

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

A Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program Symposium

ONE-FIFTH OF THE NATION:

A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE TO AMERICA'S FIRST SUBURBS

Wednesday, February 15, 2006

8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Falk Auditorium
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

[TRANSCRIPT PREPARED FROM TAPE RECORDINGS.]

C O N T E N T S

Introduction:

BRUCE KATZ, Vice President and Director
Metropolitan Policy Program, The Brookings Institution

Opening Remarks:

THE HONORABLE HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
United States Senator, New York

Presentation:

ROBERT PUENTES, Fellow
The Brookings Institution

Moderator:

E.J. DIONNE, Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

Panel Discussion:

THE HONORABLE MARGARET KELIHER
County Judge, Dallas County, Texas

RON SIMS
County Executive, King County, Washington

DAN ONORATO
Chief Executive
Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

THOMAS SUOZZI
County Executive, Nassau County, New York

CHRISTOPHER ZIMMERMAN
Vice Chairman, Arlington County, Virginia

Closing Remarks:

THE HONORABLE MICHAEL TURNER
United States Representative, Ohio

- - -

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KATZ: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to welcome everyone to Brookings for this forum on first suburbs. Today marks the release of a major study on first suburb counties by two of my colleagues, Ron Puentes and David Warren. Rob and David have collected five decades' worth of demographic, economic and social trends, no easy task, to give all us a comprehensive guide to first suburbs in the United States. The bit to take away from the research, no secret from the title of the report, is that the 64 counties that qualify as first suburbs constitute almost one-fifth of the American population. In some states like Maryland, Connecticut and New Jersey, about half the residents live in first suburb counties. And in states like New York, the combination of city and first suburban populations together constitute a supermajority.

What is a first suburb? Why do we care? By our definition, first suburb counties are places that adjoin a central city that was one of the hundred most populous cities in 1950. These counties were literally the first to suburbanize, many after World War II, some even prior to World War II, in the era of trolley cars. Over the past half-century, many labels have been given to these places. Older suburbs, inner-ring suburbs, first-tier communities, close-in suburbs. Several weeks ago Fred Barnes of the Weekly Standard referenced the latest entry, "inurbs."

We call them first suburbs partly to reflect the sequence of suburbanization, partly to avoid any pejorative term that would inhibit market investment, and partly to acknowledge that these places are worthy of special attention from federal and state governments, private investors, political pundits, and academics. We've got to have a plug for Brookings.

Let me tease out the last point. It's our belief that the first suburbs occupy a unique place in the hierarchy of American jurisdictions. After 50 years or more of development, many are increasingly experiencing the central-city-like challenges that come with age, the infrastructure of these places, the roads, the schools, the commercial corridors, the housing, is in need of reinvestment and even redevelopment. And like cities, these places are diversifying quickly, and while relatively well-off, are struggling to respond to those challenges. Yet first suburbs in physical form, in cultural attitudes, are quintessential suburban. Almost all were developed in the age of the auto, almost all were developed at a time when the rage of planning was to keep all uses, residential, commercial, industrial, office, separate. Thus they look and feel like classic suburban bedroom communities, for good and bad; quiet, leafy, quality single-family neighborhoods connected by commercial arteries that were often chaotically planned, quickly and cheaply built, and are now traffic-choked, particularly on weekends.

We believe that this distinctive status of first suburbs are still not recognized or understood by many, and that status comes at a heavy price. In our view, first suburbs are caught in a policy blind spot between the benefaction long directed to central cities, the new attention lavished on fast-growing outer suburbs. As I and the county executives talked last night, on one hand, these places are not poor enough to qualify for many of the federal economic development and community development programs. Frequently the municipalities in these places are too small to qualify for the Federal Community Development Block Grant Program. At the same time, another set of major policies actually undermines these places. Federal and state spending, infrastructure policy, tax expenditures, all these taken together set the rules of the game that tend to facilitate sprawl, promote concentrated poverty, and first suburbs are basically caught between these powerful forces.

We're here today to explore in greater depth the evolving demographic, economic and social reality of these places, their promise, their challenges, and their latent political potential.

We will hear from two of the few federal policy makers, Senator Clinton and Congressman Turner, who understand the changing nature of these places and their need for friendly federal policies. We will hear from Rob Puentes, the main author of the study who will summarize this finding and the recommendations. We will hear from five county executives, what I call the A Team of first suburb county leaders

who have established national reputations for smart and innovative governance.

Last but not least, we will benefit from the moderating skills and political and policy insights of E.J. Dionne.

I just want to thank a few people at the beginning who made this forum possible. As many of you know, Brookings relies on support from any foundations for our research, representatives from Mott, Ford, Fannie Mae, the Casey Foundations, as well as Living Cities are all here today and we thank them for making this research possible. There are several local elected municipal officials in the room. I'd like to particularly recognize Dan Pocek, the Mayor of Bedford, Ohio, who is Chair of the National League of Cities First Suburbs Council and the formation of this network of municipal leaders at the NLC is one of the many signs that this group of jurisdictions is starting to recognize their shared challenges and beginning to organize collectively in new ways.

