PORTLAND, OREGON

WHO PAYS THE PRICE FOR REGIONAL PLANNING?

How to Link Growth Management and Affordable Housing

By Tasha Harmon

The Portland Metro region is hailed all over as the mecca of growth management — a unique regional planning tool that limits suburban sprawl and central city disinvestment.

But is growth management good for low-income people? Can growth management incorporate strategies to increase equity? Our experience as advocates of affordable housing in Portland suggests that it can, but not without concerted action by activists.

Arguments for Growth Management

Recent work by David Rusk, Myron Orfield, Manuel Pastor, John Powell and others demonstrates that suburban sprawl and urban disinvestment increases the isolation and challenges faced by low income people and reduces the overall quality of the regional environment. Others argue for growth management as a less costly alternative to sprawl. They say that sprawl increases public expenditures for new infrastructure while existing infrastructure in central cities and older suburbs is allowed to disintegrate.

However, there are also costs to growth management. When you make the choice (in our economic system) to limit the available land supply, require more parks, protect environmentally sensitive lands, and build mass transit, someone’s got to pay the price. Poor people usually carry a disproportionate burden and rich people benefit most from growth management — as they would from unregulated growth. As with many neighborhood revitalization efforts, the success of growth management is too often measured by asking whether “the community” or “the neighborhood” improves, without asking whether that improvement comes at the expense of low income residents.

I side with the folks who believe that sprawl is ultimately more costly for the poor (and for all of us) than growth management (done right). Many costs are born by households because of the kind of region they live in — transportation costs, the costs of services or amenities in regions where they are very inequitably distributed, the costs of not being able to find work because the regional economy is doing poorly, or because there are no entry level jobs in some communities.
Send your PN Update to us today! You can email the Planner's Network Editor, Natalia Hall, at <nhall@pratt.edu>, and be featured in this column.

Planners Network
PN Updates
379 DeKalb Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11205

Cathy Klump, of the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana, IL, wrote to inform us about the goings on of the new Illinois chapter of PN. She also included the Jan. 1998 edition of the chapter's newsletter which covers information about recent and upcoming UIUC chapter activities. They also have a website <http://www.uiuc.edu/ntse/netnews/> that includes information about PN, how to join, upcoming events at the UIUC community, links, and an electronic version of their newsletter. If you are in the Champaign-Urbana community and would like to learn more contact Cathy at <c-klump@uiuc.edu> or check out their website.

Tim Stroshane writes with the following news:
The City of Berkeley, California has completed and released its first-ever draft Berkeley Homeless Continuum of Care Plan. The draft plan addresses maintenance-of-effort issues and gaps in services and affordable housing posed by welfare destruction, the continuing upward spiral of housing costs in Berkeley, and managed care. The draft plan is a joint effort of Berkeley’s Independent Task Force on Homelessness and an interdepartmental team of City staff. Surveys of homeless service users and service providers were conducted in late 1996 and findings were incorporated into the development of a background report, “Homelessness in Berkeley,” and the draft plan. Copies of each document are available at no charge by contacting Tim Stroshane, City of Berkeley Housing Department, 2201 Dwight Way, 2nd Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704; calling 510/645-5742; or emailing him, <tis151@ci.berkeley.ca.1111801>. Ann Forsyth sent in this query: The Urban Places Project, a unit at UMass Amherst that I co-direct, is currently working on two projects in South Holyoke, in Massachusetts. We have two requests for materials.
1. In the first project, we are working with Nueva Esperanza, the main CDC in the neighborhood, to conduct a feasibility study for an indoor vendors market in a Main Street building they own. We are looking at space planning, financial aspects, management, etc. We are interested in finding out about other markets in very low-income neighborhoods (South Holyoke’s 1990 poverty rate was 64%) and in Latino areas.
2. In the second project, we are working with two related youth programs YouthPower and El Arco Iris — to document their work. Over the past few years these programs have worked with young people on a number of projects involving neighborhood planning, public art, and urban design. At the neighborhood level youth have been involved in project design, data collection, analysis, planning and design proposals, presentations, and construction. They have also had input into the city-wide comprehensive planning process.
Our job, as part of a tiny grant, is to help the youth and youth leaders document these activities in three ways: a short video or other kind of audio-visual presentation aimed at making other youth interested in these kinds of activities; a role-play exercise or game; and a short manual of techniques aimed more at the adults who work with youth. Age groups for youth range from about 8 through 15. We are particularly interested in audio-visual materials, role plays, and games. Does anyone know of examples? Thanks in advance for your help.
Ann Forsyth, <aforsyth@larp.umass.edu>
Regional Planning Program, LARP
109 Hills North, Unit 302
South Holyoke, MA 01030-4010
USA
(413) 545-6034. FAX: (413) 545-1772.

Please don’t be bashful about contacting us with your news for our Updates. I look forward to your notes and e-mails.
—Dallal Hall, Membership Editor <nhall@pratt.edu>

Welcome...
new PLANNERS NETWORK members!
Ranu Banu, Ramya Buvikatte, Suby Bowden, Whitney Dahlman, Chris Grant, Judith Mayer, Jeffrey Segal, Sigmund Shipp, and Mitchell Skov.

Thank You...renewing members!
Mary Cassidy Anger, Joseph G. Feinberg, Norman Krumholz, Allan Lichtenstein, Lucilla Fuller Marvel, Gray Smith, Brad Smith, and Jordan Yin.

Contributions since the last issue total $100. Thanks for supporting PN!

PN News

NEW STEERING COMMITTEE MEETS
On February 21, nine of the fourteen newly elected PN Steering Committee members met for a full day at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, NY. The highlights of the meeting follow.

Reports
Tom Angotti reviewed the history of PN and the evolution of the organization over the last four years. In 1997, PN was incorporated as a 501(c)3 nonprofit corporation in NY State. No change was made to the by-laws but members are urged to send any proposals for changes to Patricia Nolan or Peg Seif, who will be reviewing the by-laws.
The Champaign/Urbana chapter has produced a chapter newsletter, held several public forums and organized a demonstration. They currently have about 50 members. They are organizing a Women in Planning conference for fall 1998.
The New York chapter continues to offer its monthly forum series. Other chapters or activities may be in brewing in Boston, Seattle, Los Angeles, Arizona and the Research Triangle.
There was a general discussion about how PN could broaden its membership, how to define PN and the function it should serve. A future issue of PN should be devoted to “Whither Planners Network.”

Newsletter
The SC generally approved of the recent changes in the newsletter, which now has more articles and fewer resources than previously, and a regular editorial column (Seventh Generation). PN continues to serve as a valuable place for the discussion of non-mainstream perspectives, and this is the source of its strength and potential. The Editors noted that there has not been much feedback from members, and the SC suggested polling members to find out what they think of the publication. Some minor style changes were suggested.
The following suggestions were made for special issues: energy politics; local responses to globalization; class and inequality; transnationalism and immigration; and participatory planning. We will initiate a regular editorial on current political issues to be signed by the SC.
The SC decided to regularly post the newsletter on the PN Web site. It was also decided to change the Web address to a simpler one, <www.plannersnetwork.org>, and Winton Picoff offered to pay for the change as his contribution to PN. Thanks, Winton!

Conferences
No conference is scheduled for 1998. PN will participate in the Urban Affairs Association conference in Louisville in 1999, by organizing at least one workshop that links urban theory with practice. Interested members should contact Patricia Nolan or Ken Reardon. We will also look into the possibility of an east coast conference in 1999; possible sites are Boston, Philadelphia, Washington and Baltimore. Interested members should contact Peg Seif.
In 2000, the PN conference will be in Toronto; in 2001 on the west coast (location to be determined); and in 2002 in New York City.

Finances
John McCrory distributed the 1997 financial report showing an operating deficit of approximately $1,500. In general, PN runs a $5,000 annual deficit, but in recent years this has been made up by conference earnings. The net income from last year’s Pomona Conference, about $4,000, has yet to be received. It cost about $1,000 in fees to incorporate; legal services were contributed pro bono by a prominent New York law firm.
It was noted that since no conference is planned for 1998, PN’s operating deficit would need to be made up in other ways. The SC decided to undertake a fundraising campaign and raise additional $5,000 from member contributions by seeking 50 contributions of $100 each. Steering Committee members will be contacting selected members to ask for contributions. John McCrory will be looking into the use of credit cards for membership contributions.

Co-Chairs
Four new co-chairs were elected: Tom Angotti, Marie Kennedy, Patricia Nolan and Peg Seif.
The Steering Committee will meet next at the November 5-8 ACSF conference in Pasadena, California, where we hope to have a PN reception.
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Cathy Kumpf, of the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana, IL, wrote to inform us about the goings on of the new Illinois chapter of PN. She also included the Jan. 1998 edition of the chapter's newsletter which contains information about recent and upcoming IUCU chapter activities. They also have a website <http://www.uiuc.edu/npnetwork> that includes information about PN, how to join, upcoming events at the IUCU community, links, and an electronic version of their newsletter. If you are in the Champaign-Urbana community and would like to learn more contact Cathy at <ckumpf@uiuc.edu> or check out their website.

Tim Stroshane writes with the following news: The City of Berkeley, California has completed and released its first-ever draft Berkeley Homeless Continuum of Care Plan. The draft plan addresses maintenance-of-effort issues and gaps in services and affordable housing posed by welfare destruction, the continuing upward spiral of housing costs in Berkeley, and managed care. The draft plan is a joint effort of Berkeley's Independent Task Force on Homelessness and an interdepartmental team of City staff. Surveys of homeless service users and service providers were conducted in late 1996 and findings were incorporated into the development of a background report, "Homelessness in Berkeley," and the draft plan. Copies of each document are available at no charge by contacting Tim Stroshane, City of Berkeley Housing Department, 2201 Dwight Way, 2nd Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704; calling 510/645-3542; or emailing Tim, <tstroshane@ci.berkeley.ca.us>

Ann Forsyth sent in this query: The Urban Places Project, a unit at U.Mass Amherst that I co-direct, is currently working on two projects in South Holyoke, in Massachusetts. We have two requests for materials. 1. In the first project, we are working with Nueva Esperanza, the main CDC in the neighborhood, to conduct a feasibility study for an indoor vendors market in a Main Street building they own. We are looking at space planning, financial aspects, management, etc. We are interested in finding out about other markets in very low-income neighborhoods (South Holyoke's 1990 poverty rate was 64%) and in Latino areas. 2. In the second project, we are working with two related youth programs YouthPower and El Arco Iris — to document their work. Over the past few years these programs have worked with young people on a number of projects involving neighborhood planning, public art, and urban design. At the neighborhood level youth have been involved in project design, data collection, analysis, planning and design proposals, presentations, and construction. They have also had input into the city-wide comprehensive planning process.

Our job, as part of a tiny grant, is to help the youth and youth leaders document these activities in three ways: a short video or other kind of audio-visual presentation aimed at making other youth interested in these kinds of activities; a role-play exercise or game; and a short manual of techniques aimed more at the adults who work with youth. Age groups for youth range from about 8 through 15. We are particularly interested in audio-visual materials, role plays, and games. Does anyone know of examples? Thanks in advance for your help.

Ann Forsyth, <annforsyth@larp.umass.edu>
Regional Planning Program, LARP
109 Hills North, UMass Amherst, MA 01003-4010, USA
413/545-6634. FAX: 413/545-1772.

Please don't be bashful about contacting us with your news for our Updates. I look forward to your notes and e-mails.
—Dalila Hall, Membership Editor <dhal@pratt.edu>

Welcome... new PLANNERS NETWORK members!

Ranu Banu, Ramya Ravikatte, Suby Bowden, Whitney Dahlman, Chris Grant, Judith Mayer, Jeffrey Segal, Sigmund Shipp, and Mitchell Skov.

Thank You renewing members!

Mary Cassidy Anger, Joseph G. Feinberg, Norman Krumholz, Allan Lichtenstein, Lucilla Fuller Marvel, Gray Smith, Brad Smith, and Jordan Yon.

Contributions since the last issue total $359. Thanks for supporting PN!

PN NEWS

NEW STEERING COMMITTEE MEETS

On February 21, nine of the fourteen newly elected PN Steering Committee members met for a full day at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, NY. The highlights of the meeting follow.

Reports

Tom Angotti reviewed the history of PN and the evolution of the organization over the last four years. In 1997, PN was incorporated as a 501(c)3 nonprofit corporation in NY State. No change was made to the by-laws but members are urged to send in any requests for changes to Patricia Nolan or Peg Seip, who will be reviewing the by-laws.

The Champaign-Urbana chapter has produced a chapter newsletter, held several public forums and organized a demonstration. They currently have about 50 members. They are organizing a Women in Planning conference for fall 1998.

The New York chapter continues to offer its monthly forum series.

Other chapters or activities may be brewing in Seattle, Boston, Los Angeles, Arizona and the Research Triangle.

There was a general discussion about how PN could broaden its membership, how to define PN and the function it should serve. A future issue of PN will be devoted to "Whither Planners Network."

Newsletter

The SC generally approved of the recent changes in the newsletter, which now has more articles and fewer resources than previously, and a regular editorial column (Seventh Generation). PN continues to serve as a valuable place for the discussion of non-mainstream perspectives, and this is the source of its strength and potential. The Editors noted that there has not been much feedback from members, and the SC suggested polling members to find out what they think of the publication. Some minor style changes were suggested.

The following suggestions were made for special issues: energy politics, local responses to globalization; class and inequality; transnationalism and immigration; and participatory planning. We will initiate a regular editorial on current political issues to be signed by the SC.

The SC decided to regularly post the newsletter on the PN Web site. It was also decided to change the Web address to a simpler one, <www.plannersnetwork.org>, and Winton Picoff offered to pay for the change as his contribution to PN. Thanks, Winton!

Conferences

No conference is scheduled for 1998. PN will participate in the Urban Affairs Association conference in Louisville in 1999, by organizing at least one workshop that links urban theory with practice. Interested members should contact Patricia Nolan or Ken Reardon. We will also look into the possibility of an east coast conference in 1999; possible sites are Boston, Philadelphia, Washington and Baltimore. Interested members should contact Peg Seip.

In 2000, the PN conference will be in Toronto; in 2001 on the west coast (location to be determined); and in 2002 in New York City.

Publications

The SC agreed to pursue the proposal to publish a book on community-based planning from a progressive perspective. The edited volume would combine articles on the global, national and local context for community planning with case studies and discussions of strategies. A sub-committee will develop a proposal and seek interested publishers. Interested members should contact any one of the sub-committee members: Tom Angotti, Winton Picoff, Barbara Rabder, Ken Reardon or Arturo Sanchez.

Finances

John McCrory distributed the 1997 financial report showing an operating deficit of approximately $1,500. In general, PN runs a $5,000 annual deficit, but in recent years this has been made up by conference earnings. The net income from last year’s Pennoma Conference, about $4,000, has yet to be received. It cost about $1,000 in fees to incorporate; legal services were contributed pro bono by a prominent New York law firm.

It was noted that since no conference is planned for 1998, PN’s operating deficit would need to be made up in other ways. The SC decided to undertake a fundraising campaign that raised an additional $5,000 from member contributions by seeking 50 contributions of $100 each. Steering Committee members will be contacting selected members to ask for contributions. John McCrory will be looking into the use of credit cards for membership contributions.

Co-Chairs

Four new co-chairs were elected: Tom Angotti, Marie Kennedy, Patricia Nolan and Peg Seip.

The Steering Committee will meet next at the November 5-8 ACSPP conference in Pasadena, California, where we hope to have a PN reception.
Regional Profiles

METROPOLITAN GOVERNANCE AND REGIONAL PLANNING

Four Cities, Four Approaches

by Dalila Hall

PORTLAND, OREGON’S METRO

Metro is the only directly elected regional government in the United States. It serves more than 1.3 million residents in three counties, and 24 cities in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area. Established in 1979 in response to a state wide land-use planning program (1976) that required all cities to establish an urban growth boundary, Metro was initially responsible for land-use and transportation planning and regional services such as solid waste management and operation of a metropolitan zoo. These responsibilities have since expanded to include solid waste disposal, regional parks and green spaces, technical assistance to local governments, and authority over convention, cultural, sports and exhibition centers in the region.

The central feature of Portland’s regional plan is growth management. The Urban Growth Boundary’s (UGB) purpose is to prevent sprawl development from consuming natural areas and farmlands. Another key feature of the plan is to preserve central cities by keeping investment within the boundary. Growth control is addressed by two tools: open space designations within the boundary and rural reserves beyond the boundary.

Planners Network Needs Your Help!

Did you know that last year’s PN conference in Pomona actually raised about $3,700? If it weren’t for the conference, we wouldn’t have had enough money to keep the newsletter coming to you.

This year, there won’t be a PN conference. This extra-large roster issue is costing more than usual to print and mail, but member donations aren’t enough to cover this cost. We have found ways to trim expenses — even as we grow in size — such as printing on lighter-weight paper to keep the cost of postage down. But, we still need more help to sustain PN! See the information about our Sustainer Campaign on page 50.

METROPOLITAN NEW YORK’S REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION

The Regional Plan Association (RPA), founded in 1929, is the nation’s oldest regional planning organization. The RPA is a non-profit civic organization working on issues facing the NY-NJ-Connecticut metropolitan area. The Association’s work is funded by individual members, private foundations and corporations. Working in an advisory and research capacity the RPA has created and promoted three long-term plans in 1929, 1968 and 1996. Areas of research include land use, transportation, economic development, the environment, governance and social policy. The Association seeks to build coalitions between government and private organizations, and to foster public participation.

Their Third Regional Plan, A Region at Risk, published in 1996 states, “...for the first time the challenge facing the RPA and the region is not managing growth, but preventing decline.” The plan recommends enhancing the region’s “Three E’s” foundation: economy, environment, and equity. These are portrayed as interlocking rings which intersect to shape the quality of life. By investing in this foundation, the region will be able to attract and retain people and businesses and remain competitive in the global economy. Their recommendations are organized into 5 campaigns: Mobility, Greenswards, Centers, Workforce, and Governance.

MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA’S METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

The Metropolitan Council was created in 1967 by the Minnesota legislature to oversee regional planning for the Twin Cities Area. This area encompasses a seven county region with 190 local governments and includes about 2.5 million people. The area is divided into 16 districts of equal population and each district is represented by one council member. An additional member acts as the Council Chair. All representatives and the Chair are appointed by the governor.

The Council’s first regional task was the coordination of an area wide sewer system. Since then responsibilities have expanded to include long-range plan development for services such as aviation, transportation, parks and open space, water quality and water management. They are a housing and redevelopment authority and the proposing agency for the area’s growth management plan, Metro 2040. The plan aims to: reduce sprawl by keeping development compact, preserve agricultural land, set up an “urban reserve” to be developed after 2020, revitalize the region’s urban core, and target certain areas for job development.

Currently there are two bills before the state’s legislature on the matter of whether or not Council members should be elected rather than appointed. It is believed that elected representation would give the Council the necessary political power to fully implement its plans.

TORONTO, CANADA’S METRO AND THE NEW CITY OF TORONTO

Created in 1953 by the provincial government of Ontario, the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto (Metro) was part of a two tier system of government. Metro served as the upper tier of government that coordinated public works, land use planning and development for the thirteen cities of greater Toronto. At that time the local municipalities (lower tier) were to retain most of their functions while Metro would concern itself with regional issues.

In 1967 the thirteen municipalities were consolidated into the six municipalities of Toronto, East York, Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough and York. Over time Metro began to share some of the local responsibilities.

Today the region has a population of 2.4 million people and is the eighth largest metropolis in North America.

Metro was governed by a 34 member council (28 councillors & 6 mayors). Initially the councillors were indirectly elected by the various city councils but beginning in 1988 they were directly elected by the people in their wards.

Beginning on January 1, 1998, the new City of Toronto was created by the conservative provincial government. The six municipalities plus Metro have been condensed into a single government made up of 28 wards. It is governed by 56 councillors (2 from each ward) and one mayor. Only the mayor is elected by all city residents. The councillors are elected only by those residing in their respective wards.

Sometimes referred to as the Megacity, the new City of Toronto is already facing criticisms that it is wiping out local democracy, politicizing residents, and that it will exacerbate central city and suburban inequalities.

Information for this article was compiled from a variety of sources where you can find more detailed information. For your convenience, a few of these are listed below.

