what's your point?

And [William Millar] is executive director of the American Public Transit Association, which

represents the transit systems and bus companies of America. They have been working together on a report and a statement that they want to briefly summarize.

But, before I did that, though, I just wanted to give you a better idea of what Paul Weyrich is all about. He grew up in Racine, near here. He was a reporter for the Milwaukee Sentinel for a while. And he knows a lot about Milwaukee history, so I thought I would just read this brief excerpt from a book that I wrote recently, “The Wealth of Cities.”

This is to continue your education on this theater. In 1911, [George Kennan], the great foreign policy expert performed here as a seven year old boy. Anyway, George Kennan, foreign policy scholar and former ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia was born and raised in Milwaukee. In 1990, he returned to receive an honorary degree from the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. Kennan arrived a day early to tour his home town, which he had not seen in 40 years.

As mayor, he insisted that I accompany him. We visited various landmarks, and finally, remember sites from Kennan’s youth. Although, some were gone, he delighted in those remaining. We ended our tour at one of Kennan’s boyhood’s spots, a small downtown park. In Kennan’s youth, train stations had abutted the park on three sides. The Milwaukee Electric Railway. The Milwaukee Union Station, proud home of the Hiawatha. And the North Shore Railway, the 100 mile per hour electric train that connected Milwaukee to Chicago in only 70 minutes and 20 times a day round trip.

In those days, when young Kennan finished his paper route, if he had extra papers, he would bike to the park. To him, the park seemed like the center of the world with thousands of passengers coming and going. It was the basic city park, surrounded by buildings full of human activity, making its little green common all the more valuable. Kennan would sell his papers, all of them, fast. And he had great fun doing so, among the excitement and crowds generated by the nearby trains, hotels, restaurants, offices, shoe shine stands, and saloons.

That day, in 1990, Kennan stood in what is now called [Zyler Park], and his eyes moistened. All three train stations were gone. The park was empty and quiet. The only sound was the roar of the freeway a block way. Kennan looked off toward a concrete parking ramp. He shook his head and said, this is not an improvement.

I think that Paul Weyrich has that kind of sensitivity about what has happened to cities. He’s old enough to remember when a lot of the transit systems that were ripped out in the 1950’s still existed. Even though he may look young to you, he’s old enough to remember that.

And it’s my great pleasure to introduce one of America’s leading political thinkers, who I disagree with on many issues. But, I think he has a profound knowledge to share on transit.

Paul Weyrich: Thank you, John. Leave it to a politician to turn an introduction into a plug for his own book. It’s absolutely—

Listening to Ray’s questions and the five excellent mayors here reminds me of the little town in central Illinois, which had a weekly newspaper. And the biggest story of the weekly newspaper was the fact that the Illinois Power Company was coming to rip the boards off of the little substation because the area had expanded. And they were reopening something which had been closed some years earlier.

So, the photographer went and took a picture of the boards being ripped off. Just as the paper was going to bed, the word came out that the 79-year old mayor of the town had eloped with his 19 year old secretary. So, they decided that was a much better story for the front page of the paper. They didn’t have a picture of the secretary. Of course, they had a picture of the mayor. So, they put the picture of the mayor on the front page.

In their haste, however, they neglected to change the caption. Therefore, the next morning, the paper came up. And there was the picture of the 79 year old mayor and the caption, old power-

house reactivated. I think about that when I think of the revival of the cities.

Bill and I are not from that group of conservative who are driving the transit debate. And we set out to try to change that. In the country, close to 40% of the population self identify as conservative. But, only 4% are libertarians. The libertarians as Mayor Schundler has correctly said, are the ideological component that insists on everything fitting in to their preconceived ideologies.

So, the first study which we did and released three years ago, took a look at why conservatives ought to be interested in mass transit, particularly in urban transit. But the libertarians have continued to drive the debate by trumping up phony statistics about how only 1% of the trips made by people in urban areas are taken by transit. And therefore, transit is absolutely useless.

And so, what we have tried to do in a study which is being released today at your conference, called “Does Transit Work? A Conservative Reappraisal,” is to come up with a different way of looking at this so that we can argue it on the correct terms, instead of arguing it on the terms in which they have set. Because, he who frames the issue determines the outcome of the debate. They have framed the issue for far too long.

So, my colleague, Bill Lind, will tell you in very brief summary, what we have come up with in this new study which we have done in cooperation with the American Public Transit Association. and Bill Millar will make a couple of very quick closing comments after Bill tells you our study.