And finally Myron Orfield is present. And more than any other person in this country, Myron has exploded the myth that suburbia is monolithic and has really helped raise the profile of older suburbs within regions, within states, and at the national stage.

It's my pleasure to introduce Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton from the Great State of New York. I'm from Brooklyn.

[Laughter.]

MR. KATZ: And no comments, please, from the peanut gallery about the accent.

As many of you know, Senator Clinton has been a strong advocate for issues of central importance to first suburbs, access to health care for children and families, business development and community revitalization. Last May she introduced the Suburban Core Opportunity, Restoration and Enhancement Act, the so-called SCORE legislation, and this bill jointly introduced into the House by Representative Peter King of New York would set aside \$250 million for first suburbs nationwide to help fund reinvestment and revitalization projects. This is one of the rare, rare federal pieces of federal legislation that directly responds to the challenges faced by first suburbs. Senator Clinton, the floor is yours.

[Applause.]

SENATOR CLINTON: Good morning, and I'm absolutely delighted to be back at Brookings as I always am to have an opportunity to be part of the ongoing work of this extraordinary national and international treasure.

I really want to thank Bruce Katz. Bruce has driven the idea behind this conference, but much more than that, the analytic work and research that was done that support many of the conclusions and recommendations, and has fashioned here at Brookings a Metropolitan Policy Program that has tremendous reach. So, thank you, Bruce. I was

recently at the swearing in for the second term of the Borough President of Brooklyn, and he was talking about secession so that he could be a suburb of Manhattan, that other borough.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR CLINTON: I also want to congratulate and thank Robert Puentes and David Warren for their efforts.

You will hear in a few minutes from some extraordinary leaders from around our country and people who have really been on the forefront of understanding what we mean when we talk about the challenges facing "first suburbs." Margaret Keliher from Dallas, and Dan Onorato of Allegheny County, Ron Sims from King County, and Chris Zimmerman from Arlington County. Certainly from my perspective, the panelist who I'm delighted is here because he and I have worked so closely together on these issues is Tom Suozzi, the County Executive from Nassau County. Tom has been a real leader in the first suburbs smart growth movement, and I think Howard Weitzman, our Comptroller from Nassau County, is also here. Hi, Howard. And together they and their team have really tried to surface some of the problems that have been denied or overlooked for a while and begin to get people to focus on the reasons why so many of us love the suburbs, grew up in the suburbs, are under pressure because we're loving them to death. We are filling them up and choking them off and we need to have a strategy that this

conference is part of to begin to acknowledge what needs to happen as we move forward.

I grew up in a suburb. I was born in Chicago, and then quickly moved into the suburbs when my father, a World War II vet, sort of followed his generation to the suburbs. So I grew up with all kinds of wonderful attributes that we looked for and took for granted in the suburbs, great schools, fabulous recreational opportunities, easy walking and biking from place to place. We had a right of passage at Eugene Field Elementary School, and that was in fourth grade you had to take a test and if you were deemed competent you could ride your bike to school. It was a great opportunity.

Where I live now, in a suburb further out, not a first suburb but maybe you could call second generation suburb, there's a big debate going on in Chappaqua because it's too dangerous many people think for children to ride their bikes to school. So suburbs and where people live and how people accommodate themselves to our changing lifestyles could not be a timelier subject.

As we start talking about the challenges we face now, it's important to understand what led us to this point. The post-war boom of 60 years ago was defined by three things, investments in education, a commitment to the middle-class, and a shared dedication at all levels of government to development and economic growth. There was an underlying basic bargain that if you worked hard, played by the rules,

you and your family could prosper, you could own your own home, you could have your little piece of America with your yard no matter how big or small it might be. And the GI Bill, the explosion of school construction, colleges and universities opening their doors to greater and greater numbers of Americans, all of that just exploded the opportunity society, and we created an unparalleled, unprecedented amount of wealth and potential. The middle-class flourished and the suburbs boomed.

Between 1950 and 2000, what we now call the first suburbs, grew twice as fast as the rest of the nation. Nassau County in New York, for example, nearly doubled in population. What began in places like Levittown on Long Island turned into a national trend and that development became intertwined with the very idea of American prosperity and promise.

Did this take place in a vacuum? Well, no, of course not. It took leadership, and there was so much that promoted the whole ethos of the suburbs and what was expected of you as somebody growing up in the suburbs. I remember after Sputnik went up that like a few days afterwards my fifth-grade teacher telling us we had to do more math and science because President Eisenhower expected us to, and that seemed perfectly reasonable to us, that the President would be somewhere in Washington in the White House thinking the kids at Field School in Park Ridge, Illinois, they're better do more math and science. There was this

feeling that we were not just apart from the cities, but we were helping to define and remake America.

The interstate highway system was clearly defined in part to connect up all these places and to open up more areas for more development for yet even greater numbers of suburbs. We had leaders who really invested tremendously in the middle-class and understood the importance of a strong and growing middle-class and of giving families the tools they needed to succeed, so suburbs became synonymous with the American dream.