Websites

Metro
Portland, Oregon
http://www.multnomah.lib.or.us/metro/

Regional Plan Association
New York, New Jersey, Connecticut Metropolitan Area
http://www.rpa.org

The Metropolitan Council
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota
http://www.metrocouncil.org

Metro / City of Toronto
Toronto, Canada
http://www.city.toronto.on.ca/

In Print


—Dalila Hall
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METROPOLITAN GOVERNANCE AND REGIONAL PLANNING

Four Cities, Four Approaches

by Dalilla Hall

PORTLAND, OREGON'S METRO

Metro is the only directly elected regional government in the United States. It serves more than 1.3 million residents in three counties, and 24 cities in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area. Established in 1979 in response to a state wide land-use planning program (1976) that required all cities to establish an urban growth boundary, Metro was initially responsible for land-use and transportation planning and regional services such as solid waste management and operation of a metropolitan zoo. These responsibilities have since expanded to include solid waste disposal, regional parks and green spaces, technical assistance to local governments, and authority over convention, cultural, sports and exhibition centers in the region.

The central feature of Portland’s regional plan is growth management. The Urban Growth Boundary’s (UGB) purpose is to prevent sprawl development from consuming natural areas and farmlands. Another key feature of the plan is to preserve central cities by keeping investment within the boundary. Growth control is addressed by two tools: open space designations within the boundary and rural reserves beyond the boundary.

Open space designations protect natural resources such as water sheds, parks, and tree stands. Rural reserves, along connecting corridors in the Metro area, maintain farm land and space between communities. Urban areas within the region are classified as Neighborhoods (inner & outer), Centers (towns & regional), and Corridors and Main Streets which connect all the above. Within these urban areas densities are higher than average in most western cities and lot sizes are smaller than average at about 7,000 square feet. These urban areas are serviced by a well utilized light rail and bus system.

Metro is currently developing a plan for the year 2040.

METROPOLITAN NEW YORK'S REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION

The Regional Plan Association (RPA), founded in 1929, is the nation’s oldest regional planning organization. The RPA is a non-profit civic organization working on issues facing the NY-NJ-Connecticut metropolitan area. The Association’s work is funded by individual members, private foundations and corporations. Working in an advisory and research capacity the RPA has created and promoted three long-term plans in 1929, 1968 and 1996. Areas of research include land-use planning, transportation, economic development, the environment, governance and social policy. The Association seeks to build coalitions between government and private organizations, and to foster public participation.

Their Third Regional Plan, A Region at Risk, published in 1996 states, “...for the first time the challenge facing the RPA and the region is not managing growth, but preventing decline.” The plan recommends enhancing the region’s “Three E’s” foundation: economy, environment, and equity. These are portrayed as interlocking rings which intersect to shape the quality of life. By investing in this foundation, the region will be able to attract and retain people and businesses and remain competitive in the global economy. Their recommendations are organized into 5 campaigns: Mobility, Greenswards, Centers, Workforce, and Governance.

MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA'S METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

The Metropolitan Council was created in 1967 by the Minnesota legislature to oversee regional planning for the Twin Cities Area. This area encompasses a seven county region with 190 local governments and includes about 2.5 million people. The area is divided into 16 districts of equal population and each district is represented by one council member. An additional member acts as the Council Chair. All representatives and the Chair are appointed by the governor.

The Council’s first regional task was the coordination of an area wide sewer system. Since then responsibilities have expanded to include long-range land use planning for areas such as aviation, transportation, parks and open space, water quality and wastewater management. They are a housing and redevelopment authority and the proposing agency for the area’s growth management plan, Metro 2040. The plan aims to: reduce sprawl by keeping development compact, preserve agricultural land, set up an “urban reserve” to be developed after 2020, revitalize the region’s urban core, and target certain areas for job development.

Currently there are two bills before the state’s legislature on the matter of whether or not Council members should be elected rather than appointed. It is believed that elected representation would give the Council the necessary political power to fully implement its plans.

TORONTO, CANADA'S METRO AND THE NEW CITY OF TORONTO

Created in 1953 by the provincial government of Ontario, the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto (Metro) was part of a two tier system of government. Metro served as the upper tier of government that coordinated public works, land use planning and development for the thirteen cities of greater Toronto. At that time the local municipalities (lower tier) were to remain most of their functions while Metro would concern itself with regional issues. In 1967 the thirteen municipalities were consolidated into the six municipalities of Toronto, East York, Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough and York. Over time Metro began to share some of the local responsibilities.

Today the region has a population of 2.4 million people and is the eighth largest metropolis in North America. Metro was governed by a 34 member council (28 councillors & 6 mayors). Initially the councillors were indirectly elected by the various city councils but beginning in 1988 they were directly elected by the people in their wards. Beginning on January 1, 1998, the new City of Toronto was created by the conservative provincial government. The six municipalities plus Metro have been condensed into a single government made up of 28 wards. It is governed by 56 councillors (2 from each ward) and one mayor. Only the mayor is elected by all city residents. The councillors are elected only by those residing in their respective wards.

Sometimes referred to as the Megacity, the new City of Toronto is already facing criticisms that it is wiping out local democracy, politicizing residents, and that it will eradicate central city and suburban inequalities.

Information for this article was compiled from a variety of sources where you can find more detailed information. For your convenience, a few of these are listed below.

Websites

Metro
Portland, Oregon
<http://www.multnomah.lib.or.us/metro>

Regional Plan Association
New York, New Jersey, Connecticut Metropolitan Area
<http://www.rpa.org>

The Metropolitan Council
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota
<http://www.metrocouncil.org>

Metro / City of Toronto
Toronto, Canada
<http://www.city.toronto.on.ca>

In Print


New York
RACE, CLASS & SPACE
A Historical Comparison of the Three Regional Plans for New York
by Tony Schuman and Elliott Sclar

Region and Race: An Introduction
The raw material of American planning history derives from two concerns: the physical problems associated with regional growth and the social ones connected to race and class. New York, because it is simultaneously one of the nation’s oldest cities as well as its largest, has been the crucible in which these powerful forces have engendered the now standard pattern of segregated sprawl which characterizes all too much of metropolitan America.

This is a critical juncture at which to focus on issues of race and class in the tri-state metropolitan region. The physical isolation of African-Americans in compact inner city ghettos has reached such proportions that in various scholars now invoke the specter of apartheid to describe the situation. The two largest cities in the region, New York and Newark, are among the most segregated in the United States; both cities score highly on every index used to measure racial isolation and concentration. Moreover, both cities have shown an increase in these indices from 1970 to 1990, indicating that racial segregation is now firmly built into the physical and social fabric of the region.

As this racial concentration has consolidated, structural changes in technology and the global economy have transformed the local job market. This is most notable in the loss of 140,000 production and craft jobs in the region that provided good paying jobs to unskilled or semi-skilled workers. Concomitant with this shift in the economic base has been a dramatic redistribution of income to the point where the United States now has the highest gap between rich and poor of any industrialized nation, an imbalance that is particularly severe in the tri-state region. There are at present more than two million poor people in the region. Many of them reside in the area’s central cities.

As Massey and Denton persuasively argued in American Apartheid, this interaction of poverty and segregation is responsible for the creation and perpetuation of a black “underclass.” The contemporary black ghetto is a place of consistently high unemployment, low median income, low median house values, low school test scores, a high percentage of single parent families and births to unwed mothers and a high incidence of substance abuse and crime. The result is an environment where these effects not only occur, but are common or normative.

This article explores the relationship of physical and social planning through an analysis of the three regional plans for New York produced by the Committee on the Plan of New York and Its Environments, established in 1921, and its successor, the Regional Plan Association (RPA): the 1929 Regional Plan for New York (RPNY), the 1968 second regional plan, and the 1996 third regional plan.

For the last sixty years, the RPA has been the voice of the progressive business community, whose leaders seek to assure economic efficiency by promoting coherent regional planning competitiveness. While the first two plans treated the minority and immigrant workforce as a burdensome, nonproductive sector, the current plan identifies this population as a critical component in workforce growth and competitiveness. Recognizing discrimination and segregation as obstacles to labor force productivity, the third plan gives prominence to issues of education and access to jobs. At the same time, however, the plan stops short of a concerted attack on segregation.

The (First) Regional Plan of New York and Its Environments (1929)
From the closing decades of the nine-teenth century, when transit severed the ancient tie between residence and work place, there has been a strong impetus to channel the spatial evolution of walking cities into coherent metropolitan regions. Although the roots of conscious regionalism antedate the RPA and its predecessor, the Committee for a Regional Plan, the RPA is America’s oldest formal regional planning organization. It owes an evident intellectual debt to earlier attempts at regional rationality found in the English Garden Cities Movement and Burnham’s Plan for Chicago. In 1921 when the Russell Sage Foundation established the first Committee for a Regional Plan under Charles Dyer Norton’s leadership, a powerful consensus behind the notion of regional rationality was already in place. At about the same time that regionalism was becoming a clearly articulated focus within the nascent planning profession, the mechanization of agriculture was transforming large numbers of rural African-Americans into urban immigrants.

In the opening decades of the present century this population of former slaves and their descendants began leaving the southeast for the great cities of the northeast and midwest. In 1910, 902,000 African-Americans lived in New York City, less than 2 percent of the population. By 1920 their numbers had grown to 150,000, about 3 percent of the population. By 1930, when the RPNY was released, the African-American population had more than doubled again to 327,000, roughly 5 percent of the city’s population. The framers of the RPNY were concerned that the foreign and Negro population, in addition to constituting a nonproductive burden on the economy, would interfere with the efficiency of the residential and commercial real estate market. Chief economist Robert Haig expresses this concern succinctly in his study “Major Economic Factors in Metropolitan Growth and Arrangement” in Volume 1 of the Regional Survey that underpins the first Regional Plan:

Some of the poorest people live in conveniently located slums on high-priced land. On patrician Fifth Avenue, Tiffany and Worthworth, check by jewl, offer jewells and gemcraks... on substantially identical sites... In the very heart of the “commercial” city on Manhattan Island south of 59th Street, the inspectors in 1922 found nearly 420,000 workers, employed in the factories. Such a situation outrages one’s sense of order. Everything seems misplaced. One yearns to re-arrange the hedge-podge and to put things where they belong.

The Poor, including immigrants, Jews, and Negroes, are not viewed as human resources worthy of attention and assistance in their own right, but as impediments to the efficient functioning of the regional economy.

This, of course, is in large measure the logic behind New York’s first zoning resolution whose passage, along with slum clearance and tenement house reform, was championed by Lawrence Veiller and Robert DeForest, later head of the Russell Sage Foundation, the principal sponsor of the first Regional Plan. These earlier efforts shared with the RPNY an overriding emphasis on physical infrastructure as cause and cure for the region’s problems. The poor, including immigrants, Jews, and Negroes, are not viewed as human resources worthy of attention and assistance in their own right, but as impediments to the efficient functioning of the regional economy. The “sense of order” that Haig and his colleagues sought to promote reflects class prejudice as well as the desire for economic efficiency. The physical plan itself is a series of proposals of breathtaking scope to re-order the region through the construction of an elaborate network of bridges, tunnels, highways and parks. While the intention of the first regional plan was primarily to ease congestion and improve productivity, as implemented by New York City construction czar Robert Moses, it ultimately had a devastating long term impact on the social stratification of the metropolitan region.

This is especially poignant in light of the authors’ express denial of such an intention: “What we have to refrain from are those details of housing or sanitation or social order that have no direct relation to the development of the land, the transportation system, or the general scheme of city building. What we have to pursue as our primary task is the making of a comprehensive ground diagram.”

The Second Regional Plan (1968)
By the time the second plan was promulgated, the question of race was unavoidable. Deteriorating conditions led to urban riots and the appointment of a Presidential Commission on Urban Unrest — the Kerner Commission — whose final report warned that the United States was rapidly becoming two nations, black and white, separate and unequal. In this context, of the eight reasons the RPA gave as warranting a second regional plan, number two on the list (after “Uncontrolled Urbanization”) was: “A segregated society; the growing separation of rich and poor, Negro and white. The movement continues of white, middle- and upper-income families from the older cities to the suburbs.”

see RPA on page 8
New York
RACE, CLASS & SPACE
A Historical Comparison of the Three Regional Plans for New York
by Tony Schuman and Elliott Sclar

Region and Race: An Introduction

The raw material of American planning history derives from two concerns: the physical problems associated with regional growth and the social issues connected to race and class. New York, because it is simultaneously one of the nation’s oldest cities as well as its largest, has been the crucible in which these powerful forces have engendered the now standard pattern of segregated sprawl which characterizes all too much of metropolitan America.

This is a critical juncture at which to focus on issues of race and class in the tri-state metropolitan region. The physical isolation of African-Americans in compact inner city ghettos has reached such proportions. In various scholar now invoke the specter of apartheid to describe the situation. The two largest cities in the region, New York and Newark, are among the most segregated in the United States; both cities score highly on every index used to measure racial isolation and concentration. Moreover, both cities have shown an increase in these indices from 1970 to 1990, indicating that racial segregation is now firmly built into the physical and social fabric of the region.

As this racial concentration has consolidated, structural changes in technology and the global economy have transformed the local job market. This is most notable in the loss of 140,000 production and craft jobs in the region that provided good paying jobs to unskilled or semi-skilled workers. Concomitant with this shift in the economic base has been a dramatic redistribution of income to the point where the United States now has the highest gap between rich and poor of any industrialized nation, an imbalance that is particularly severe in the tri-state region. There are at present more than two million poor people in the region. Many of them reside in the area’s central cities. As mosquitoes and Nancy A. Denton persuasively argued in American Apartheid, this interaction of poverty and segregation is responsible for the creation and perpetuation of a black “underclass.” The contemporary black ghetto is a place of consistently high unemployment, low median income, low median house values, low school test scores, a high percentage of single parent families and births to unwed mothers and a high incidence of substance abuse and crime. The result is an environment where these effects not only occur, but are common or normative.

This article explores the relationship of physical and social planning through an analysis of the three regional plans for New York produced by the Committee on the Plan of New York and Its Environments, established in 1921, and its successor, the Regional Plan Association (RPA): the 1929 Regional Plan for New York (RPNY), the 1968 second regional plan, and the 1986 third regional plan. For the first sixty years, the RPA has been the voice of the progressive business community, whose leaders seek to assure economic efficiency by promoting coherent regional planning competitiveness. While the first two plans treated the minority and immigrant workforce as a burdensome nonproductive sector, the current plan identifies this population as a critical component in workforce growth and competitiveness. Recognizing discrimination and segregation as obstacles to labor force productivity, the third plan gives prominence to issues of education and access to jobs. At the same time, however, the plan stops short of a concerted attack on segregation.

The (First) Regional Plan of New York and Its Environments (1929)

From the closing decades of the nineteenth century, when transit severed the ancient tie between residence and work place, there has been a strong impetus to channel the spatial evolution of walking cities into coherent metropolitan regions. Although the roots of conscious regionalism antedate the RPA and its predecessor, the Committee for a Regional Plan, the RPA is America’s oldest formal regional planning organization. It owes an evident intellectual debt to earlier attempts at regional rationality found in the English Garden Cities Movement and Burnham’s Plan for Chicago. In 1921 when the Russell Sage Foundation established the first Committee for a Regional Plan under Charles Dyer Norton’s leadership, a powerful consensus behind the notion of regional rationality was already in place.

At about the same time that regionalism was becoming a clearly articulated focus within the nascent planning profession, the mechanization of agriculture was transforming large numbers of rural African-Americans into urban immigrants. In the opening decades of the present century this population of former slaves and their descendants began leaving the southeast for the great cities of the northeast and midwest. In 1910, 90,000 African-Americans lived in New York City, less than 2 percent of the population. By 1920 their numbers had grown to 150,000, about 3 percent of the population. By 1930, when the RPNY was released, the African-American population had more than doubled again to 327,000, roughly 5 percent of the city’s population. The framers of the RPNY were concerned that the foreign and Negro population, in addition to constituting a nonproductive burden on the economy, would interfere with the efficiency of the residential and commercial real estate market. Chief economist Robert Haig expresses this concern succinctly in his study “Major Economic Factors in Metropolitan Growth and Arrangement” in Volume I of the Regional Survey that underpins the first Regional Plan:

Some of the poorest people live in conveniently located slums on high-priced land. On particular Fifth Avenue, Tiffany and Woolworth, cheek by jowl, offer jewels and gimmicks... on substantially identical sites... In the very heart of the ‘commercial’ city on Manhattan Island south of 59th Street, the inspectors in 1922 found nearly 420,000 workers, employed in the factories. Such a situation outrages one’s sense of order. Everything seems misplaced. One yearns to re-arrange the hodge-podge and to put things where they belong.

The poor, including immigrants, Jews, and Negroes, are not viewed as human resources worthy of attention and assistance in their own right, but as impediments to the efficient functioning of the regional economy.

This, of course, is in large measure the logic behind New York’s first zoning resolution whose passage, along with slum clearance and tenant house reform, was championed by Lawrence Veiller and Robert DeForest, later head of the Russell Sage Foundation, the principal sponsor of the first Regional Plan. These earlier efforts shared with the RPNY an overriding emphasis on physical infrastructure as cause and cure for the region’s problems. The poor, including immigrants, Jews, and Negroes, are not viewed as human resources worthy of attention and assistance in their own right, but as impediments to the efficient functioning of the regional economy. The “sense of order” that Haig and his colleagues sought to promote reflects class prejudice as well as the desire for economic efficiency. The physical plan itself is a series of proposals of groundbreaking scope to re-order the region through the construction of an elaborate network of bridges, tunnels, highways and parks. While the intention of the first regional plan was primarily to ease congestion and improve productivity, as implemented by New York City construction czar Robert Moses, it ultimately had a devastating long term impact on the social stratification of the metropolitan region as well.

It is especially poignant in light of the authors’ express denials of such an intention: “What we have to refrain from are those details of housing or sanitation or social order that have no direct relation to the development of the land, the transportation system, or the general scheme of city building. What we have to pursue as
The third plan is very different in tone from the previous documents in its expression of alarm over both wasteful land consumption and a decline in the economic competitiveness of the region.

Concurrent with this courtship of an elite workforce, the 1968 regional plan reflects the social turmoil of the times in its recognition of issues of race and poverty. Written in a period of economic expansion, however the plan permits itself the luxury of assuming that education and training will rapidly open the doors to universal economic prosperity, placing its faith in "the steep climb in income that this economy could provide for everyone if recent economic trends can be continued and the prosperity widely distributed." The history of the past thirty years demonstrates how much this over-optimistic economic projection was off the mark.

In similar fashion, the plan invoked the contemporary political climate, notably the rise of the black power movement, to justify not taking a strong stand on residential segregation. "In many ghetto areas, a suggestion to move out is not popular right now... However, it does seem likely, that good housing outside the ghetto would be welcome by many Negroes and Puerto Ricans, as long as it were convenient to jobs and services and good schooling. This effort to improve housing quality and promote integration would fail in large part if housing that should be replaced is filled with new

The planners in this case, were, at least to some extent, identified with the people of the region, and they spoke for them with authority. The plan was not an elite document, but one that was genuinely representative of the people it was intended to serve. It was a document that was written by the people, for the people, and with the people. It was a plan that was truly the people's plan.

The plan was not without its critics, however. Many felt that it was too optimistic, too Panglossian, too utopian. They criticized it for its lack of realism, its failure to face up to the harsh realities of the world as it was. They wanted a plan that was more realistic, more grounded in the realities of the world as it was.

But the plan was a major step forward, in that it did not shrink from the hard realities of the world. It faced up to the challenges of the future, and it set out to meet them. It was a plan that was designed to make the future better, not just to make the present comfortable. It was a plan that was designed to make the lives of people better, not just to make the lives of the rich better.

And so the plan was adopted, and it was put into action. And it succeeded. It succeeded in making the lives of people better, in making the future better. It succeeded in making the world a better place. And it did so in a way that was truly representative of the people it was intended to serve.

The planning of the future is a complex and difficult task. But it is a task that must be done. It is a task that must be done if we are to make the future better, if we are to make the world a better place. And it is a task that can be done, if we have the determination and the will to do it.
The third plan is very different in tone from the previous documents in its expression of alarm over both wasteful land consumption and a decline in the economic competitiveness of the region.

Concurrent with this courtship of an elite workforce, the 1968 regional plan reflects the social turmoil of the times in its recognition of issues of race and poverty. Written in a period of economic expansion, however the plan permits itself the luxury of assuming that education and training will rapidly open the doors to universal economic prosperity, placing its faith in "the steep climb in income that this economy could provide for everyone if recent economic trends can be continued and the prosperity widely distributed." The history of the past thirty years demonstrates how much this over-optimistic economic projection was off the mark.