Bill Lind: As is so often the case, the problem with the 1% argument isn't the answer, it's the question. The question what percentage of total trips in the United States are made on transit neglects facts like half of Americans have no transit available whatsoever. And half of those who have transit available do not have anything that we would recognize as quality transit. Anything that you might leave your car home, if you have one, and take transit instead.

So, we came up with a different measurement. The measurement that is the center of our paper here is transit competitive trips. Of those trips which transit is in a position to compete for, in terms of availability, availability of quality transit, and also trip purpose viewed historically. What kind of trips historically, including going back to the height of the transit era in the teens and twenties, did transit carry? And what types didn't it carry, even then?

If we ask that question—if we say, all right, if that defines transit competitive trips, then how does transit do? We get a radically different answer. Not 1%. Not 2%. Not 5%. The statistics have not been collected—and this is interesting in itself—in such a way that we can give you an exact number. But, what we have done instead is three case studies. We looked at an older, modern light rail system—San Diego's. A new light rail system—St. Louis. And Metra Commuter Rail System in Chicago. And what we find in each of those cases is whatever the number is, we can give it precisely, it's vastly higher.

Examples—in Chicago, public transit—now here's an area where public transit and quality transit which usually means rail is available widely. In Chicago, 50% to 60% of all the trips commuting trips to the central business district, which remains the economic powerhouse of the Chicago are made on transit. That's a little different from 1%.

And the most fascinating statistic of all—it's really not a statistic, it's a vignette—we looked at St. Louis and we found something really creepy. Perhaps, not the only thing in St. Louis that's really creepy. But Metro Links new light rail line almost precisely parallels within a mile and sometimes closer—within walking distance, essentially—the first transit line in St. Louis. This originally was a combination of cable car and steam railway, was electrified precisely 100 years before Metro Link opened. And was at that time, the longest electric railway in the country. We've compared ridership. And Metro Link is carrying two-thirds the ridership that that line carried at the height of the streetcar era in the 1920's. Now, not the most ideological libertarian can tell you that in the 1920's transit wasn't important. So, how is it not important or a failure today, if it's carrying two-thirds of the ridership on a parallel line that it did then?

I think what we have had created here that effectively swats the libertarian fly. Not, once again, but quibbling over decimal points and statistics, but by posing a different question. One that is a far more real world question, and that we believe overcomes the contradiction between the 1% number—the real figure is somewhere around 2%, but that's not really important—but the contradiction between that number and the reality that those of us who live in cities and work in cities see everyday in terms of the importance of public transit.

As Paul mentioned, this is the release of our study. Many of you, I'm sure are familiar with it's predecessor. It will be in the bookstore. It's free for the taking. We've got a few hundred copies up here. And we will also be available after the session breaks in the lobby out here to talk to any one who is interested, including, of course, press.

Let me ask Bill Millar of APTA if he wants to add a few words.

William Millar: Good morning. It's great to be in a wonderful city. And Mayor Norquist, we are very appreciative of your willingness to share a bit of the podium time here and to the Congress of New Urbanism. I was very pleased in seeing your charter and seeing the importance that you place on the walk-ability and live-ability of cities. And the fact that public transit is a very important contributor to that and can be.

The American Public Transit Association is the trade organization that represents the public transit operators throughout North America. In fact, looking at the five mayors that were with us earlier, the transit systems in each of their communities is one of our members. Our members also include the companies—the private sector companies—that build public transit. They build buses, rail cars, design systems and that sort. And it is our private sector members, that have understood that it's important that the public get good information, factual information on important public debates, such as Mayor Hood talked about in terms of public transit and what type of transit should be built.

So, our private sector members have allowed us to develop a partnership with the Free Congress Foundation that Paul heads up. And as they have mentioned, this is the second report they have done for us. We believe this will add some real substance to the debate. And for those of us who believe in cities, believe in community, and believe in transit's contribution to the building of community, we believe this will be another tool in the toolbox to help get the truth out about what transit can mean.

So, on behalf of the American Public Transit Association, on behalf of our private sector business members, we're very pleased with this relationship with the Free Congress Foundation. We hope you will go to your bookstore upstairs and get copies of this. If they do run out, you can contact us in Washington, DC—www.apta.com—and we'll get you a copy right away.

So, it's great to be with you. Congratulations on all you're doing. And our thanks to the Congress on New Urbanism for allowing us to be here today.

Thanks very much.

[End of session]