In similar fashion, the plan invoked the contemporary political climate, notably the rise of the black power movement, to justify not taking a strong stand on residential segregation. In "many ghettos, a suggestion to move out is not popular right now... However, it does seem likely, that good housing outside the ghetto would be welcome by many Negroes and Puerto Ricans, as long as it were convenient to jobs and services and good schooling. This effort to improve housing quality and move people integration would fail in large part if housing that should be replaced is filled with new unskilled unemployed immigrants as soon as it is vacated, as has been happening in the Region's core." This section is notable both for its frank description of the dynamics of ghetto housing and the affirmation, in passing, that integration is a goal.

The Third Regional Plan

In its emphasis on the metropolitan transportation network the third regional plan follows the general thrust of the RPA's earlier efforts. It calls for expanding rail freight and for filling in missing links in existing commuter rail lines to create a regional rail system, including access to La Guardia and Kennedy airports. But the third plan, entitled "A Region At Risk," is very different in tone from the previous documents in its expression of alarm over both wasteful land consumption and a decline in the economic competitiveness of the region. It is the latter aspect that bears most directly on workforce issues. Between 1989 and 1992, the region lost 770,000 jobs, the largest job loss in any metropolitan area in the country since World War II. At the same time, the composition of the region's workforce has changed: nearly half of those working or seeking work are women, and over a third (36 percent) are Hispanic, Asian, or African-American. Over the past decade, while male workers have decreased in absolute numbers. In New York City, 59 percent of the work force is comprised of racial or ethnic minorities. Moreover, the future workforce will, in all likelihood, continue this trend because all population growth in the region is accounted for by foreign immigration, principally from the Dominican Republic, China, and the newly independent states of the former Soviet bloc.

The result of these demographic changes is that the third plan reverses the RPA's historic perspective on minority and immigrant labor; instead of being maligned as a nonproductive burden on the overtaxed resources of the region, this group is seen as a critical component in the region's return to economic vitality. As a consequence, the plan is focused on measures to bring the immigrant work force into the cultural and economic main stream, primarily through education programs. The RPA cites evidence linking education levels to a rise in income and, notably, productivity: "A recent study by the National Center on the Educational Quality of the workforce indicates that a 10 percent increase in the education level of a company's workforce improves its productivity by nearly 9 percent... a larger increase than that caused by comparable increases in hours worked or investments in computers, machinery or other equipment."

In other words, the ethnic and racial minority workforce is now cast as human capital. In a region forecast to be a majority minority society by 2010, the education of this labor force is a matter of paramount concern. The thinking that skill levels is identified as the most significant cause of the increasing polarization of the economy between high- and low-income segments. The draft plan emphasizes the dramatic decline over the past decade in wage levels of high school versus college graduates. In 1989, a 30-year old high school graduate made only 68 percent of the income of a college graduate, compared with 88% in 1979. Consequently the plan's recommendations seek to improve the skill level of the immigrant and minority workforce by bolstering English language programs, currently over-subscribed in the region, and calling for state assumption of local school budgets. While these measures reflect a new generosity towards the minority workforce, there is also evidence that the RPA is taking a different approach to suburban job development. The plan also calls for tightening immigration policy to better match the supply of incoming skills to the demands of the local labor market.

At the same time the plan demonstrates a high level of appreciation for the nontraditional contributions of the immigrant and minority community to the general well being through development of an informal economy. The plan endorses activities such as home-based business, street vending zones or bazaars, and incubator facilities to help unlicensed businesses improve their performance and gain necessary skills and credentials. Impressively, while the plan emphasizes assimilation of foreign immigrants, it also calls for foreign language instruction for native English speakers to improve their entry into the global economy.

Thus the third regional plan represents a major step forward in focusing on labor force participation as a critical component in regional prosperity. It elevates "equity" along with "economy" and "environment" as one of three foundation stones for improving quality of life in the region. But if the plan is forthright in acknowledging the region is "changing and persistent racial and income segregation," it soft peddles many of the formidable obstacles to transforming the region's social and economic imbalance. While a levels and causes of isolation that distinguish these three forms of residential concentrations.

While the issue of segregation is identified, including the desire of the white middle class to keep "them" out, the plan offers no targeted response to this issue.
During a series of Roundtable discussions preceding the draft plan, the Mt. Laurel experience was discussed in some depth at a session on "The Habitable Region." When this discussion found its way into the draft third regional plan, however, its thrust had shifted. Instead of identifying the absence of black migration to the suburbs as a shortcoming of the Mt. Laurel plan as implemented by COAH, the draft plan tries to reassure its readers who fear that "affordable housing" will be unwanted "outsiders" into their communities. "The fears are misplaced, because the "outsiders" are the community's own grown children, teachers, fire-fighters, and police officers who want to stay in the town where they grew up or now work but cannot afford to." Similarly, a discussion of the Gautreux court decision in Chicago, which mandates housing vouchers to allow public housing residents to rent apartments in outlying suburbs, fails to examine fully the improved life circumstances these families have found outside the ghetto. While the recommendations call for building housing for all residents of the region regardless of race or income, there is no mechanism suggested as to how this might be accomplished, only a brief allusion to federal Fair Housing Laws. There is no discussion of pro-active integrative strategies which have been successful elsewhere, such as targeted mortgage assistance.

The RPA's Dilemma

The timeliness of the RPA's discussion of suburban segregation is emblematic of the internal contradiction at the heart of that organization. More importantly it is emblematic as well of the political difficulty we as a society have in effectively addressing our urban problems. On the one hand, the RPA is at the forefront of efforts to promote coherent regional development that conserves natural resources as it nourishes human ones. On the other, the corporate sponsorship that helps to make it an effective planning organization also limits the scope of practical initiatives which it can put forth. Typically, where longer term social issues clash with more immediate political imperatives, the social issues are given second priority.

Thus "the overarching vision" heralded in the first plan or the "radical restructuring of the status quo" promised in the second are compromised from the start. It was precisely this tension that was at the heart of the famous Adams/Mumford debate in the early 1930s. Writing in The New Republic, Lewis Mumford argued that there was no "regionalism" in the plan, that it merely confirmed chaotic methods governing regional growth and proposed no serious attempt at regionalizing the organization of production. The Regional Plan for New York and Its Environs, Mumford charged, was "conceived... in terms which would meet the interests and prejudices of the existing financial rulers... and its aim from the beginning was as much welfare and amenity as could be obtained without altering any of the political or business institutions which have made the city precisely what it is." Thomas Adams, author of the plan, responded angrily by accusing Mumford of being an idealistic idealist, an "esthete-sociologist," and defended the plan as a practical and workable set of proposals. As a later commentator observed, Adams was "so concerned not to interfere in any way with existing rights and institutions that he rejected even the possibility of public intervention in low-cost housing."

This pragmatism pervades the Third Plan as well. While the plan's section on "Equity" recognizes that "governance is critical to breaking down remaining segregation barriers," the section on governance offers no specific proposals to address segregation directly. Except for a proposal for state assumption of school financing, the RPA relies again on voluntary cooperation among the over 2,000 separate administrative entities in the region. Here the authors acknowledge that problems besetting the educational system go far beyond formulas of per capita expenditure per student, but the proposed remedy does not address underlying inequities of neighborhood conditions, concentrated poverty and the like. The principle of "home rule" is held sacrosanct despite a very clear understanding of the costs of this system:

The net result of this property tax-based and highly fragmented system is a region in which the cost of living is among the highest in the nation and the quality of life it offers its citizens is declining. Unsustainable growth and development patterns are established; the future workforce is inadequately educated and unskilled. Low-density automobile-dependent sprawl is encouraged; centers of all sizes are eroding; residents, jobs, and retail establishments; and open space and sensitive natural resources are conserved.

Citing widespread popular skepticism about big government, the authors are wary about proposing new layers of municipal or regional government. Instead they argue cautiously that the home rule-based governance system should be improved rather than dismantled. Their presentation misses the fire of former New Jersey Governor Jim Florio's keynote address at the RPA's 1991 Regional Assembly, where he spoke candidly about the need for government initiatives and tax increases to provide necessary services and infrastructure improvements. Instead, the plan paid a high political price for his willingness to move ahead of current political wisdom. In his farewell "State of the State" address, Florio warned, "It's time to stop living in a fantasy where we think small is automatically better when in fact the price we pay is the duplication and inefficiency of maintaining 611 school districts and 567 totally independent municipalities awash in administrative redundancies. The bottom line cries out for more cooperation, coordination, and, yes, regionalization."

Conclusions: The Regionalization of Racial Conflict

When the first regional plan was getting, in the late teens and early twenties, the orbit of racial conflict was within five miles of the central business district (CBD). Harlem was the flash point of urban racial change as speculators recouped their losses by converting a white community into a black one. By the time of the second plan, in the early 1960s, the racial front lines had moved further out from the CBD. The emblematic fight in Forest Hills, a middle income neighborhood in Queens, was triggered by a decision to locate a large public housing project at the edge of the neighborhood. The City was ultimately forced to back away from its original plan. Instead of a larger number of low income housing units, it substituted a drastically scaled back plan replacing most of the family apartments with units for the elderly. The site of the most recent racial clash, unfolding as the third regional plan was being finalized for release, is Leonia New Jersey, a predominately white middle class, inner ring suburb just across the George Washington Bridge, about 15 miles from the CBD. Leonia sits adjacent to Englewood, a racially integrated suburb with a heavily black public school population. The fight is over court ordered desegregation of suburban schools to promote racial integration.

In none of these cases did or will the outcome bring a satisfactory resolution. By the 1930s Harlem was an overcrowded ghetto with a large concentration of very poor people. Forest Hills, which was a prestigious urban neighborhood until the 1970s, is no longer a preferred social destination, serving at best as a stopping point on the way out of the city for those with upwardly mobile ambitions. The pressures on Leonia are similar to ones felt in Yonkers and Mount Vernon in Westchester County. They will only push more middle class people further into the hinterlands. These three examples are important because they demonstrate that the unsolved regional problems related to race do not go away as a result of infrastructural improvement. Instead they make the next round of planning more difficult. Indeed if Massey and Denton are correct, the regional crisis will only get worse as the effects of racial segregation are compounded by fading economic opportunity. By not targeting the dismantling of the ghetto as a priority concern, the RPA is not only missing an opportunity to link social and physical planning in a comprehensive way, but is making a potentially serious error. Either we make a concerted effort to open up the region or we can stand by and watch as the white middle class withdrawing into ever more remote and gated reserves devotes an ever higher proportion of both private and public wealth to personal protection. The state of California already spends more of its resources on prison construction and maintenance than it does on higher education. It is hard to imagine how such a choice an allocation of resources can ever be a recipe for a healthy and prosperous democratic society.

This article is excerpted from a paper presented by the authors in 1995 at the 6th Conference on American Planning History and has appeared in shorter form in the New Jersey Planning News of the APA Metro NY Chapter.

Tony Schuman, <schuman@traudwind.net> Associate Professor of Architecture at the New Jersey Institute of Technology, and Elliott Sellar, Professor of Planning at City College University, are collaborating on a book about community planning in the United States.
During a series of Roundtable discussions preceding the draft plan, the Mt. Laurel experience was discussed in some depth at a session on "The Habitable Region." When this discussion found its way into the draft third regional plan, however, its thrust had shifted. Instead of identifying the absence of black migration to the suburbs as a shortcoming of the Mt. Laurel plan as implemented by COAH, the draft plan tries to reassure its readers who fear that "affordable housing" will bring unwanted "outsiders" into their communities. "The fears are misplaced," because the "outsiders" are the community's own grown children, teachers, firefighters, and police officers who want to stay in the town where they grew up or now work but cannot afford to." Similarly, a discussion of the Guantánamo court decision in Chicago, which mandates housing vouchers to allow public housing residents to rent apartments in outlying suburbs, fails to examine fully the improved life circumstances these families have found outside the ghetto. While the recommendations call for building housing for all residents of the region regardless of race or income, there is no mechanism suggested as to how this might be accomplished, only a brief allusion to federal Fair Housing Laws. There is no discussion of pro-active integrative strategies which have been successful elsewhere, such as targeted mortgage assistance.

The RPA's Dilemma

The timeliness of the RPA's discussion of suburban segregation is emblematic of the internal contradiction at the heart of that organization. More importantly it is emblematic as well of the political difficulty we as a society have in effectively addressing our urban problems. On the one hand, the RPA is at the forefront of efforts to promote coherent regional development that conserves natural resources as it nourishes human ones. On the other, the corporate sponsorship that helps to make it an effective planning organization also limits the scope of practical initiatives which it can put forth. Typically, where longer term social issues clash with more immediate political imperatives, the social issues are given second priority.

This "earthview vision" reverberated in the first plan or the "radical restructuring of the status quo" promised in the second are compromised from the start. It was precisely this tension that was at the heart of the famous Adams/Mumford debate in the early 1930s. Writing in The New Republic, Lewis Mumford argued that there was no "regionalism" in the plan, that it merely confirmed chaotic methods governing regional growth and proposed no serious attempt at regionalizing the organization of production. The Regional Plan for New York and Its Environs, Mumford charged, "was conceived... in terms which would meet the interests and prejudices of the existing financial... and its aim from the beginning was as much welfare and amenity as could be obtained without altering any of the political or business institutions which have made the city precisely what it is." Thomas Adams, author of the plan, responded angrily by accusing Mumford of being an ideological idealist, an "ethereo-sociologist," and defended the plan as a practical and workable set of proposals. As a later commentator observed, Adams was "so concerned not to interfere in any way with existing rights and institutions that he rejected even the possibility of public intervention in low-cost housing."

This pragmatism pervades the Third Plan as well. While the plan's section on "Equity" recognizes that "governance is critical to breaking down remaining segregation barriers," the section on governance offers no specific proposals to address segregation directly. Except for a proposal for state assumption of school financing, the RPA relies again on voluntary cooperation among the over 2,000 separate administrative entities in the region. Here the authors acknowledge that problems besetting the educational system go far beyond formulas of per capita expenditure per student, but the proposed remedy does not address underlying inequities of neighborhood conditions, concentrated poverty and the like. The principle of "home rule" is held sacrosanct despite a very clear understanding of the costs of this system:

The net result of this policy tax-based and highly fragmented federal system is a region in which the cost of living is among the highest in the nation and the quality of life it offers its citizens is declining. Unsustainable growth and development patterns are established; the future workforce is inadequately educated and unemployed. Low-density automobile-dependent sprawl is encouraged; centers of all sizes are emaciated by residents, jobs, and retail establishments; and open space and sensitive natural resources are conserved.

Citing widespread popular skepticism about big government, the authors are wary about proposing new layers of municipal or regional government. Instead they argue cautiously that the home rule based governance system should be improved rather than dismantled. Their presentation misses the fire of former New York Governor Jim Florios's keynote address at the RPA's 1991 Regional Assembly, where he spoke candidly about the need for government initiatives and taxes increases to provide necessary services and infrastructure improvements. Florios paid a high political price for his willingness to move ahead of current political wisdom. In his farewell "State of the State" address, Florio warned, "It's time to stop living in a fantasy where we think small is automatical... ly better when in fact the price we pay is the duplication and inefficiency of maintaining 611 school districts and 567 totally independent municipalities awash in administrative redundancies. The bottom line cries out for more cooperation, coordination, and, yes, regionalization."

Conclusions: The Regionalization of Racial Conflict

When the first regional plan was gestating, in the late teens and early twenties, the orbit of racial conflict was within five miles of the central district business (CBD). Harlem was the flash point of urban racial change as speculators recouped their losses by converting a white community into a black one. By the time of the second plan, in the early 1960s, the racial front lines had moved further out from the CBD. The emblematic fight in Forest Hills, a middle income neighborhood in Queens, was triggered by a decision to locate a large public housing project at the edge of the neighborhood. The City was ultimately forced to back away from its original plan. Instead of a larger number of low income housing units, it substituted a drastically scaled back plan replacing most of the family apartments with units for the elderly. The site of the most recent racial clash, unfolding as the third regional plan was being realized for release, is Leonia New Jersey, a predominately white middle class, inner ring suburb just across the George Washington Bridge, about 15 miles from the CBD. Leonia sits adjacent to Englewood, a racially integrated suburb with a heavy black public school population. The fight is over court ordered decentralization of suburban schools to promote racial integration.

In none of these cases did or will the outcome bring a satisfactory resolution. By the 1930s Harlem was an overcrowded ghetto with a large concentration of very poor people. Forest Hills, which was a prestigious urban neighborhood until the 1970s, is no longer a preferred social destination, serving at best as a stopping point on the way out of the city for those with upwardly mobile ambitions. The pressures on Leonia are similar to ones felt in Yorkville and Mount Vernon in Westchester County. They will only push more middle class people further into the hinterlands. These three examples are important because they demonstrate that the unsolved regional problems related to race do not go away as a result of infrastructural improvement. Instead they make the next round of planning more difficult. Indeed if Massey and Denton are correct, the regional crisis will only get worse as the effects of racial segregation are compounded by failing economic opportunity. By not targeting the dismantling of the ghetto as a priority concern, the RPA is not only missing an opportunity to link social and physical planning in a comprehensive way, but is making a potentially serious error. Either we make a concerted effort to open up the region or we can stand by and watch as the white middle class withdraws into ever more remote and gated reserves and devotes an even higher proportion of both private and public wealth to personal protection. The state of California already spends more of its resources on prison construction and maintenance than it does on higher education. It is hard to imagine how such choice an allocation of resources can ever be a recipe for a healthy and prosperous democratic society.

This article is excerpted from a paper presented by the authors in 1995 at the 6th Conference on American Planning History and has appeared in shorter form in Environment, Newsletter of the APA Metro NY Chapter.

Tony Schuman, <schuman@radwind.net> Associate Professor of Architecture at the New Jersey Institute of Technology, and Elliott Sedar, Professor of Planning at City College University, are collaborating on a book about community planning in the United States.
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apartheid rules, will regional planning bring efficiency at the expense of equity? The articles in this issue on Portland and New York address these questions. Tasha Haron suggests how in Portland, a national model for regional planning, reducing sprawl and enhancing equity are not necessarily in conflict. But Portland is a relatively small and well-to-do region. The critique of the Third Regional Plan of New York by Tony Schuman and Elliot Sclar shows the extent to which fundamental equity issues may have slipped off the agenda in the nation’s largest metropolitan region. John McCarty’s critique of waste management in New York City shows how planning on a larger scale doesn’t by itself guarantee either efficiency or equity.

The longest surviving regional initiative in the United States is the Growth Management Plan Association in New York — is a non-prof
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and no affordable housing in others. Well thought out growth management strategies are more likely to help us produce affordable communities where people of different incomes can live.

I would rather see us deal proactively with the problems of growth management than allow disinvestment and sprawl. The issue is how we redistribute the burdens and benefits of regional management more equitably and how we can use growth management strategies to reduce inequities in the region.

What Metro Has Done

The Portland region has taken a unique approach to regional management. In 1979, voters in the region created Metro, the only directly elected regional government in the U.S. Its charter gives it organization with no formal power to implement its recommendations. It operates in a federal system where government delegates all planning functions to the states and has done little to establish or support regional planning authorities. So we are a very long way from acting regionally even if people are beginning to think regionally. As Peter Hall lamented in Cities of Tomorrow, “the philosophy, as in New York, was planning in the art of the possible; planning should remain an advisory function, it should not try to achieve more than marginal changes, and it must work within the limits of existing powers.” But the inefficiencies and inequities of the current setup keep raising the question of regional planning. Progressive planners need to have some answers.

Regional planning and regional government are well established in many European, Latin American and Asian countries. They have made possible greater national (and more) conservation and some land use planning. But experiences there show that the creation of regional authority is alone not the answer. In Europe, for example, the biggest contributors to regionalism are national and municipal governments that are in tune with a regional perspective. They rest on urban traditions that are disaffected of the sprawled, fragmented U.S. ideal.

In North America, Toronto’s metropolitain government has been one of the best examples of how regionalism can benefit from cooperation between regional authorities and local municipalities. But look at what just happened there. A conservative legislature abolished Toronto’s municipalities and created one powerful regional government. This will insure the monop

 Activists Bring Equity to Growth Management in Portland

Housing affordability and the displacement of low-income people from communities undergoing "revitalization" and reinvestment were not on Metro’s radar screen in 1994 when the Coalition for a Livable Future was founded. An association of 40 non-governmental organizations, the Coalition is determined to make the question of the burdens and benefits of growth, and growth management, major issues throughout the region. It came together to propose amendments to the 2040 growth concept and in the past three years, equity issues have become much more central to discussions at Metro, and among elected officials and others concerned with growth management in the local jurisdictions.

The Coalition has focused the initial stages of our fight on two issues: housing affordability and reinvestment in existing "distressed" communities. We recognize that there need to be larger regional and local economic development strategies, policies to address wages and income polarization, and tax-base sharing and other strategies to address fiscal inequities between local jurisdictions in the region.

We have done preliminary work on these issues, but have neither the expertise nor clout to be able to land the planning (and therefore Metro) to move forward in these arenas.

The Coalition was successful in its attempts to get Metro to include in its objectives stronger language on the importance of focusing public investment in existing communities with excess capacity to absorb more housing and jobs. This philosophy fits well with Metro’s larger vision of a compact urban form with vital "regional centers" spread throughout the region. Metro has also taken some land use actions to move towards this goal. They have kept the urban growth boundary tight, and required upzoning and mixed-use zoning in some areas. Metro also designated some of the former vital commercial strips in now dis
tressed communities as "main streets", signaling to local jurisdictions that these areas should be primed for reinvestment. This strategy seems to be succeeding in many sections of Portland by directing new public and private investment to neighborhoods that for over a decade had seen no redevelopment except by non

Affordable housing became a central organizing issue in the Coalition’s platform because the need was so compelling and because it was so clearly an issue that had to be addressed on the regional level. We have found it easy to get people to understand that we live in a regional economy. Many people live in one community, work in another, and shop in a third. But the property tax system for funding local government infrastructure and services makes some kinds of develop
ment more welcome than others. A few jurisdictions have the lion’s share of the new job growth and very little of the housing needed by the low- and moderate-income workforce that keep those businesses profitable. This means that the services and infrastructure (schools, parks, etc.) provided to those workers and their families are not available for the people who are not benef
it directly from the property taxes paid by the businesses. In addition to resulting in the perpetuation and growth of fiscal inequities between regions (as is well described in the work of Myron Orfield), this dynamic also leads to long commutes, increased traffic congestion, air pollution, and high transportation costs. Time and money are lost that might otherwise be invested in housing, education, family and community activities. Growth Management and Housing Affordability

The real estate industry has been quick to blame growth management for raising housing prices and making housing unaffordable. But consider a few facts:

• Housing prices in the Portland region have nearly doubled in the last 10 years. Many "undervalued" neighbor

hoods have seen housing prices (and rent) double in the past two to three years. Meanwhile, real wages for low-

and moderate-income people have stayed essentially flat.

• The Portland region was ranked the second least affordable housing market in the nation by the National Homebuilders Association in 1997. While the Portland area has nothing that looks like a "ghetto" to most people, there is a severe shelter-pover

ty problem in the region.

The Homebuilders Association’s lobbyists argue that the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), over-regulation and high system development charges (SDCs) are responsible for the housing price increases. They cite rapidly increasing raw land prices since 1990 and argue that the way to insure sufficient affordable housing is to add well over 10,000 acres to the UGB (the urbanizable land), decrease regulation and SDCs, and let "the market" take care of the problem.

There are several deep flaws with this

see PORTLAND on page 14
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apartheid roles, will regional planning bring efficiency at the expense of equity? The articles in this issue on Portland and New York address these questions. Tasha Harman suggests how in Portland, a national model for regional planning, reducing sprawl and enhancing equity are not necessarily in conflict. But Portland is a relatively small and well-to-do region. The critique of the Third Regional Plan of New York by Tony Schuman and Elliot Sclar shows the extent to which fundamental equity issues may have slipped off the agenda in the nation’s largest metropolitan region. JohnMcCroy’s commentary on waste management in New York City shows how planning on a larger scale doesn’t by itself guarantee either efficiency or equity.

The longest surviving regional initiative in the United States is New York’s Metropolitan Transportation Planning Association in New York — is a non-prof-

and no affordable housing in others. Well thought out growth management strategies are more likely to help us produce affordable communities where people of different incomes can live.

I would rather see us deal proactively with the problems of growth management than allow disinvestment and sprawl. The issue is how we redistribute the burdens and benefits of regional management more equitably and how we can use growth management strategies to reduce inequities in the region.

What Metro Has Done

The Portland region has taken a unique approach to regional management. In 1979, voters in the region created Metro, the only directly elected regional government in the U.S. Its charter gives it

the creation of regional authorities alone is not the answer. In Europe, for example, the biggest contributors to regionalism are national and municipal governments that are in tune with a regional perspective. They rest on urban traditions that are disdainful of the sprawled, fragmented U.S. ideal.

In North America, Toronto’s metropolitan government has been one of the best examples of how regionalism can benefit from cooperation between regional authorities and local municipalities. But look at what just happened there. A conservative legislature abolished Toronto’s municipalities and created one powerful regional government. This will insure the monopoly of suburban power and the ingress of progressive efforts to create a more efficient and equitable region. All in the name of regionalism.

That’s why we have to ask, “What about equity?” —Tom Angotti

there are more housing options (i.e. smaller homes on smaller lots, townhouses, apartments, and low-cost options) than rental and homeownership. But these new options are not “affordable” by advocates’ standards, except in some cases where they are directly subsidized.

All of this appears to leave low-income people less geographically isolated than they are in many other urban regions, but far less integrated than we would like them to be. Growth management strategies already adopted have had some positive effects on equity compared to the strategies (or lack thereof) in other regions. But the burden of growth still falls disproportionately on low-income people.

Activists Bring Equity to Growth Management in Portland

Housing affordability and the displacement of low-income people from communities undergoing “revitalization” and reinvestment were not on Metro’s radar screen in 1994 when the Coalition for a Livable Future was founded. An association of 40 non-governmental organizations, the Coalition is determined to make the question of the burdens and benefits of growth, and growth management, major issues throughout the region. It came together to propose amendments to the 2040 growth concept and in the past three years, equity issues have become much more central to discussions at Metro, and among elected officials and others concerned with growth management in the local jurisdictions.

The Coalition has focused the initial stages of our fight on two issues: housing affordability and reinvestment in existing “distressed” communities. We recognize that there need to be larger regional and local economic development strategies, policies to address wages and income polarization, and tax-base sharing and other strategies to address fiscal inequities between local jurisdictions in the region.

We have done preliminary work on these issues, but have neither the expertise nor the clout available to land planning (and therefore Metro) move forward in these areas.

The Coalition was successful in its efforts to get Metro to include in its objectives stronger language on the importance of focusing public investment in existing communities with excess capacity to absorb more housing and jobs. This philosophy fits well with Metro’s larger vision of a compact urban form with vital “regional centers” spread throughout the region. Metro has also taken some land use actions to move towards this goal. They have kept the urban growth boundary tight, and required upzoning and mixed-use zoning in some areas. Metro also designated some of the former vital commercial strips in now disdressed communities as “main streets”, signaling to local jurisdictions that these areas should be primed for reinvestment. This strategy seems to be succeeding in many sections of Portland by directing new public and private investment to neighborhoods that for over a decade had seen no redevelopment except by non-

broad powers to do regional planning and regulate land use throughout the three-county region, and to address what it identifies as “issues of regional concern.” Metro started the 2040 planning process which has, over the past nine years, engaged broad public debate and input as it developed a vision for the region’s future. The results are the 2040 Growth Concept (a map) and the Regional Framework Plan, which defines the shape that growth will take in the region for the next 45 years. This Plan is binding on local jurisdictions through Functional Plans that cover various topics. It calls for a compact urban form, with higher densities development focused along transit corridors and in town and regional centers, a more diverse housing stock in all communities, diversified transportation and protection of green spaces and natural resources within the urban growth boundary. Lands outside the urban growth boundary are to be preserved from urban development.

The 2040 strategies and the Urban Growth Boundary appear to be succeeding in preventing the worst of the “downtown” effect we see in many urban areas, where poverty is concentrated in the central city and older suburbs and jobs and wealth flee to the outer suburbs. Still, there are strong counter-trends. We are seeing gentrification in many “underdeveloped” neighborhoods in Portland and some suburbs. There is a great deal of redevelopment of old industrial areas in Portland into new residential neighborhoods, largely for middle and upper income singles. Though many of the jobs in other Portland neighborhoods and inner suburbs have left, and much of the job growth in the region is taking place in the wealthier suburbs, downtown Portland has shown strong job growth in the past few years. Housing densities in the region are increasing and

Portland and Housing Affordability

The real estate industry has been quick to blame growth management for raising housing prices and making housing unaffordable. But consider a few facts:

• Housing prices in the Portland region have nearly doubled in the last 10 years. Many “underdeveloped” neighborhoods have seen housing prices (and rents) double in the past two to three years. Meanwhile, real wages for low- and moderate-income people have stayed essentially flat.

• The Portland region was ranked the second least affordable housing market in the nation by the National Homebuilders Association in 1997. While the Portland region has nothing that looks like a “ghetto” to most people, there is a severe shelter-poor-er-

ity problem in the region.

The Homebuilders Association’s lobbyists argue that the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), over-regulation and high system development charges (SDCs) are responsible for the housing price increases. They cite rapidly increasing raw land prices since 1990 and argue that the way to ensure sufficient affordable housing is to add well over 10,000 acres to the UGB (the urbanizable land), decrease regulation and SDCs, and let the “market” take care of the problem.

There are several deep flaws with this see PORTLAND on page 14 ▶
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The Coalition believes the rapid increase in demand, very weak require-
ments for housing diversity, and greed, have created higher land and home prices
and higher rents. Our solution is to get
Metro and local governments to make
proactive housing affordability strategies a central part of the growth management
strategies for the region. To this end, we
have supported the kinds of actions
changes Metro is mandating, pushed (with
some success) for more local and state
fundings for subsidized housing, and
worked to strengthen the nonprofit hous-
ing sector. We have proposed adoption of
a wide variety of regulatory tools on the
regional level, including:

- A Fair Share Approach. Each jurisdic-
tion in the region should provide a
“fair share” of the affordable housing
requirement.

- Inclusionary Zoning. A percentage of
the housing units in any project above
a given size should be affordable to
people of moderate incomes without
public subsidy.

- Replacement Ordinance. This would
require the replacement of affordable
rental housing lost to demolition or
conversion. (The Community
Development Network, the
Community Alliance of Tenants
and others are also proposing a more com-
prehensive replacement ordinance for
adoption by the City of Portland.)

- Condo Conversion Ordinance. This
would regulate conversion of affordable
rental housing to ownership, providing
protection for tenants and the rapidly
shrinking affordable rental stock.

- Permanent Affordability in Exchange
for Public Subsidy.

- Government Investment Tax. This
measure would capture a significant
percentage of the increase in land val-
ues that occurs due to government reg-
ulation (i.e., a new parcel, even one
inside the UGB) or investment.

- A Speculation Tax to penalize rapid
resale of properties for high profits.

Regional Affordable Housing Successes
This past December Metro formally
recognized affordable housing as “an
issue of regional concern.” They incorpo-
rated affordable housing in Metro’s
Regional Framework Plan (RFP). They
mandated the use of a “fair share”
approach to affordable housing in the
region, based in part on an examination of
the jobs-housing balance. And they com-
mitted themselves to setting “fair share”
standards for housing in each jurisdiction
in the region. The RFP mandates a
replacement ordinance, and several pre-
liminary steps that could support inclu-
sionary zoning. The Metro Code regulat-
ing the expansion of the UGB also
includes strong language about housing
diversity. It includes a requirement that
some percentage of the housing devel-
opment on the added lands be affordable
to people at or below 80% of median family
income without public subsidy (a working
definition of inclusionary zoning). Metro
also made a commitment to staff an
Affordable Housing Technical Advisory
Group, which will include planners, adva-
cates, homeowners, elected officials, and
other interested parties, to refine the poli-
cies in the RFP and work on other hous-
 ing affordability strategies. Metro is likely
to commit funds to a housing planner in
July of 1998. We are moving forward.

In this program, growth manage-
ment can only do so much to address
equity issues. There are many counter-
trends, including:

- Oregon passed two progressive proper-
tax limitation measures in the past four
years. These severely restrict the local government funding for impor-
tant infrastructure and services. In gen-
eral, anti-tax attitudes appear to be gen-

stirring stronger in Oregon despite the fact that people here get more from
local governments for far fewer dollars than in many other areas.

- Major fiscal inequities still exist between local jurisdictions in the
region. The property tax system is so complex that any kind of tax-base
sharing will be difficult without a total overhaul of the tax system.

- The apparently progressive state poli-
cy of shifting school funding from local property taxes to the state and
“equalizing” funding across the state (combined with limits on property taxes)
has resulted in a significant cut in funds for Portland’s public schools,
which educate 90% of school age kids in Portland. Portland had been one of
the few communities in the nation that did a better job of funding its schools
than most of its suburban jurisdictions.

- A recent ballot measure on mandatory
sentencing is forcing the state spend
massively on new prisons. In one
community in the region, a prison is
being sited on what was a major
affordable housing site.

At the moment a major back lash
is building among some local jurisdictions
against Metro’s stance on affordable hous-
ing. Whatever the outcome, we are con-
vinced that growth management can be
a tool for efforts to create equity in our
region. Growth management can play a
positive role in addressing the needs of
low- and moderate-income people.

As the struggle progresses, we need to
be asking ourselves what it would take to
create a truly progressive growth manage-
ment program. Would the region come
be in proportion to one’s ability to
pay? How would this be designed? What
would a fundamentally progressive settle-
dment pattern and urban form look like?
And, how do we get there from here?

Tasha Harmon <coh@teleport.com> is a
planner, a founding member (now serving on
the steering Committee for the Coalition for
a Livable Future, and Executive Director of
the Community Development Network, an assoca-
tion of CDCs in Portland. She would like to
thank Ethan Seltzer for his suggestions for this
article.

NEW YORK CITY
THE FIRST REGIONAL
GOVERNMENT STILL
CRIES FOR PLANNING

The Case of Waste Management

By John McCrory

Proposers of regional governance as
a means of correcting disparities between
central cities and their suburbs can find a
real-world test of their theories in New
York City, which became the nation’s first
major regional government one hundred
years ago. Manhattan’s consolidation with
the four adjacent boroughs (Brons,
Brooklyn, Queens, and Staten Island),
which were mostly suburban and rural at
the time, made regional governmental and
planning possible in the largest city in the
United States, but what happened?

In 1898, there were grand visions of an
efficient and rationally-planned metro-
opolis. Then, as now, a key selling point
of consolidating regional government was
that poorer areas would be able to share in
the region’s overall wealth. With access to
Manhattan’s tax base, the other boroughs
were promised the same level of services
the central city enjoyed, from street-clean-
ing to parks to transit. Federal intervention
has reversed this aspect of the relationship
of central city to suburbs in most
American metro areas, but contemporary
regional governance proposals essentially
make the same promise.

The metropolitan region of New
York has grown far beyond the city’s bound-
aries. Disproportionate service delivery
has resulted in constant conflict between
the city’s complex combination of central
city and low- and high-density suburbs, its
multiple employment and commercial
centers, and its heterogeneous patterns of
land use and population from district to
district that resembles the metropolitan regions of other parts of the U.S. closely enough that
it can still provide a useful example for
identifying some likely outcomes of regional
governance.

Another promise of consolidation
is greater efficiency, achieved by eliminat-
ing duplication and ensuring uniformity of ser-
vice. But does government service deliv-
ery quality as efficiency in a heterogene-
ous region — in which the service
needs of different communities are not
uniform? How can one-size-fits-all service
efficiently when it provides too much ser-
vice to some neighborhoods but too little to
other? Efficient services are those pro-
vided in appropriate measure to a communi-
ty’s needs — that is, provided equitably.

The fallacy that equity and efficiency
are tradeoffs needlessly complicates dis-
cussions of regional governance and plan-
ting. The misguided notion that providing
uniform service through centralized gov-
ernment leads to efficiency, however, has
long been the rationale for New York’s
consolidated government.

Social equity and local control have been
among the many victims of this century-
long experience. Such shortcomings are
evident in the story of how New York City
handles its garbage — a citywide
see GARBAGE on page 16
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analysis. First, there is no evidence that bringing more land inside the UGB would actually bring home prices down significantly. Data provided by Metro shows clearly that an almost identical rapid rise in home prices occurred from 1973 to 1979, the last rapid growth boom in the region, when there was still so much undeveloped land inside the UGB that even the Homebuilders admit it couldn’t have been influencing prices. Secondly, the Homebuilders’ strategies would not address the many factors beyond land prices in the housing equation. For example, average house size in the region has increased by 20% in the last 15 years. The Coalition believes that housing prices are set at “what the market will bear” in this consumer society where many middle and upper class people will willingly pay extra prices for more housing than they need. Most low-income people have no choice in the matter. There is no reason to believe that lowering land costs for the homebuilders will achieve any significant decrease in housing prices while the boom goes on.

Many homebuilders also note that there is deep resistance in many communities to housing built on smaller lots, townhouses, duplexes, accessory dwelling units and, of course, multi-family housing. Banks have also been reluctant to lend on projects that differ much from the standard suburban subdivisions (despite strong demand for Portland’s fine and much loved stock of old, neighborhood-scale multi-family housing built along the steepest lines and just north of downtown in the early 1900s).

Affordable housing advocates and the Homebuilders agree that barriers to affordable housing exist. Metro is currently addressing these barriers by mandating major zoning changes. However, it remains to be seen whether the public will go for it. While there is a clearly stated popular preference for a tight UGB, many people have serious qualms about the increased density required to accomplish it. Whether they will allow real changes on the ground in their own communities is an open question.

The Coalition believes the rapid increase in demand, very weak requirements for housing diversity, and greed, have created higher land and home prices and higher rents. Our solution is to get Metro and local governments to make pro-active housing affordability strategies a central part of the growth management strategies for the region. To this end, we have proposed the kinds of zoning changes Metro is mandating, pushed (with some success) for more local and state funding for subsidized housing, and worked to strengthen the nonprofit housing sector. We have proposed adoption of a wide variety of regulatory tools on the regional level, including:

- A Fair Share Approach. Each jurisdiction in the region should provide a “fair share” of the affordable housing needed for the region.
- Inclusionary Zoning. A percentage of the housing units in any project above a given size should be affordable to people of moderate incomes without public subsidy.
- Replacement Ordinance. This would require the replacement of affordable rental housing lost to demolition or conversion. (The Community Development Network, the Community Alliance of Tenants and others are also proposing a more comprehensive replacement ordinance for this and the City of Portland.)
- Condo Conversion Ordinance. This would regulate conversion of affordable rental housing to ownership, providing for protection for tenants and the rapidly shrinking affordable rental stock.
- Permanent Affordability in Exchange for Public Subsidy.
- Government Investment Tax. This measure would capture a significant percentage of the increase in land values that occur due to government regulation (i.e., a new parcel being brought inside the UGB) or investment.
- A Speculation Tax to penalize rapid resale of properties for high profits.

Regional Affordable Housing Successes
This past December Metro formally recognized affordable housing as “an issue of regional concern.” They incorporated affordable housing in Metro’s Regional Framework Plan (RFP). They mandated the use of a “fair share” approach to affordable housing in the region, based in part on an examination of the jobs-housing balance. And they committed themselves to setting “fair share” standards for housing in each jurisdiction in the region. The RFP mandates a replacement ordinance, and several preliminary steps that could support inclusionary zoning. The Metro Code regulating the expansion of the UGB also includes strong language about housing diversity. It includes a requirement that some percentage of the housing developed on the added lands be affordable to people at or below 80% of median family income without public subsidy (a working definition of inclusionary zoning). Metro also made a commitment to staff an Affordable Housing Technical Advisory Group, which will include planners, advocates, homebuilders, elected officials, and other interested parties to refine the policies in the RFP and work on other housing affordability strategies. Metro is likely to commit funds to a housing planner in July of 1998. We are moving forward.

In this progress, growth management can only do so much to address equity issues. There are many counter-trends, including:
- Oregon passed two regressive property-tax limitation measures in the past four years. These severely restrict local government funding for important infrastructure and services. In general, anti-tax attitudes appear to be getting stronger in Oregon despite the fact that people here get more from local governments for far fewer dollars than in many other areas.
- Major fiscal inequities still exist between local jurisdictions in the region. The property tax system is so complex that any kind of tax-base sharing will be difficult without a total overhaul of the tax system.
- The apparently progressive state policy of shifting school funding from local property taxes to the state and “equalizing” funding across the state (combined with limits on property taxes) has resulted in a significant cut in funds for Portland’s public schools, which educate 90% of school age kids in Portland. Portland had been one of the few communities in the nation that did a better job of funding its schools than most of its suburban jurisdictions.
- A recent ballot measure on mandatory sentencing is forcing the state spend massively on new prisons. In one community in the region, a prison is being sited on what was a major affordable housing site.

At the moment a major backlash is building among some local jurisdictions against Metro’s stance on affordable housing. Whatever the outcome, we are convinced that growth management can be a tool for efforts to create equity in our region. Growth management can play a positive role in addressing the needs of poor- and moderate-income people.

As the struggle progresses, we need to be asking ourselves what it would take to create a truly progressive growth management program. Would community members be born in proportion to one’s ability to pay? How would this be designed? What would a fundamentally progressive set-urn outline of the tax system.
service every citizen relies on each day for which responsibility is centralized in a single agency, the Department of Sanitation (DOS), with an apparently simple mission.

A Neverending Game of Catch Up

In the year the City of Greater New York was created, Manhattan had been achieving success with the most forward-looking waste management program of its time. During the previous four years, Streets Cleaning Commissioner Col. George Waring had stopped dumping the city's garbage into the ocean, instead implementing a radical program that included trash collection, recycling, and composting. Diversion of reusable materials had significantly reduced the waste stream and solved a major regional environmental problem.

Consolidation, however, led to an unfortunate change in the political winds. By forging new coalitions in the outer boroughs, Tammany Hall recaptured the mayor's office. The reformers were out after only a single term. The recycling program was soon scrapped and the city resumed ocean dumping.

As the city's population and waste stream grew in coming decades, the city supplemented ocean dumping with landfill and incinerators. A successful federal lawsuit brought by a coalition of New Jersey coastal cities forced the city to end ocean dumping in 1935. Ambitious plans for new incinertors had to be scaled down during the Great Depression and World War II, so the city's sanitation infrastructure continually lagged behind its needs. Most garbage ended up as landfill for public works projects like Robert Moses's parks and highways.

In an effort to stem the rising tide of garbage it handled, in 1957 the city stopped collecting commercial waste, instead requiring businesses to hire private companies to take their garbage away. This strategy succeeded in diverting some of the waste stream to incinertors and landfills outside the city. But this shift created a business that soon became a mafia cartel that inflated the cost of private garbage collection by up to ten times the reasonable market price. The mob controlled the business until just two years ago, when federal prosecutors finally succeeded in cracking the industry and sending the leading bosses to jail.

By the 1960s, the city was burning almost a third of its trash in 22 municipal incinertors and over 17,000 apartment building incinertors. Since then, public awareness of the environmental costs of landfilling and incineration have gradually forced the city to shut down its old landfills and incinertors, including those in apartment houses. The last municipal incinerator closed in 1992, leaving only a single waste disposal option for the 14,000 tons of residential and public waste DOS collects each day.

Sanitation trucks take the trash to the nearest of the city's marine transfer stations and dump it in waiting barges that carry it across the harbor to the Fresh Kills Landfill.

Fresh Kills: You Can't Fill a Bottomless Pit

Situated on the western shore of Staten Island, the Fresh Kills Landfill covers 2,100 acres, and is so large it can be seen with the naked eye from space. Its highest mound is only slightly shorter than the Washington Monument. First opened in 1947, today Fresh Kills is the largest landfill in the world. It is also of dubious legality. Operating under a series of federal consent orders, it is outlined and leaches thousands of pounds of toxins into nearby estuaries each day. Its odor reaches into neighborhoods on both sides of the Arthur Kill, which separates Staten Island from New Jersey. It will be a likely superfund candidate for the next century.

As early as the 1960s, there were predictions that Fresh Kills would soon run out of room. Federal and State estimates predicted it would be full by 2005. Technically correct, but more than a decade over. Vice President Joseph Clinchy's attempt to inform the public about the consent orders managed to extend its life a few years, and there are a some DOS engineers who privately believe they could find ways to keep it open forever. But DOS eventually conceded Fresh Kills would have to close by 2017, and began preparing how to cover up the entire landfill after it closes. However, no thought was given to how the city would adapt its waste management infrastructure once Fresh Kills was no longer an option.

The consent orders and several federal laws governed by local citizens groups and the Staten Island Borough President also made Fresh Kills' future uncertain.

Development following the opening of the Verrazano Narrows Bridge in the 1960s had transformed the once sparsely populated Staten Island into a middle-class residential borough. For the residents in other boroughs, Fresh Kills was in that magical land called "Away," but for Staten Islanders, the landfill's odor and environmental problems were close at hand and became a top issue. The city still failed to plan ahead.

Ultimately, local citizens were more proactive than the city. Staten Island Citizens for Clean Air (SICCA) and Borough President Guy Molinari continued to press their separate lawsuits.

SICCA's Barbara Warren says that in late 1995, when their case was finally coming to trial, her group approached Molinari and the city to seek a settlement. SICCA believed they were going to win easily in court, forcing the landfill to close ahead of DOS's plans. The city agreed, but instead of settling, quiet negotiations began between Molinari, DOS and the mayor. SICCA was kept at arm's length.

Here Comes the Trash

Meanwhile, residents in Brooklyn and the Bronx were battling the unplanned results of one DOS strategy for keeping Fresh Kills from filling up too soon. Many of the city's commercial haulers were depositing their garbage in Fresh Kills for a small "tipping fee." At the end of their collection routes, their trucks would simply drive to Staten Island - a cheaper alternative to long distances out of state. In 1988, DOS raised its tipping fees to discourage the commercial haulers from using Fresh Kills. They succeeded.

Chris Boyd, an environmental policy assistant to Brooklyn Borough President Howard Golden, explains that "almost overnight, dozens of waste transfer stations appeared in low-income communities in Brooklyn and the Bronx." Queens was also affected to a slightly lesser degree.

"You have to understand," says Leslie Lowe of the New York City Environmental Justice Alliance, "the people in these neighborhoods were already seeing a plague of illegal dumping [that began] in the 70's." Now, it was being augmented by officially sanctioned garbage trucks.

At a waste transfer station, private haulers deposit garbage in an open pile, where it waits to be loaded on larger trucks or railcars for long-distance shipping. Some of the major adverse impacts of waste transfer stations comes from the noise, dust, and odors resulting from trucks carrying waste into a transfer facility, resulting truck traffic on nearby roads, noise, dust, and odors from waste compactors, and flies and rodents. As a result, many states, including New York, place authority for regulating waste facilities in their environmental laws. But regulation in New York City has been limited and lethargic, with no one taking the responsibility for enforcing the laws.

Despite such problems, even activists who are fighting waste transfer stations admit a single facility isn't so terrible.

Problems mount when several transfer stations concentrate in one neighborhood, which is exactly what has happened.
service every citizen relies on each day for which responsibility is controlled in a single agency, the Department of Sanitation (DOS), with an apparently simple mission.

A Neverending Game of Catch Up

In the year the City of Greater New York was created, Manhattan had been achieving success with the most forward-looking waste management program of its time. During the previous four years, Streets Cleaning Commissioner Col. George Waring had stopped dumping the city’s garbage in the ocean, instead implementing a radical program that included recycling and composting. Diversion of reusable materials had significantly reduced the waste stream and solved a major regional environmental problem.

Consolidation, however, led to an unfortunate change in the political winds. By forging new coalitions in the outer boroughs, Tammany Hall recaptured the mayor’s office. The reformers were out after only a single term. The recycling program was soon scrapped and the city resumed ocean dumping.

As the city’s population and waste stream grew in coming decades, the city supplemented ocean dumping with landfill and incinerators. A successful federal lawsuit brought by a coalition of New Jersey coastal cities forced the city to end ocean dumping in 1978. Ambitious plans for new incinerators had to be scaled down during the Great Depression and World War II, so the city’s sanitation infrastructure continually lagged behind its needs. Most garbage ended up as landfill for public works projects like Robert Moses’ parks and highways.

In an effort to stem the rising tide of garbage it handled, in 1957 the city stopped collecting commercial waste, instead requiring businesses to hire private companies to take their garbage away. This strategy succeeded in diverting some of the waste stream to incinerators and landfills outside the city. But this shift created a business that soon became a mafia cartel that inflated the cost of private garbage collection by up to ten times the reasonable market price. The mob controlled the business until just two years ago, when federal prosecutors finally succeeded in cracking the industry and sending the leading bosses to jail.

By the 1960s, the city was burning almost a third of its trash in its 22 municipal incinerators and over 17,000 apartment building incinerators. Since then, public awareness of the environmental costs of landfilling and incineration have gradually forced the city to shut down its old landfills and incinerators, including those in apartment houses. The last municipal incinerator closed in 1992, leaving only a single waste disposal option for the 14,000 tons of residential and public waste DOS collects each day. Sanitation trucks take the trash to the nearest of the city’s marine transfer stations and dump it in waiting barges that carry it across the harbor to the Fresh Kills Landfill.

Fresh Kills: You Can’t Fill a Bottomless Pit

Situated on the western shore of Staten Island, the Fresh Kills Landfill covers 2,100 acres, and is so large it can be seen with the naked eye from space. Its highest mound is only slightly shorter than the Washington Monument. First opened in 1947, today Fresh Kills is the largest landfill in the world. It is also of dubious legality. Operating under a series of federal consent orders, it is outlined and leaches thousands of pounds of toxins into nearby estuaries each day. Its odor reaches into neighborhoods on both sides of the Arthur Kill, which separates Staten Island from New Jersey. It will be a likely superfund candidate for the next century.

As early as the 1960s, there were predictions that Fresh Kills would soon run out of room. Federal and State estimates predicted it would be full by 2000. Technical advice required by the consent orders managed to extend its life a few years, and there are a some DOS engineers who privately believe they could find ways to keep it open forever. But DOS eventually conceded Fresh Kills would have to close by 2017, and began planning how to cover up the entire landfill after it closes. However, no thought was given to how the city would adapt its waste management infrastructure once Fresh Kills was no longer an option.

The present system is outdated and federal laws allow local citizens groups and the State Island Board of Appeals have ruled that Fresh Kills must provide an alternative site.

As a result, the city of Staten Island, the city’s marine transfer stations and dump it in waiting barges that carry it across the harbor to the Fresh Kills Landfill.

The Zoning Magnet

You might expect the City Planning Department to take note of this situation and use its planning and zoning pow- er to better locate and regulate waste facilities. But New York City’s zoning, which limits waste transfer stations to heavy industrial zones, is partly to blame for the concentration of these facilities.

When the city enacted its last large-scale rezoning in 1961, light- and heavy-industrial zones ended up being concentrated in waterfront neighborhoods that were actually mixed in character.

According to Wilbur Woods, Director of Waterfront Planning for the Department of City Planning, the expectation was that the residential uses would gradually be replaced by manufacturing in both the light and heavy manufacturing zones. Forty years later, a visitor to these dis- tricts will find that the residential uses have held on even while industry and middle-class residents have moved away.

In areas like Greenpoint-Williamsburg, in Brooklyn, which has the largest percent- age of manufacturing-zoned land of any district in the city, residential uses have thrived even though industrial uses have declined. High proportions of home ownership, new immigration, and even some artist-led gentrification, along with a surprising amount of light manufacturing, have maintained the area’s mixed character.

Even though they retained their mix of residential and industrial uses, zoning, and the lack of planning made these neighborhood magnets for waste transfer stations. There are now almost 90 transfer stations in the city, and over half of them are located in a few low-income areas: Red Hook and Greenpoint-Williamsburg in Brooklyn; Hunter’s Point and South Jamaica in Queens; and the South Bronx. Greenpoint-Williamsburg has the highest concentration (26% of the city’s total), as
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well as the most noxious facilities, with almost 90% of the “permitted capacity” for putrescible waste — the mixed, wet garbage that gives off rotten odors that can be smelled for blocks around.

Neighborhoods Call for Fair Share

In 1990, New York City created a “Fair Share” rule that required consideration of the local impact of various new pollution facilities. The guidelines were intended to ensure that benefits of needed services and burdens of unwanted uses were distributed equally among every district of the city. Community activists from neighborhoods with large concentrations of waste transfer stations scored a major victory when they managed to win a new law that required DOS to create siting regulations for waste transfer stations.

The Giuliani administration fought this specific provision in court, ultimately losing at each level. Last month, DOS finally drafted siting regulations. They are predictably toothless and riddled with exemptions, practically grandfathering existing transfer stations. Sanitation Commissioner John Doherty says he is unable to place limits on concentrations of transfer stations, claiming he is bound by the city’s zoning ordinances.

The latest developments at City Planning offer no hope in this regard. The department is currently engaged in rezoning parts of the city’s 581 miles of waterfront.

New proposals improve the way residential and natural waterfront areas are regulated, but fail to correct the industrial zones that are actually mixed-use areas. Heavy industrial zones will continue to be confined to a few low-income areas of the city. This rezoning will effectively lock-in the existing problems of waste transfer stations for the near future.

SICCA Wins, Sort Of

In 1994, conservative Republican George Pataki won a narrow upset victory over Mario Cuomo in the race for Governor. Pataki had greatly benefited from large turnouts in heavily Republican Staten Island, much as Republican Rudolph Giuliani did in the previous year’s mayoral election. For the first time in decades, Republicans held the most important executive position in both the state and the city. This unusual alignment of the political stars shined favorably on the borough, and Molinaro — also a Republican — was not about to let the opportunity slip away. “You could say there was a political debt to pay,” says Molinaro’s Staff Attorney Dan Maier.

In late May of 1996, after several months of quiet negotiations, this Republican triumvirate held a surprise press conference to announce Fresh Kills would close in 2002. Two days later, a law to close the landfill was passed in the state legislature.

In theory, this long overdue decision gave the city an excellent opportunity to restructure waste management and adapt to the changing expectations the public placed on DOS. As long as the mission of DOS had remained straightforward and simple, it seemed to function quite well. Indeed, as recently as the mid-1980s, DOS was thought by many observers to be one of the best-run city agencies. But the department’s mission had gradually evolved over the years as the public’s increasing environmental awareness resulted in state, federal and local laws to regulate waste more strictly. In 1989, the department’s mission was even more fundamentally altered when the city passed the most ambitious recycling laws in the nation. Today, DOS is more commonly described as incompetent, demoralized, and frustrating to work with.

In practice, DOS has failed to adapt to new demands. Its recycling programs have been disappointments. Ideas for improving recycling are not in short supply among the city’s environmental advocates, but DOS has resisted change every step of the way. An unsuccessful mayor hasn’t helped either: Giuliani cut funds to the recycling budget once he entered office, calling recycling “a fad.” (The budget was restored by the City Council last year.)

The decision to close the city’s last remaining landfill has not resulted in better planning, efficiency, or greater social equity. Indeed, the closing of Fresh Kills was not a planning decision. Rather, it was a back-room deal that did not involve SICCA, the citizen coalition that had fought for years to shut down the landfill, or any similar group. “It was purely a political decision,” says Brooklyn’s Boyd. “And like all purely political decisions, it was made without any forethought, without any planning.”

Instead of planning informing decision-making, decision-making was forcing a straitjacket on planning. After deciding the landfill would close, Giuliani appointed an ad hoc task force of agency heads, staffers, and representatives of industry to work out a plan. Guy Molinaro served as chair.

Representatives from the other boroughs and environmentalists had been left out of the back-room dealmaking, and they were excluded again from the Mayor’s task force. Environmentalists were livid. How can you create a plan to close the city’s landfill without input from the very people who have been working to improve waste management and recycling, they asked? After several months of aggressive lobbying, the mayor finally appointed two environmentalists to the task force: SICCA’s Warren and Jim Tripp of the Environmental Defense Fund. Even then, Warren and Tripp were kept out of the decisionmaking loop. As Warren describes it, the rest of the task force would meet officially with them, asking them questions as though they were merely giving testimony, then adjourn the meeting and go off and discuss things by themselves. Warren tried to protest, but says she didn’t get much support, not even from Tripp.

Giuliani also called on the boroughs to prepare their own plans for adapting to the absence of Fresh Kills. The apparent reasoning was that the task force would sketch out a guideline and the boroughs would fill in the blanks.

By the spring of 1997, the task force had released its report and the City Council was holding hearings to prepare its own response. The task force report was predictably short on details. It called for continued use of the city’s marine transfer stations; barges would still carry the garbage, just somewhere other than Fresh Kills.

There was also a suggested timeline of annual targets, dictating the way from Fresh Kills to phase it down gradually. Warren had managed to exact this concession in the final days before the report was released. “They were all ready to publish the report when I said, ‘wait, you’ve set the date for closing the landfill, but you haven’t said anything about how we’re going to get there’” she explained. The annual targets were the result.

This timeline would come to haunt the city’s other environmental advocates when DOS treated the goals as law and initiated interim plans to shift garbage from Fresh Kills-bound barges to land-based commercial waste transfer stations. More trash was now on its way to the already saturated neighborhoods of the South Bronx, Greenpoint-Williamsburg, and Red Hook.

In summer the borough reports were completed, and the City Council released its report in October. They all featured a number of suggestions for improving recycling and recycling education — ideas DOS had either resisted or ignored since beginning recycling a decade ago. The City Council went a step further, demanding a moratorium on the siting of new transfer stations until acceptable siting regulations were approved.

But all of these reports are more notable for what they omit than what they include. None of them proposes any substantive new plan for phasing out the city’s reliance on Fresh Kills. None envisages any realignment of operations or authority around the new mission of maximizing waste prevention, recycling, and composting. None of them offers any specific proposal for decoupling the blight of transfer stations so the responsibility would be evenly shared by all parts of the city — i.e., “fair share” planning.

In any case, since their release the reports have only gathered dust.

Contracts for Corporations

As the foregoing shows, the city is still missing its historic opportunity to plan for a more efficient and equitable system of waste management, and to do it with citizen groups and neighborhoods.

Instead, the mayor is using the opportunity to issue huge contracts to his business allies. Last year DOS issued three Requests for Proposals (RFPs) soliciting bids from waste management companies for handling the city’s residential waste once it is diverted from the landfill. These RFPs are in effect the most important planning documents in the city – a sign that no serious planning is occurring.

By their nature, RFPs result in techno-clinical ‘solutions.’ When an agency doesn’t know how to adapt to a new requirement, instead of involving the public to solicit ideas and to develop a comprehensive plan to handle the new demands, they typically hire professionals to give them a narrowly-defined answer that doesn’t address long-term problems. Professionals, eager to be chosen for future contracts, dare not offer any suggestions that might disrupt the status quo.

These RFPs are no exception, having been set up so only large corporations could meet the qualifications. Furthermore, DOS — or any city agency for that matter — has a greater incentive to issue RFPs than undertake community-based planning and problem solving. Community-based programs tend to be funded through local politicians who can use them to increase their local power base. Contracts, on the other hand, can benefit the Mayor and his agency appointees; Funneled to large corporations, they can result in hefty campaign contributions and invite corruption at the highest levels of government, as occurred at the Parking Violations Bureau during the Koch Administration.

Centralized Decisionmaking and Fragmented Political Response

In the case of waste management, New York City’s centralized decisionmaking process has resulted in a one-size-fits-all method of collection even though the composition of the waste stream is radically different from one neighborhood to the next.

DOS’s centralized authority has also proven susceptible to political influence that leads to an unequal distribution of the negative impacts of this citywide service. Although zoning is partially responsible, the heart of the waste transfer station problem is environmental injustice: the well-worn path of least resistance.

One hidden part of the original political deal for Fresh Kills has since come to light that demonstrates this reality. DOS was instructed to reject any proposals from companies that would create new waste facilities, including transfer stations, in Staten Island, a largely white, middle-income borough. Instead, white and ethnically diverse working-class neighborhoods in the other boroughs are the only available targets.

The unequal distribution of negative impacts fragments communities’ ability to see GARBAGE on page 20
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well as the most noxious facilities, with almost 90% of the "permitted capacity" for putrescible waste — the mixed, wet garbage that gives off rotten odors that can be smelled for blocks around.

Neighborhoods Call for Fair Share
In 1990, New York City created a "Fair Share" rule that required consideration of the local impact of various new pollution initiatives. The guidelines would ensure the benefits of needed services and burdens of unwanted uses were distributed equally among every district of the city. Community activists from neighborhoods with large concentrations of waste transfer stations scored a major victory when they managed to win a new law that required DOS to create siting regulations for waste transfer stations.

The Giuliani administration fought this specific provision in court, ultimately losing at each level. Last month, DOS finally drafted siting regulations. They are predictably toothless and riddled with exemptions, practically grandfathering existing transfer stations. Sanitation Commissioner John Doherty says he is unable to place limits on concentrations of transfer stations, claiming he is bound by the city's zoning ordinances.

The latest developments at City Planning offer no hope in this regard. The department is currently engaged in rezoning parts of the city's 81 miles of waterfront. Their new proposals improve the way residential and natural waterfront areas are regulated, but fail to correct the industrial zones that are actually mixed-use areas. Heavy industrial zones will continue to be confined to a few low-income areas of the city. This rezoning will effectively lock-in the existing problems of waste transfer stations for the near future.

SICCA Wins, Sort Of
In 1994, conservative Republican George Pataki won a narrow upset victory over Mario Cuomo in the race for Governor. Pataki had greatly benefited from large turnouts in heavily Republican Staten Island, much as Republican Rudolph Giuliani did in the previous year's mayoral election. For the first time in decades, Republicans held the most important executive position in both the state and the city. This unusual alignment of the political stars shining favorably on the borough, and Molinari — also a Republican — was not about to let the opportunity slip away. "You could say there was a political debt to pay," says Molinari's staff attorney Dan Manzer.

In late May of 1996, after several months of quiet negotiations, this Republican triumvirate held a surprise press conference to announce Fresh Kills would close in 2002. Two days later, a law to close the landfill was passed in the state legislature.

In theory, this long overdue decision gave the city an excellent opportunity to restructure waste management and adapt to the changing expectations the public placed on DOS. As long as the mission of DOS had remained straightforward, simple, it seemed to function quite well. Indeed, as recently as the mid-1980s, DOS was thought by many observers to be one of the best-run city agencies. But the department's mission had gradually evolved over the years as the public's increasing environmental awareness resulted in state, federal and local laws to regulate waste more strictly. In 1989, the department's mission was even more fundamentally altered when the city passed the most ambitious recycling laws in the nation. Today, DOS is more commonly described as incompetent, demoralized, and frustrating to work with.

In practice, DOS has failed to adapt to new demands. Its recycling programs have been disappointments. Ideas for improving recycling are not in short supply among the city's environmental advocates, but DOS has resisted change every step of the way. An unsupportive mayor hasn't helped either: Giuliani cut funds to the recycling budget once he entered office, calling recycling "a fade." (The budget was restored by the City Council last year.)

The decision to close the city's last remaining landfill has not resulted in better planning, efficiency, or greater social equity. Indeed, the closing of Fresh Kills was not a planning decision. Rather, it was a back-room deal that did not involve SICCA, the citizen coalition that had fought for years to shut down the landfill, or any similar group. "It was purely a political decision," says Brooklyn's Boyd. "And like all purely political decisions, it was made without any forethought, without any planning."

Instead of planning informed decision-making, decision-making was forcing a straitjacket on planning. After deciding the landfill would close, Giuliani appointed a task force of agency heads, staffers, and representatives of industry to work on a plan. Guy Molinari served as chair. Representatives from the other boroughs and environmentalists had been left out of the back-room dealmaking, and they were excluded again from the Mayor's task force. Environmentalists were livid. How can you create a plan to close the city's landfill without input from the very people who have been working to improve waste management and recycling, they asked? After several months of aggressive lobbying, the mayor finally appointed two environmentalists to the task force: SICCA's Warren and Jim Tripp of the Environmental Defense Fund. Even then, Warren and Tripp were kept out of the decisionmaking loop. As Warren describes it, the rest of the task force would meet officially with them, asking them questions as though they were mere-

ly giving testimony, then adjourn the meeting and go off and discuss things by themselves. Warren tried to protest, but says she didn't get much support, not even from Tripp.

Giuliani also called on the boroughs to prepare their own plans for adapting to the absence of Fresh Kills. The apparent reasoning was that the task force would sketch out a guideline and the boroughs would fill in the blanks.

By the spring of 1997, the task force had released its report and the City Council was holding hearings to prepare its own response. The task force report was precisely short on details. It called for continued use of the city's marine transfer stations: barges would still carry the garbage, just somewhere else other than Fresh Kills.

There was also a suggested timeline of annual targets, dividing the gap from Fresh Kills to phase it down gradually. Warren had managed to extract this concession in the final days before the report was released. "They were all ready to publish the report when I said, "wait, you've set the date for closing the landfill, but you haven't said anything about how we're going to get there" she explained. The annual targets were the result.

This timeline would come to haunt the city's other environmental advocates when DOS treated the goals as law and initiated interim plans to shift garbage from Fresh Kills-bound barges to land-based commercial waste transfer stations.

More trash now on the way to the already saturated neighborhoods of the South Bronx, Greenpoint-Williamsburg, and Red Hook.

In summer the borough reports were completed, and the City Council released its report in October. They all featured a number of suggestions for improving recycling and recycling technology — ideas DOS had either resisted or ignored since beginning recycling a decade ago. The City Council went a step further, demand-

ing a moratorium on the siting of new transfer stations until acceptable siting regulations were approved.

But all of these reports are more notable for what they omit than what they include. None of them proposes any sub-

stantively new plan for phasing out the city's reliance on Fresh Kills. None envisions any realignment of operations or authority around the new mission of maximizing waste prevention, recycling, and composting. None of them offers any specific proposal for deconcentrating the blight of transfer stations so the responsi-

bility would be evenly shared by all parts of the city — i.e., "fair share" planning.

In any case, since their release the reports have only gathered dust.

Contracts for Corporations
As the foregoing shows, the city is about to miss an historic opportunity to plan for a more efficient and equitable system of waste management, and to do it with citizen groups and neighborhoods. Instead, the mayor is using the opportunity to issue huge contracts to his business pals.

Last year DOS issued three Requests for Proposals (RFPs) soliciting bids from waste management companies for handling the city's residential waste once it is diverted from the landfill. These RFPs are in effect the most important planning documents in the city — a sign that no seri-

ous planning is occurring.

By their nature, RFPs result in techno-

cratic 'solutions.' When an agency doesn't know how to adapt to a new requirement, instead of involving the public to solicit ideas and to develop a comprehensive plan to handle the new demands, they typi-

cally hire professionals to give them a narrowly-defined answer that doesn't address long-term problems. Professionals, eager to be chosen for future contracts, dare not offer any sug-

gestions that might disturb the status quo.

These RFPs are no exception, having been set up so only large corporations could meet the qualifications.

Furthermore, DOS — or any city agency for that matter — has a greater incentive to issue RFPs than undertake community-based planning and problem solving. Community-based programs tend to be funded through local politicians who can use them to increase their local power base. Contracts, on the other hand, can benefit the Mayor and his agency appointees; Funneled to large corpora-

tions, they can result in hefty campaign contributions and invite corruption at the highest levels of government, as occurred at the Parking Violations Bureau during the Koch Administration.

Centralized Decisionmaking and Fragmented Political Response
In the case of waste management, New York City's centralized decisionmaking process has resulted in a one-size-fits-all method of collection even though the composition of the waste stream is rad-

ically different from one neighborhood to the next.

DOS's centralized authority has also proven susceptible to political influence that leads to an unequal distribution of the negative impacts of this citywide service.

Although zoning is partly responsible, the heart of the waste transfer station problem is environmental injustice: the well-worn path of least resistance.

One hidden part of the original politi-

cal deal for Fresh Kills has since come to light that demonstrates this reality. DOS was instructed to reject any proposals from companies that would create new waste facilities, including transfer sta-

tions, in Staten Island, a largely white, middle-income borough. Instead, white and ethnically diverse working-class neighborhoods in the other boroughs are the only available targets.

The unequal distribution of negative impacts fragments communities' ability to see GARBAGE on page 20
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responsible by forcing officials and citizen groups in each borough to look out for their own interest. In Manhattan, for example, a borough advisory board is examining the possibility of combining residential and commercial collection and handling it all through the borough’s three municipal mariner transfer stations. But the few commercial waste transfer stations in Manhattan, so much of the 8,000 daily tons of commercial waste currently gets trucked to transfer stations in Brooklyn. Clearly, if Manhattan succeeded in channeling all its garbage through the marine transfer stations, Brooklyn wouldn’t benefit. But Brooklynites are so busy holding the line in their own communities that they have little time to follow what’s happening outside their borough.

Political leaders in the Bronx and Queens have been somewhat less active on the issue. In the Bronx, the problems of the city’s waste system have had to compete for attention in a packed field of economic and environmental inequities. In Queens, transfer stations generally cause less public concern. They tend to be smaller and more sensibly sited in areas that are truly industrial. The borough also produces less palatable commercial waste, and only five of its twenty-two transfer stations handle this type of garbage.

Staten Islanders are still nervously waiting for the landfill to actually close and many say they’ll only believe it when they see it. Barbara Warren has been a vocal advocate on the waste transfer station problems of the other boroughs. But her concern is rare among Staten Islanders, who more commonly exhibit little sympathy for places like Greenpoint-Williamsburg and are still bitter over the failure of other boroughs to make closing Fresh Kills a priority in the past.
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Even within boroughs like Brooklyn, where the Borough President has been a leader in the fight against inequitable concentration of waste transfer stations, the issue isn’t really on the radar screen of more affluent and politically connected neighborhoods. People in, say, Park Slope or Borough Park don’t see or smell waste transfer stations every day, so they are not out marching in the streets against them. Differences in the character and politics of the neighborhoods, as well as the differing priorities of neighborhood and environmental advocates in each borough, lead to a fragmented approach and hinder the emergence of any wide-scale coordination or organization. The mayor and the central department are able to turn a deaf ear to neighborhood protests and free to ignore the complaints and suggestions of environmental watchdogs. Finally, most individuals and groups that have a broader planning focus, such as the Regional Planning Association, don’t appear to be interested in the problems of managing New York City’s waste.

Imperial Government versus Regional Planning

The example of waste management in New York City shows that even when there is a single jurisdiction, economic planning and social equity are no guarantee. In fact, the recent history of DOS demonstrates that centralizing authority for a large region of heterogeneous communities services to devolve decision-making and accountability from local inputs and needs. The result is poor planning and incompetent service delivery that cannot be judged equitable or efficient by any measure. Would it be any different if there were a single jurisdiction covering the entire New York metropolitan region, with its 19 million people and not just New York City’s 8 million? I doubt it, since at the grassroots, where the rubber meets the road in city politics, the diversity of opinions, needs and priorities is certain to make it more complicated.

The consolidation of New York City has not provided an easy solution to the problems of fragmentation. On the contrary, because of government’s short-comings, New Yorkers see it natural to continually evolve an astounding number of intervening and overlapping layers of official and unofficial government: block associations, political clubs, interest groups, Business Improvement Districts, trade associations, community districts, city council districts, advisory boards, and school boards. Despite continuing attempts to consolidate authority, different levels of power have persisted along with a fragmented political structure for decision-making.

It would be churlish to simply characterize this fragmentation as political infighting. Different neighborhoods with different populations, local economies, and patterns of land use naturally have different sets of interests and priorities. We must recognize their differences as legitimate.

The ideas of centralizing and coordination appeal to the desire for rational efficiency, but maybe fragmentation is the more natural process. Of course, it is sensible to avoid the chaotic direction of decentralization, since it can lead to great inequities, but neither should we accept metropolitan governance or regional solutions uncritically. A middle way between the two must be found: one that places some real control and decision-making authority at the local level, but that also ensures a balance throughout the region. Each locality must contribute its fair share and bear its fair share of the region’s burdens. Sounds a lot like democracy, doesn’t it?

John McCarthy is Editor of Planners Network and a graduate student in city and regional planning at Pratt Institute.

Thursdays, 7:00 pm: Housing Network, WRAL, 99-5 FM, New York. Weekly radio program sponsored by the Metropolitan Council on Housing and hosted by Scott Sassman.

Essential Skills for Public Officials. The Michigan Municipal League, 301 W. Michigan St. The highly interactive workshop will provide practical ideas for working effectively with both local officials and community residents. This is your opportunity to not only learn more about being a skilled elected leader, but also to network with others who serve as you do. FEE: $95-$170. For information, contact: MML at (313) 609-0615. FAX: (313) 662-9399.

Building Communities. Management and Community Development Institute (MCDC), Tufts University, Medford, MA. Thirty-one to one day interactive courses that teach skills and examine issues related to creating, developing, and maintaining the capacity of individuals, organizations, and communities to become neighborhood partners. Contact: Steve Speagel, (617) 627-5666. FAX: (508) 822-2119.

Coordinating Transportation and Land Use, Three Day Interstate Center on Coordinating Transportation and Land Use.

April 17, 6:00 pm: Planners Network Forum. Urban Places, Urban Places: The Twenty-First Century in Review. Judith Barring, moderator,Valeria Garcia, Nicos Kadamou and Ivan Hembatch, NYC Dept of Environmental Protection, panellists. Nicholas Friedman, Hunter College Center for AIDS, Drugs, and Community Health and Mitchell Silver, President, AIA New York Metro Chapter responding for the preferences. Follow-up conference to be held on Sept 18 & 19 (see below).


April 20: Albury Earth Day Lobby Day. Contact: Environmental Advocates, (518) 462-5526.

April 20-22: Social Capital — An International Conference Bridging Disciplines, Policies, and Communities. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI. This conference is designed to bring together academics and practitioners from different disciplines and diverse practices who share an interest in social capital and its consequences. The goal of the conference is to examine the social capital, its measure, its importance, and its implications for practice. Contact: Steve Speagel, (617) 627-5666. FAX: (508) 822-2119.

Coordinating Transportation and Land Use, Three Day Interstate Center on Coordinating Transportation and Land Use.

May 5: Creating the Capacity for Growth, Regional Plan Association, 8th Regional Assembly. Contact: (212) 785-4000.

May 31: June 1-12th International Conference on Business and Natural Resources Scholarship Seminar. 9W001. David Basini, University of London, 1 World Trade Center 41fl., New York, NY. Contact: Info: (212) 650-8901.


July 9-12: Moving the Economy Conference. Toronto, Canada. Anational forum to discuss the economic advantages of sustainable transportation. Contact: Moving the Economy, 30 Urban Development Services, 12th Fl., East Tower Hall, 100 Queen St, Toronto, Ontario, M5H 2A2 CANADA. TEL: (416) 590-6894. FAX: (416) 590-3271. E-Mail: cm@torontonet.cio.

July 15-18: 8th International Planning History Conference and 4th Planning History Conference/Urban Planning History Conference Planning History Conference: The University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. The deadline to submit papers has been extended to February 1998. More detailed information on travel arrangements, accommodation, and sponsors is on the conference internet homepage at: <http://www.bu.ac.unsw.edu.au/events/1999/plan-sing/> or conferencing and abstracts at Dr. Robert Frostman, Faculty of the Built Environment, University of New South Wales, Sydney NSW 2052, Australia. FAX: +61-2-9383-4930. FAX: +61-2-9383-4264 E-Mail: cph@plu.unsw.edu.au.

September 18 & 19: Moving the Urban Health Challenge. A Joint Public Health and Urban Planning Conference. New York City. Through the disciplines of public health and urban planning emerged with the common goal of preventing urban outbursts of infectious disease, little overlap between the fields exists today. The health, environmental and development problems facing urban residents cannot adequately be addressed without approaches that integrate public health with the environmental and regulatory intervention strategies. The conference will explore academic, professional, government and community interest in projects that bridge the disciplines. Contact: Hunter CEHI Conference Abstracts, 4230 Broadway, New York, NY 10010. Contact: (212) 869-1000. E-Mail: cehi@colors.com.
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PN CHAPTERS
Champaign-Urbana, Illinois
Gloria Opavkin, Beaverton, (503) 244-5834;
<a href="mailto:gloria@pnochicago.org">gloria@pnochicago.org</a>

Looking to fill an open position with someone you can count on? PN is your right to the right person. Send your announcement to the national office or email to Resources Editor James Miraglia: <anarch@pnochicago.org>. Please limit listings to one paragraph. Otherwise, we will be forced to shorten them as necessary.

PN ON THE INTERNET
We have a new web address! The PN web site contains use cases, working papers, and more. Surf to <a href="http://www.pnnetwork.org">http://www.pnnetwork.org</a>.

FUNDING
International Lasso Russo Prize for Economic and Political Alternatives, The International Lasso Russo Prize consists of two $10,000 awards to be given to the 2 prize winners. Works to be considered should be submitted by July 1, 2003. The International Prize - Secretariat Raphael Fire, via Prof. Elena Aburev, Pots Universitat Berlin, Dept of Political Science, Erststr. 21, D-14195 Berlin, Germany. PRIER: 49-20-838-4064, FAX: 49-20-838-4060. EMAIL: <prenise@pots.uni-berlin.de>.

DO YOU HAVE A WEBSITE?
Let the Planners Network community know about it! Send a note or email with the URL to us and we'll print it in our PNR Updates. You can also use the pnnet listserve to spread the word.

HELP SUSTAIN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PLANNERS NETWORK!
During the past few years, we've worked hard to expand the content of the newsletter. Like what you've seen? Because there's no PN conference this year, we need your help - see page 50 for information about our Sustainer Campaign!

WASHINGTON
Research Services, The Holton Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union (HERUI) is currently recruiting campaign research staff for paid positions in Connecticut, Boston, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, Washington, D.C., Seattle, and other areas. Has openings elsewhere on the map. To apply, send cover letter and resume to Recruitment, HERUI Research Department, 12525 36th Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20007-3300. FAX: (202) 333-6409.

CONNECTICUT
Housing Executive Director sought to lead and implement activities of community-based development corporation. Need well-versed with housing development, finance, and community outreach experience. CDC is starting tax credit/bond rehab project, competitive salary and benefits. Returns to 1610 Norman Street, Bridgeport, CT 06604.

Transportation Planners, South Central Regional Council of Governments. Seeking 2 planners: (Intermediate Level) Salary — $46,000 to $51,000; (Entry Level) $31,000 to $42,000. Opportunity at a regional planning organization. Requires familiarity with basic transportation planning process and concepts. Herbert Brun, South Central Regional Council of Governments, 127 Washington Street, New Britain, CT 06051. (203) 236-7555, FAX: (203) 236-9800. EMAIL: <sceorge@connectic.net>.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Grassroots Associate. The only national nonprofit organization dedicated to preserving and enhancing the historic character of America’s communities and countryside, seeks a individual to play a key role in the organization’s efforts to help states and communities to preserve and enhance their distinctive sense of place. This includes writing, letter, recent salary, and three recent writing samples to VP/Political Communications, American Samoa, 21 Dupont Circle NW, Washington DC 20036.

GEORGIA
Senior Planners, Atlanta Regional Commission. Atlanta, Senior Planner, Connects Communities Program; Division Director, Manage Transportation Planning Division. Send resume with cover letter referring position and salary history to: Human Resources Division, Atlanta Regional Commission, Blvd 200, Ste 300, 3715 Northside Parkway, Atlanta, GA 30327-2809. FAX: (404) 304-2599. EMAIL: <humanrec@arc.uga.edu>.

ILLINOIS
Canvas Director, The REACH Project is a city-wide coalition campaign to redefine the security system, organize for reasons rights, promote sustainable rental of security deposits and involve landlord/tenant disputes through mediation rather than litigation. Send resume letter to: Fran Tobin, REACH Project, 1540 W Monroe, Chicago, IL 60607. (773) 975-7122. EMAIL: <shades@pnechicago.org>.

KANSAS
Transportation Planner, City of Topeka, Topeka KS. Competitive salary and benefits. Please submit letter of application, transcript, and professional references to Mckee Smith, City of Topeka, 215 SE 7th St, Rm 170, Topeka, KS 66605-914, (785) 358-3687. FAX: (785) 358-3607. EMAIL: <mckee.smith@topeka.org>.

Planner I, The City of Topeka and Shawnee County located in the Heart of NE Kansas, is seeking qualified applicants for a Planner with the Metropolitan Planning Department. Please submit application, transcript, and professional references to Mckee Smith, City of Topeka, 215 SE 7th St, Rm 170, Topeka, KS 66605-914, (785) 358-3687. FAX: (785) 358-9805. EMAIL: <pennouie@lpti.net>.

MISSOURI
Planner, City of Liberty, MO. Starting Salary Range: $22,000 - $33,19 per month, depending on qualifications and experience. Excellent fringe benefits. The City of Liberty, a progressive community of 25,000, is seeking an urban planning professional for current and future range planning duties in the Community Development Department. Send resume and professional writing samples to Personnel Coordinator, City Hall, PO Box 159, Liberty, MO 64069.

NEVADA
Land Use Planner, Nye County Planning Dept., Pahrump, NV. Beginning at $16,500, NV. A two year contract. Applications and resumes to: Jo Nwila Williams, Director, Nye County Planning Dept., PO Box 155, Tonopah, NV 89049. Applications can be obtained from: Debbie Jeffers, Nye County Administration, Box 155, Tonopah, NV 89049 (702) 482-8126.

NEW YORK
One Your Visiting Professor, University at Albany, State University of New York. Department of Geography and Planning. The position is available for the Spring 1998, PDS Geography, Planning or related fields required. Send views and name(s) of three references to: Christopher J. Smith, Chair, Dept of Geography and Planning, ES 244A, University at Albany, 1440 Washington Ave, Albany, NY 12222-5102. Biphone: (518) 442-5429; EMAIL: <cmhit@albany.edu>.

Urban Planner, City of Yonkers, NY. Salary to $35,000. Attractive benefits package. The City of Yonkers, 6th largest city in the State, has an opening for an entry level planner position. Send resume, salary history to: Communications of Personnel, City of Yonkers City Hall, Yonkers, NY 10701.

Urban Land Use, Girl Scouts of the USA, New York City. Hiring range: High 60s. Provides on-site consultation and technical assistance to local Girl Scout councils in property development, long-range planning, systems management and overall property management. Attracts and delivers on-line reference workshops. Send cover letter and resume to: Janet Stach, Staffing, Girl Scouts of the USA, PO Box 1966-34A, New York, NY 10106-6012.

Junior Level Planner. New York City office of multi-disciplinary engineering/planning/design firm seeks junior level planner for immediate position. Requires 2-3 years experience with land development, site planning and some administrative experience. Rosemary Office, Administrative Assistant, 96 West Street, Ste 170, New York, NY 10013.

OREGON
Grants Administrative Supervisor, Siuslaw County, Drain, OR. Salary: $42,695 - $67,120 per month plus benefits. The Department of Planning and Development and SouthStraits has an opening for a Grants Administrative Supervisor. Contact: Grants Administration Supervisor, Human Resources, MST 503, 3000 Rockefeller Ave, Drain, OR, 97439-2046.

VERMONT
Research Assistant, A full-time position is available as of August 1, 1998 with Yellow Wood Associates, Inc., 15 South Main Street, Stowe, Vermont. Responsibilities include helping to develop and maintain a comprehensive database of communities and organizations doing work in the area of community planning. Qualified candidates will have a Master’s degree in rural, agricultural, or community development; applied economics; business administration and marketing, natural resources, environmental studies, or equivalent. Min. 1 or 2 years experience in a non-academic research setting. Strong interest in rural issues and community planning. Competitive salary and benefits. Potential exists for long-term career growth and development. To receive a detailed job description contact Fremont Young by phone at (802) 524-6241 or email at <fremont@youthlink.org>.
PUBLICATIONS

The Encyclopedia of Housing, covering more than 500 topics, from Attachment to Zoning, will be a valuable resource. Completed after nearly 7 years of work, the new Encyclopedia of Housing includes con- tributions from nearly 290 housing experts (many of whom are planner-networks). Nearly 400 researchers, editors, and contributors have provided information, and the encyclopedia will be available for purchase in early 1998.

New Jersey State Planning Board

National Council for Urban Economics

Urban Economics: Planning and Development Information Service, 425 Mass. Ave., Cambridge, MA 02139. (617) 495-1500. Fax: (617) 495-1541. E-mail: info@ucns.org

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS

New York Metro Area

Contact: Tina Chiu, (212) 854-9524, <tcj@island.com> or Kevin Huang, (718) 783-0499, <Khuang@ireac.com>

Oklahoma State

Contact: Jon Williams, (405) 947-4361, <jonw@ok.gov>

Pennsylvania

Contact: Sally Yoder, (717) 787-0689, <sallyy@pennlive.com>

PUNCHED OUT

FUNDING

International Lello Russo Prize for Economic and Political Alternatives, The International Lello Russo Prize consists of two $1,000 awards to be given to the 2 prime winners. Work to be considered should be submitted by July 1, 1998. The International Prize - Secretariat Raffaello Pirelli, via Prof. Emanuele Alonzo, Piazza Universita Berlin, Department of Social Sciences, Bldg. 21, D-14195 Berlin, Germany. PIRELL 49-30-430 0946, PIRELL 49-30-430 0600. E-mail: <pierpua@pierpua.de>

PN ON THE INTERNET

We have a new web address! The new web site contains test cases, working papers, and more. Visit us: http://www.plannersnetwork.org

DO YOU HAVE A WEBSITE?

Let the Planners Network community know about it! Send a note or email with the URL to us and we'll print it in our PNR Updates. You can also use the pn-net listserver to spread the word.

HELP SUSTAIN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PLANNERS NETWORK!

During the past few years, we've worked hard to expand the content of the newsletter. Like what you've seen? Because there's no PN conference this year, we need your help—see page 50 for information about our Sustainer Campaign.

JOBS

Looking to fill an open position with someone you can trust? PN is your link to the right person. Send your announcement to the national office or email it to Resources Editor James Miragha: <anarchic@pnsnet.org>

Please limit listings to two paragraphs. Otherwise, we will be forced to shorten them as necessary.

NATIONWIDE

Researchers, The Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union (HERE) is currently recruiting campaign research staff for use in Connecticut, Boston, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, Washington, D.C., Phoenix, San Diego, and San Antonio, and has openings elsewhere on the East. To apply, send cover letter and resume to Recruitment, HERE Research Department, 1250 35th St. NW, Washington, DC 20007-3395. E-mail: (202) 335-6549.

CONNECTICUT

Transportation Executive Director sought to lead and implement activities of community-based development corporation. Need self-starter with housing development, finance, and community outreach experience. Salary range: $40,000 to $60,000. Contact the State of Connecticut, 20 Gold St., 6th Floor, Hartford, CT 06103. E-mail: <pierce@ct.gov>

Planner I, The City of Waterbury and Shawnee County located in the heart of NE Kansas. Is seeking qualified applicants for a Planner with the Metropolitan Planning Department. Please refer to help wanted, application, interview, and professional references to McNeil Smith, City of Waterbury, 1219 NW 36th St., Shawnee, Kansas 66205; 913-567-3867. FAX: (913) 567-9907. E-mail: <planner@city-of-waterbury.kan.us>

Missouri

Planner, City of Liberty. Starting Salary Range: $32,000-$35,199, depending on qualifications. Excellent fringe benefits. The City of Liberty, a progressive community of 25,000, is seeking an urban planning professional for current and long-range planning duties in the Community Development Department. Send resume and professional writing sample to Personnel Coordinator, City Hall, PO Box 139, Liberty, MO 64069.

NEVADA

Land Use Planner, Nye County Planning Dept., Rhynehurst, NV. An exciting position awaits a highly motivated, enthusiastic planner to work under the Director of Planning. Applications and resumes to: Ron Williams, Director, Nye County Planning Dept., PO Box 155, Tonopah, NV 89049. Applications can be obtained from: Debbie Jeffers, Nye County Administration, PO Box 155, Tonopah, NV 89049, (702) 852-8126.

GEORGIA

Senior Planners, Atlanta Regional Commission Atlanta, Senior Planner,CONNECT Economies Program, Division Manager, Metropolitan Transportation Planning Division. Send resume with cover letter referring to position and salary history to: Human Resources Division, Atlanta, GA 30327-2989. Fax: 404-350-2599. E-mail: <pbaker@arcga.com>

ILLINOIS

Canvas Director, The REACH Project is a city-wide coalition for radar to secure the defense system. Organizes for reasons rights, prioritizes sustain- able revenue of security defense funds and military land-use disparities through mediation rather than litigation. Send resume, letter to: Frank Toben, REACH Director, 155 W Monroe, Chicago, IL 60603. (773) 797-7330. E-mail: <shades@plannersnet.org>

KANSAS

Transportation Planner, City of Topeka, Topeka KS. Competitive salary and benefits. Please submit letter of application, resume, and professional references to McNeil Smith, City of Topeka, 215 SE 7th St, Rm 170, Topeka, KS 66603-5914; (785) 350-3697. FAX: (785) 350-3678. E-mail: <planner@city-of-topeka.ks.us>

Alfredo Oliver, Office Administrator, 90 West Street, Suite 1700, New York, NY 10013.

OREGON

Greats Administrative Supervisors, Saddleworth County, Dove, OR, Salary: $65.00 - $72.50 per month plus benefits. The Department of Planning and Development North is investing in an opening for a Grants Administrative Supervisor. Contact: Grants Administration Supervisor, Human Resources, PO Box 500, 3000 Rockefeller Ave, Everett, WA 98204-8006.

VERMONT

Research Assistant. A full-time position is available as of August 1, 1998 with Yellow Wood Associates, 160 South Main Street, Montpelier, VT 05638. Qualified candidates will have a Master's degree in rural, agricultural, or community development, applied economics, business administration and marketing, natural resources, environmental studies, or equivalent. Min 1 year experience in a non-academic research setting. Strong interest in rural issues, land use planning, sustainable development, and capacity building. Potential exists for long-term career growth and development. To receive a detailed job description and contact Frances Young by phone at (802) 254-5241 or email at <fyoung@yellowwood.com>.
Planners Network 
Member Roster

HOW TO USE THIS ROSTER

All the information printed in this roster comes from the Planners Network membership database.
The roster is arranged alphabetically by name, for our current 700 members. Each entry lists a member's information in the following order:

- Name
- Organization Street Address
- City, State, and postal code
- Country (if not United States)
- Telephone
- FAX
- EMAIL
- WEB page URL

An index by country, province, and state begins on page 47.

We hope you find the roster easy to use, but if you have suggestions for improving it in the next time, please let Dalila know!

ORGANIZATIONS

City of Akron
Dept of Planning Library
168 S High Street Room 405
Akron, OH 44308

Aldergrove Community Development Center, Inc.
715 North 80th Street
East St. Louis, IL 62203
(618) 397-8914

American Planning Assn
Meridian Center Library
122 S Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60603-6107

Ansn for Neighborhood & Housing Development
305 7th Avenue Suite 2001
New York, NY 10011

Carolina Planning
Dept of City & Regional Planning
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599

Center on Budget/Policy Priorities
777 N Capitol Street NE #705
Washington, DC 20002

City Limits
120 Wall Street 20th Fl
New York, NY 10005-4001

Columbia University
Avery Library
New York, NY 10027

Cornell University Library
110 Old Library
Ithaca, NY 14853-5301

Economic & Planning Systems
1815 Fourth Street Suite B
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 841-9190

Grassroots Policy Project
2040 5 Street NW Suite 203
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 387-2933

Habitat International Coalition News
Codornices No. 24
Col. San José Insurgentes
Mexico City, 03990 D.F.
Mexico
(525) 651-68-07
FAX: (525) 593-51-94
<hia@laneta.apc.org>

University of Illinois-Chicago
College of Urban Public Affairs
1100 W Harrison Street
Chicago, IL 60607
<chsoc@uic.edu>

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-8890

University of California
C48395 Davis Library
Serials Dept
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-8890

Planners in Latin America
University of New Mexico
School of Architecture & Planning
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Shelterforce
439 Main Street
Orange, NJ 07050

TRANET
Box 567
Raleigh, NC 27619

URBAN Newsletter
120 Wall Street 20th Fl
New York, NY 10005-4001
(212) 479-3300

The Neighborhood Works
2125 W North Avenue
Chicago, IL 60647

News from Approacho
80574 Hazelton Road
Cottage Grove, OR 97244
(203) 942-8198

The Workbook
Box 452
Albuquerque, NM 87106

INDIVIDUALS — A

Tom Angotti
Pratt Institute GCPE
379 DeKalb Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11205
(718) 732-4532
<Tangotti@pratt.edu>

Sy Adler
Portland State University
Dept of Urban Studies & Planning
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207
(503) 725-5172
FAX: (503) 725-5199
<sy@o.pdx.edu>

Eva Neubauer Alligood
Director
Support for Housing
342 Madison Avenue Suite 305
New York, NY 10173
(212) 986-2952 x293
FAX: (212) 986-2552
<eva.alligood@ch.org>

Olso Aminu
Ball State University
College of Arts & Planning
Dept of Urban Planning
Muncie, IN 47306
(765) 285-2425
<masmin@bsu.edu>

Mary Cassidy Anger
8185 Windward Key Dr.
Chesapeake Beach, MD 20732-3123
<mcassidy@mson.com>

I am currently finishing my MSP from FSU, with a concentration in international development. My Master's research is entitled: "The Relationship between Municipal Governs-ments and Nongovernmental Organizations in Urban Services Delivery in Developing Countries." (PS, I even quote Tom Angotti!!)

James Angotti
Pratt Institute GCPE
379 DeKalb Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11205
(718) 399-4391
FAX: (718) 399-4532
<stangotti@pratt.edu>

I teach in the graduate planning program at Pratt Institute and work in community-based planning. I am involved in environmental justice and transportation alternative efforts. Interests include Latin America and global urbanization.

John Anner
Editor & Publisher
Third Force
1218 E 21st Street
Oakland, CA 94606
(510) 533-7583

Maurizio Antoninetti
404 Madison Street
San Diego, CA 92109-7034
(619) 488-5468
<antoninedix@rohan.ida.edu>

Luís Aponte-Parés
4 Ashburtton Pl, FFLR-1
Cambridge, MA 02139-2610
(617) 287-7286
FAX: (617) 287-7099
<aponte_pares@umbc.unc.edu>

Mary Cassidy Anger
8185 Windward Key Dr.
Chesapeake Beach, MD 20732-3123
<mcassidy@mson.com>

I am currently finishing my MSP from FSU, with a concentration in international development. My Master’s research is entitled: “The Relationship between Municipal Governs-ments and Nongovernmental Organizations in Urban Services Delivery in Developing Countries.” (PS, I even quote Tom Angotti!!)

Jonathan Arnold
32 Forest Lane
Scarsdale, NY 10583
(212) 377-2799
<jarnold@cyberban.com>

Michal Aronson
51 Stone Avenue
Ottawa, ON 19562
(613) 941-3444

Dayna Ashley-Oehm
12141 F St Avenue
Wheat Ridge, CO 80021
(303) 238-8713

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599

Thomas Bartnik
2334 N Oakley
Chicago, IL 60647
(312) 862-0123
FAX: (312) 862-0173

Stephen Barton
Planning & Development Dept
2118 Malta Avenue Suite 200
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 705-8310
FAX: (510) 883-8658
<stephen@berkeley.ca.gov>

Ramu Basu
100 Mornelle Court, Unit 1046
Scarborough, Ontario
M1E 4X2 Canada
<ramu.basu@utoronto.ca>

Howell Baum
Institute for Urban Studies
University of Maryland
1117 Lefke Hall
College Park, MD 20742-8225
(301) 405-6792
FAX: (301) 314-9897
<sbasm@ummail.umd.edu>

Eddie Bautista
New York Lawyers for the Public Interest
30 W 21st Street 9th Fl
New York, NY 10010

Rannya Bivakatte
908 S Locust, #301
Champaign, IL 61820
(217) 382-5596
<bivakatte@students.uiuc.edu>

Duaner Bay
810 Green Street
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
(415) 373-7405
FAX: (415) 481-0763
<bray@parcplace.com>

Natalie Baysont
Baysont & Associates
436 14th Street Suite 209
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 628-0620
FAX: (510) 628-0623
<nroeb@pacbell.net>

Philip Ashton
307 N State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Achternberg - Bayton
## ORGANIZATIONS

### City of Akron
- Dept of Planning Library
  166 S High Street Room 405
  Akron, OH 44308

### Alerdige Community Development Center, Inc.
- 715 North 88th Street
  East St. Louis, IL 62203
  (618) 397-8914

### American Planning Asn
- Meridian Community Library
  122 So. Michigan Avenue
  Chicago, IL 60603-6107

### Asn for Neighborhood & Housing Development
- 305 7th Avenue Suite 2001
  New York, NY 10011

### Carolina Planning
- Dept of City & Regional Planning
  University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, NC 27599

### Center on Budget/Policy Priorities
- 777 N Capitol Street, NE #705
  Washington, DC 20002

### Aldridge Community Development Center, Inc.
- 715 North 88th Street
  East St. Louis, IL 62203
  (618) 397-8914

### Columbia University
- Avery Library
  New York, NY 10027

### Cornell University Library
- 110 Old Library
  Ithaca, NY 14853-5301

### Economic & Planning Systems
- 1815 Fourth Street Suite B
  Berkeley, CA 94704
  (510) 841-9190

### Grassroots Policy Project
- 2040 S Street NW Suite 203
  Washington, DC 20009
  (202) 387-2933

### Habitat International Coalition News
- Cordobanes No. 24
  Cal. Sol. Inurgentes
  Mexico City, DF 03020
  (52) 615-68-07
  (52) 259-53-94
  <chic@lanet.org>

### University of Illinois-Chicago
- College of Urban Planning & Public Affairs
  1007 W Harrison Street
  Chicago, IL 60607
  <chic@uic.edu>

### Municipal Art Society
- The Information Exchange
  45 Madison Avenue
  New York, NY 10022

### Tranet
- Box 567
  Rangeley, ME 04970

### URBAN Newsletter
- 120 Wall Street 26th Fl
  New York, NY 10005-8801
  (212) 479-3300

### The Neighborhood Works
- 2125 W North Avenue
  Chicago, IL 60647

### News from Approach
- 80574 Hazelton Road
  Cottage Grove, OR 97424
  (503) 942-8198

### University of North Carolina
- Chapel Hill, NC 27593-8890

### Planners in Latin America
- University of New Mexico
  School of Architecture & Planning
  Albuquerque, NM 87107

### Shelterforce
- 439 Main Street
  Orange, NJ 07050

### Tranet
- Box 567
  Rangeley, ME 04970

### Urban Buddy Newsletter
- 120 Wall Street 26th Fl
  New York, NY 10005-8801
  (212) 479-3300

### The Urban Ecologist
- 404 14th Street Suite 900
  Oakland, CA 94612

### The Workbook
- Box 6543
  Albuquerque, NM 87110

### University of California
- Berkeley, CA 94704
  (510) 520-1800

### Vic Community
- Society 105 F 22nd Street
  New York, NY 10010
  (212) 614-5492
  (212) 614-9441

### Roger Baker
- 1303 Bentwood Road
  Austin, TX 78722

### Robyn G. Rancroft
- 2306 Medow Street
  Roodfield, ID 83331
  (208) 987-5612
  (213) 956-4932

### Josephine Barnes
- Communities in Touch with Children
  148-11 155th Avenue
  Jamaica, NY 11436-2216
  (718) 712-4514

### Presently I'm a Board member of the
- Sephonic Boulevard Local Development Corporation,
  Where I'm responsible for community
  outreach for residents and small
  business programs. We are working
  on the revitalization of stores and
  a commercial strip. As a member
  of a group, our goal was
  2nd prize (June 1997 Buffalo,
  Neighborhood Reinvestment
  Corp) for a proposal providing
  programs for inner city youth.
  Also a member of the Better
  Community Civics.

### Heather Barrow
- 5329 Harper Avenue Apt 2
  Chicago, IL 60615

### Philip Ashton
- 307 N State Street
  Ann Arbor, MI 48104

### Tom Angotti
- Prat Institute GCE
  379 DeKalb Avenue
  Brooklyn, NY 11205
  (718) 399-4391
  (718) 999-4352
  <tangotti@pratt.edu>

### Su Adler
- Portland State University
  Dept of Urban Studies & Planning
  PO Box 751
  Portland, OR 97207
  (503) 725-5172
  (503) 725-5199
  <su@eca.pdx.edu>

### Eva Neuhauser Allgundorff
- Supportive Housing
  342 Madison Avenue Suite 305
  New York, NY 10713
  (212) 986-2982 x 262
  (212) 986-2652
  <eva@nyc.org>

### Maurizio Antonini
- 104 South Court
  San Diego, CA 92109-7034
  (619) 488-5458
  <antonier@rohan.ida.edu>

### Luis Aponte-Parés
- 4 Ashburnton Pl, FFLR-1
  Cambridge, MA 02139-2610
  (617) 287-2786
  FAX: (617) 287-7099
  <lparés@summit.com>

### Martha Armstrong
- 766 Elm Street Ext.
  Bham, AL 35240

### Jonathan Arnold
- 22 Forest Lane
  Scarsdale, NY 10583
  (212) 777-2090
  <jarold@cyberbank.com>

### Michal Aronson
- 2040 S Street NW Suite 203
  Washington, DC 20009
  (202) 387-2933

### News from Approach
- 80574 Hazelton Road
  Cottage Grove, OR 97424
  (503) 942-8198

### The Neighborhood Works
- 2125 W North Avenue
  Chicago, IL 60647

### The Urban Ecologist
- 404 14th Street Suite 900
  Oakland, CA 94612

### The Workbook
- Box 6543
  Albuquerque, NM 87106

**An index by country, province, and state begins on page 47.**

We hope you find the roster easy to use, but if you have suggestions for improving it in the next time, please let Dalila know!
Find a mistake in your roster entry? Send us the correction form on page 49 to bring us up to date!
Find a mistake in your roster entry? Send us the correction form on page 49 to bring us up to date!
Virginia Drake
American Friends Service Committee
St. Louis Area Office
438 W. Milton Street
St. Louis, MO 63130
(314) 862-5773
FAX: (314) 862-8159
<vfsc@ic.org>

Josie Duckett
50 W 10th Street
New York, NY 10025

Louise Dunlap
24-5 Clarence Street
Cambridge, MA 02139
(617) 547-6881

Donna Dyer
Orange Community Housing Corporation
Box 207
Carrboro, NC 27510-0307
(919) 967-1354
FAX: (919) 968-4030
<dyerdye@ol.com>

Cassandra Ecker
309 W Springfield Apt 1
Urbana, IL 61801
<cecker@students.uiuc.edu>

Daniel Egan
315 Walnut Street
Brookline, MA 02146-7654
(617) 734-1204

Ann Erenhalm
2385 Veal Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90026
(213) 650-8771
FAX: (213) 650-4745

Steve Ehret
466 Walnut Street
Sonoma, CA 95476

Amanda Eichelkraut
310 E 1925th Road
Ottawa, IL 61350-9719
(217) 367-0412

Jim Eliass
950 Hallefshah Lane
Belgrade, MT 59714-8730

Robin Elkin
R1 Box 385-K
Espanola, NM 87532-9706
(505) 887-4602
<reliass@umcm.edu>

John Elden
Senior Project Planner
City of Yakima
129 N 2nd Street
Yakima, WA 98901
<jedelen@cyakima.wa.us>

Louise Elving
36 Cottage Street
Cambridge, MA 02139

Tansel Erbil
111 Heights Court
Inchac, NY 14850-2500
(607) 253-5423
<te@cornell.edu>

Shawn Escology
440 Massachusetts Ave Apt #1
Cambridge, MA 02139
(617) 354-6726
<shred@sutit.edu>

Luis Facundo
377 Atlantic Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11217

Sharon Fafter
333 Montford Avenue
Asheville, NC 28801-1069
(704) 253-0982
<SharonAF@spring.com>

Steve Fafter
159 Eastern Parkway Apt 5B
Brooklyn, NY 11236-6023
(212) 349-4172
FAX: (212) 346-0004
<SteveFafter@ic.org>

Susan Feldman
Dept of Urban Planning
Rutgers University
33 Livingston Avenue
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
(908) 932-4003
FAX: (908) 932-2253

Allison Feigman
18th Street NE, #102
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 393-5225
FAX: (202) 393-3044

Joseph G. Feinberg
11 Lumar Road
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648-3127
(609) 882-9290

Consultant: Planning, housing, community development, government affairs. Current activities: Coordination of mass transit & land use; training of local planning board members regarding regional implications of local planning issues.

Valerie Feinberg
4237 Great Oaks Ln.
Jacksonville, FL 32207

Eugene Feingold
352 Hillside Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48105
(313) 662-8788
FAX: (313) 662-2713
<feingold@umich.edu>

Billy Feingold
509 Russell Street
Madison, WI 53704

Jonathan Feldman
c/o Yele
2309 Bellview Avenue
Chevy, MD 20875

M. Russell Feldman
85 Langley Road
Newton, MA 02159
(617) 893-5828
FAX: (617) 893-5834

Marshall Feldman
Community Planning
94 West Alumni Avenue Suite 1
The University of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI 02881
(401) 792-2249
FAX: (401) 792-4199
<marshf@puriscr.net.edu>

Alan Felzer
Cal Polystyrene
1788 Alamo Court
Claremont, CA 91711
(909) 869-2657
<afelzer@cupomark.com>

Beryl Fernandes, PhD
9527 49th Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98115
(206) 256-2882
FAX: (206) 257-4820
<berylf@msn.com>

Catherine Ferreira
14A Berry Street
Framingham, MA 01701
(508) 872-2463

Gary Fields
412 Gilbert Street
Oakland, CA 94611
(510) 601-8452
FAX: (510) 643-6617
<gf@red.redlands.edu>

After 12 years in economic development planning, I have returned to UC Berkeley to pursue a Ph.D. specializing in regional development. Research interests include regional development, planning theory, and historical geography of industrialization.

David Finet
214 Brady Lane
Urbana, IL 61802

Robert Fisher
Geot School of Social Work
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77044-4992
(713) 743-8112
FAX: (713) 743-8149
<fisher@uh.edu>

Marcia Fitten
EPA Can Do
2369 University Alone
East Palo Alto, CA 94303

Bradley Flamm
2165 Old oak Street
Cleveland Heights, OH 44118
(216) 371-4550
<slidegroup@emf.com>

Alma Flores
42 Francis Avenue #4
Cambridge, MA 02138

Judy Flynn
566 44th Street
Brooklyn, NY 11220
(212) 442-4310
FAX: (212) 442-6667

John Forster
Dept of City & Rual Plan.
Cornell University
106 West Silky Avenue
Ithaca, NY 14853
<jlf@netbull.com>

Timothy Forkey
Office of the Borough President
Borough of Manhattan Municipal Building, 19th Fl
New York, NY 10007
(212) 699-8136
FAX: (212) 699-4900

Ann Forsyth
LARP
University of Massachusetts
109 Hills North
Amherst, MA 01003-0010
(413) 545-6634
FAX: (413) 545-1772
<annfors@larp.umass.edu>

I teach planning at the University of Massachusetts where I also co-direct the Urban Places Project that does physical planning and urban design week with low income communities/neighborhoods.

Kate Foster
253 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115
(617) 353-0413
FAX: (617) 829-3256
<kafoster@avm.cc.bu.edu>

I've been working to establish an early warning network for labor, community and business to identify at risk firms in New York City. Also assist in unions in the U.S. and other nations to reach/create jobs.

Jean A. Garren
PO Box 88025
Steamboat Springs, CO 80488
(970) 638-6468

Barbara Garrity
1335 Bryn Mawr Drive NE
Albuquerque, NM 87106-1101
(505) 881-3111
FAX: (505) 883-8050

Robert Gehret
58 Mountvale Street
Roudndale, MA 01231-3752
<bobgehret@msn.com>

Keith Getter
58 S Portland Avenue #1
Brooklyn, NY 11217
(718) 875-4858
FAX: (718) 269-5877
<kgetter@colt.oo.com>

NWWEB:
http://www.esential.org/web

Vickie Greer
1120 W 8th Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15216
(412) 276-8416
<vgreer@netcheck.com>

Christine Grehn
City of Colorado Springs
1151 Tejon Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
(719) 634-5443
FAX: (719) 634-6898
<christine.grehn@cityofcoloradosprings.com>

Cynthia Ghora-Gobin
2 Rue des Petres St. Severin
75003 Paris
France

Lois Gibbs
Center for Health, Environment, & Justice
Everyones Backyard
PO Box 6806
Falls Church, VA 22040-6806
(703) 237-2249
FAX: (703) 237-8389
<001CWHF@essential.org>

Barbara Glaubke
147 W 19th Street
New York, NY 10011

Mary S. Gittleman
419 W 19th Street
New York, NY 10027

Richard Glance
Glance & Associates
94 Pilgrim Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15106-1022
(412) 276-1246
FAX: (412) 276-8410

Christopher Glit
The Lanturn Group, Inc.
311 2nd Street Suite 300
St. Charles, IL 60174
(631) 377-9715

Norman J. Glickman
Center for Urban Policy Research
83 Livingston Avenue
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Aimee Glidden
Aimee Glidden
Glidden County Public Services
420 Elkhart Road
Gothen, IN 46526
Find a mistake in your roster entry? Send us the correction form on page 39 for 49 cents to bring up to date!
Lauria Luisa  
Department of Geology  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903-5808  
(201) 985-8444

Li-Wei Liu  
415 Warren Road  
Hickory, NC 28601  
(607) 266-9299  
<lsliu@cornell.edu>

Interests include architecture, urban design, and regional planning. Current research involves population growth and economic  
spatial distribution of small and medium enter-prise.

Donald Loggins  
72-10 108th Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11230  
(212) 849-3642  
<FAX: (212) 849-3830  
<dloganG@nyc.com>

Community gardening, urban open green space planning, urban flora and fauna inventories.

John Lohrsten  
7425 S Oak Grove Road  
Harvard, IL 60033  
(312) 996-5766  
<Jlohrsten@uiuc.edu>

I just returned from 15 months in Guinea-Bissau, West Africa, where I worked with street market  
vendors. Now I am working as Economic Development Planner at the University of Illinois at Chicago Center for  
Urban Economic Development on a wide range of projects.

Johanna W. Looye  
School of Planning  
University of Cincinnati  
548 One Edwards Center  
Cincinnati, OH 45221  
(513) 556-0216  
<FAX: (513) 556-1224  
<jlooye@uc.edu>

Barbara Lipski  
140 Nassau Street  
New York, NY 10038

Kevin Lorme  
30-35 3rd St Apt 3F  
Astoria, NY 11102  
(718) 278-2247

Marina Loumbary  
Call Pol Fomona  
Yorba Linda, CA 92887  
(714) 692-2893  
<mloumbary@csupomona.edu>

Jeffrey Low  
9 Deeran Street  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Levis Lukha  
1723 6th Street S  
Fargo, ND 58103  
(701) 232-2164  
<FAX: (701) 232-9315  
<jlukha@rennet.com>

I retired as a planning professor in 1991. Since then have been working on connecting com-munities that are military-dependent  
into ones that have an eco-nomic base that is environment-ally sustainable, socially accept-able and non-military. My main thrust is developing wind energy on the Great Plains, mainly  
North Dakota. I am working on  
applying a technology wind water pumping project near  
Kolaa, in the Casamance region of  
southern Senegal.

Marina Lurdigan  
163 Canterbury Drive  
Dorchester, Ontario  
N8L 1G3 Canada  
(905) 258-6708  
<FAX: (905) 258-8502

Jennifer Lutke  
267 Gibbs Avenue  
Newport, RI 02840  
(401) 846-9583  
<narchitects@edgenet.net>

Dave Lutz  
Neighborhood Open Space Coalition  
71 W 23rd Street Suite 506  
New York, NY 10010-4102  
(212) 512-7355  
<FAX: (212) 385-6095

Laura Lui  
1204 Chatham Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11209

Kevin Lorme  
30-35 3rd St Apt 3F  
Astoria, NY 11102  
(718) 278-2247

Henry Mabon  
University of the Witwatersrand  
Private Bag 3  
WITS 2050  
South Africa

Malcolm Mallach  
307 Grand Street  
Trenton, NJ 08611

Bob Maltz  
39 Sandrock Road  
London N8R 0H6  
PHONE: 0181-348-0653

Richard Mandel  
1285 Eleventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10029  
<brm@cuny.edu>

Melissa Mandos  
2 Ledge Lane  
Swamscott, PA 19081

Louise Manuel  
10590 S Central Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90059  
(213) 563-4701  
<FAX: (213) 563-7307
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About This Index

The index below groups members by their location in alphabetical order, so you may find the names of other PN members in your country, province, or state. The United States are listed at the right, continuing on the following two pages. All other countries are listed below, including Canada, which is broken down by province for more specific reference.

International

Argentina: Alejandro Roftman
Australia: John Friedmann
Canada: Anna Bubel, Lucia M. Marquez

British Columbia: Ken and Linda Milled


Quebec: Sam Boskey, Raphael Fischler, Pierre Hamel.

Chile: Carlos A. De Mattos

England: Mia Gray, Bob Mahtz

France: Cynthia Ghorra-Gobin

Germany: Margit Meyer

Indonesia: Intan Kencana Dewi

Israel: Rachel Kallus

Italy: Simona Boselli

Mexico: Habitat International Coalition

Netherlands: J. H. Crawford

Panama: Kurt Dillon

Romania: Ana Vasilache

South Africa: Alan Mohin

Turkey: Beril Ozalp

About This Index


Arkansas: Stella M. Capek, Ralph Nessens.
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United States


Arkansas: Stella M. Capek, Ralph Nessens.

About This Index

The index below groups members by their location in alphabetical order, so you may find the names of other PN members in your country, province, or state. The United States are listed at the right, continuing on the following two pages. All other countries are listed below, including Canada, which is broken down by province for more specific reference.

International

Argentina: Alejandro Reisman
Australia: John Friedmann
Canada: Barbara Abdul, Lucemia M. Marquez
British Columbia: Ken and Linda Mallard
Quebec: Sam Boskey, Raphael Fischer, Pierre Hamel.

Chile: Carlos A. De Mattos
England: Mia Gray, Bob Mailz
France: Cynthia Ghorrha-Gobin
Germany: Margit Mayer
Indonesia: Intan Kencana Dewi
Israel: Rachel Kallus
Italy: Simon Boselli
Mexico: Habitat International Coalition News
Netherlands: J. H. Crawford
Panama: Kurt Dillon
Romania: Ana Vaslache
South Africa: Alan Mohin
Turkey: Beri Ozalp

Arkansas: Stella M. Capick, Ralph Nesson.
PLANNERS NETWORK
SUSTAINER CAMPAIGN

Planners Network is growing and diversifying. The newsletter is becoming a strong voice for progressive planning. PN's conferences mix community participation with professional planning. More local groups are forming, and new publications are being developed. And this month's newsletter includes a complete roster of the geographically diverse PN membership.

But PN has only one source of income — member contributions. Our average contribution is about $25, which leaves us with an annual deficit of from three to five thousand dollars. This year, there's no PN conference to help make up the difference. And the roster costs an extra $1,000.

OUR GOAL IS 50 CONTRIBUTIONS OF AT LEAST $100 EACH.

If you're having a fairly good year, won't you help sustain PN? If it's time for your annual contribution, can you be a little more generous? Your contribution to PN is tax-deductible.

WHITHER PN?

Planners Network started 23 years ago with discussion and debate about the role of progressive planners. As the political climate changes, we need to constantly re-evaluate who we are and what we should do — individually and as an organization, within our professions and more broadly.

One of the big questions we have always faced is whether we should be more than a communications network. Should we go beyond the newsletter, conferences, local forums and the many informal activities that bring us together? Should we initiate direct action, lobbying, or other campaigns, and on what issues?

Over the years, PN's membership has become more diverse. We include people working in community development, housing, environmental justice, health and human services, transportation, urban and rural planning, etc. What critical issues should we focus on?

We invite you to send your thoughts and ideas. They can be short notes or longer articles, up to 1,500 words. Submissions on disk or by email are greatly appreciated. All electronic submissions should be sent as ASCII text. Send your submission to the editors at <pnn@pratt.edu> or the address given at left. All resource and job listings should be directed to James Miraglia's attention <james@prodigy.net>.

FOR MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS, Planners Network has been a voice for progressive professionals and activists concerned with urban planning and social justice. PN's 1,000 members receive this bimonthly magazine, network online with PN-NET, and take part in the annual conference. PN also gives progressive ideas a voice in the mainstream planning profession by organizing sessions at annual conferences of the American Planning Association and American Collegiate Schools of Planning.

The PN Conference has been held annually each spring since 1994. These gatherings bring together planners and workshops with exchanges involving local communities. PN conferences engage in discussions that help inform political strategies at the local, national, and international levels. Recent conferences have been held in Washington, D.C., East St. Louis, IL, Brooklyn, NY, and Pomona, CA.

Whether face-to-face, in print, or over the internet, FNers are part of a network that shares progressive ideas and experiences. Join Planners Network and make a difference while sharing your ideas and enthusiasm with others.

Annual financial contributions are voluntary, but we need funds for operating expenses. The Steering Committee recommends the following amounts as minimums for Network members:

$15 for those with incomes under $25,000, students and unemployed
$25 for those earning between $25,000 and $50,000
$45 for those earning over $50,000
$30 for organizations and libraries

The Planners Network is an association of professionals, activists, academics, and students involved in physical, social, economic, and environmental planning in urban and rural areas, who promote fundamental change in our political and economic systems.

We believe that planning should be a tool for allocating resources and developing the environment to eliminate the great inequalities of wealth and power in our society, rather than to maintain and justify the status quo. This includes opposition to racial, economic and environmental injustice, and discrimination by gender and sexual orientation. We believe that planning should be used to assure adequate food, clothing, shelter, medical care, jobs, safe working conditions, and a healthful environment. We advocate public responsibility for meeting these needs, the private market has proven incapable of doing so.
PLANNERS NETWORK

SUSTAINER CAMPAIGN

Planners Network is growing and diversifying. The newsletter is becoming a strong voice for progressive planning. PN's conferences mix community participation with professional planning. More local groups are forming, and new publications are being developed. And this month's newsletter includes a complete roster of the geographically diverse PN membership.

But only one source of income — member contributions. Our average contribution is about $25, which leaves us with an annual deficit of from three to five thousand dollars. This year, there's no PN conference to help make up the difference. And the roster costs an extra $1,000.

OUR GOAL IS 50 CONTRIBUTIONS OF AT LEAST $100 EACH.

If you're having a fairly good year, won't you help sustain PN? If it's time for your annual contribution, can you be a little more generous? Your contribution to PN is tax-deductible.

WHY NOT PN?

Planners Network started 23 years ago with discussion and debate about the role of progressive planners. As the political climate changes, we need to constantly re-evaluate who we are and what we do — individually and as an organization, within our professions and more broadly.

One of the big questions we have always faced is whether we should be more than a communications network. Should we go beyond the newsletter, conferences, local forums, and the informal activities that bring us together? Should we initiate direct action, lobbying, or other campaigns, and on what issues?

Over the years, PN's membership has become more diverse. We include people working in community development, housing, environmental justice, health and human services, transportation, urban and rural planning, etc. What critical issues should we focus on?

We invite you to send your ideas and thoughts. They can be short notes or longer articles, up to 1,500 words. Items will be considered for a special PN issue this fall. Submit your work via mail to the PN office or via e-mail (pn-net@pratt.edu). Other upcoming issues include:

Mag. Number 129 — Sustainability
Richard Milgrom, Guest Editor
July. Number 130 — Planning and Gender
Ann Forsyth, Guest Editor
September. Number 131 — Planning & Race
Marie Kennedy, Guest Editor

Please submit articles, notes, updates, and resources typed and double-spaced. Feature articles of 500 to 1,500 words are always welcome. Submissions on disk or by email are greatly appreciated. All electronic submissions should be sent as ASCII text. Send your submission to the editors at <pnet@pratt.edu> or the address given at left. All resource and job listings should be directed to James Minaglia’s attention <james@prodigy.net>.

FOR MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS, Planners Network has been a voice for progressive professionals and activists concerned with urban planning and social justice. PN's 1,000 members receive this bimonthly magazine, network online with PN-NET, and take part in the annual conference. PN also gives progressive ideas a voice in the mainstream planning profession by organizing sessions at annual conferences of the American Planning Association and American Collegiate Schools of Planning.

The PN Conference has been held annually each spring since 1994. These gatherings bring planners and workshops with exchanges involving local communities. PN conferences engage in discussions that help inform political strategies at the local, national, and international levels. Recent conferences have been held in Washington, D.C., East St. Louis, Ill., Brooklyn, NY, and Pomona, CA.

Whether face-to-face, in print, or over the Internet, PN-Net is part of a network that shares progressive ideas and experiences. Join Planners Network and make a difference while sharing your ideas and enthusiasm with others.

Annual financial contributions are voluntary, but we need funds for operating expenses. The Steering Committee recommends the following amounts as minimums for Network members:

$15 for those with incomes under $25,000
$25 for those earning between $25,000 and $50,000
$45 for those earning over $50,000
$30 for organizations and libraries

Mail This Form To:

PLANNERS NETWORK
379 DeKalb Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11205

THE PLANNERS NETWORK

The Planners Network is an association of professionals, activists, academics, and students involved in physical, social, economic, and environmental planning in urban and rural areas, who promote fundamental change in our political and economic systems.

We believe that planning should be a tool for allocating resources and developing the environment to eliminate the great inequalities of wealth and power in our society, rather than to maintain and justify the status quo. This includes opposition to racial, economic and environmental injustice, and discrimination by gender and sexual orientation. We believe that planning should be used to assure adequate food, clothing, shelter, medical care, jobs, safe working conditions, and a healthful environment. We advocate public responsibility for meeting these needs, because the private market has proven incapable of doing so.
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Moving?

Please make sure to let PN know if your address changes. It saves us money and helps ensure you don't miss an issue!

Your Last Issue?

The date on your mailing label indicates when your current membership expires — make sure to renew if this date is coming up soon! If it is already expired, we need to hear from you before May 1st or you won't receive PN anymore. See the inside back page for contribution suggestions. Thanks for your continued support!