We're here today because as often happens in life, you have to take stock of where you are. Fifty years later, I move a little slower, I have to take a little more time trying to get up in the morning. As a friend of mine said, it's a good news/bad news every morning. The bad news is you ache everywhere, and the good news is you're getting up. So I think that for the suburbs, the bad news is we have problems, the good news happens to be we have lots of assets and we have smart, dedicated leaders who understand we're going to have to make some changes.

The first suburbs remain in terms of median household income above the national average. Nassau and Westchester Counties in New York have incomes more than 50 percent higher. Education levels on average remain higher than the national. Graduation rates, for example, for both high school and college students. First suburbs are home to lower poverty and unemployment levels and tend to have higher

concentrations of professional workers. So they have attracted wealth, growth and investment and a self-perpetuating cycle of continuing upward mobility.

Towns once billed as bedroom communities have now turned into their own economic engines. Almost 80 percent of the people who live on Long Island, much of which was a first suburban community, now work there. They don't commute into the city as their parents did. So while America's older suburbs remain vital, the patterns of development have changed, the demographics have changed, and the future economic prosperity is by no means assured.

First suburbs are much more heterogeneous than they used to be. I went to an enormous high school, nearly 5,000 students that was all white. It was ethnically diverse, but it was all white. Nassau and Westchester Counties are struggling with the high costs of living. More and more people who grew up there, whose parents grew up there, are finding it increasingly difficult to afford to stay in their communities of choice and to raise their own children. The median house price on Long Island where Nassau is the larger of the two counties, Suffolk being the other, is nearly \$400,000. That is the median home price, more than twice the national average. And 71 percent of Long Islanders in a recent survey said they were concerned that housing costs would force a member of their family to leave.

Other areas throughout my state, like Erie, Monroe and Onondaga Counties, have been struggling with their declining manufacturing base which provided good paying jobs with secure benefits for thousands and thousands of New Yorkers. Many inner-ring suburbs, those closer to the cities, face growing competition from the so-called exurbs where development is cheaper than redevelopment and land is more readily available. So these constellations of issues that are faced is that while they are important, the best way we can address them is by looking at our common challenges. It may not seem at first blush that Nassau County in New York has much in common with Dallas County in Texas or King County in Washington, but below the surface, I think we'll find a lot that we have in common and should be working toward some kind of common agenda and common voice in our American political scene.

This report unveiled today reveals an aging transportation infrastructure built for commuters. As the local economy depends less and less on the core city, that's become a problem for many of our suburbs. The implications of greater diversity. Between 1980 and 2000, the share of racial and ethnic minorities living in first suburbs more than doubled. These areas are also increasingly home to immigrants, legal immigrants and undocumented immigrants. First suburbs now have more foreign-born residents than primary cities do.

The demographics are also shifting older. The number of elderly residents increased nearly twice as fast in first suburbs as nationally in the second half of the 20th century. And seniors, of course, face their own set of challenges including in many areas inadequate public transportation and rising housing costs.

Often the rosier median and average statistics really hide hidden pockets of blight, unemployment and lower education levels. Concentrated poverty is increasing in first suburbs, and first suburbs have also become home to widening racial disparities in both education and income levels.

I think we need to reinvigorate the basic bargain. We can look to our past for lessons, but it will take new policies and new ideas and an honest recognition of the particular challenges confronting us. It's important that we get to work which is why this conference and report are so timely. Over 50 million Americans, 20 percent, live in a first suburb including in my state almost 5 million New Yorkers which is a higher percentage, nearly a quarter of the population. So how do we get the help that we need to leaders like the ones you'll hear from today, and how do we serve the unique demands of first suburbs?

I want to talk about what the federal role should be. Because we identify suburb communities as archetypes of American prosperity, suburbia as a whole has not attracted much federal attention, and I would agree that until relatively recently that was appropriate. There were

other problems that really did need to take priority. So resources for development and investment, ideas of concern to suburbs, have really been on the back burner, if on any burner at all.

One example. The Federal Emergency Food and Shelter Program. This program has operated successfully and as a matter of necessity for a number of years on Long Island, specifically in Suffolk County. Suffolk County is a newer suburb, but Long Island is a first suburb. Suffolk County had historically qualified for grants since the program's inception to fund local food pantries and shelters and other nonprofit efforts that served families in rough times.

In more recent years, the federal government determined that Suffolk did not qualify, although the need had actually increased. Why? Unemployment, poverty, and homeless had grown, but the national rates and grown faster. And while portions of Suffolk County would be eligible for such direct grants, they were lumped in with the more affluent areas. So you had East Hampton and you had somewhere else, and so on average people would look at the numbers and say we certainly don't need to continue helping Suffolk County.

We worked with the administration in Suffolk County with Steve Levy and his team and designed a new formula and pushed for change and succeeded, but we had smart local government which had a very real and growing need that was able to articulate it effectively.

The solution, however, will not be found in new formulas, but by a new overall commitment at the federal level. First, we need to do more to foster collaboration and cooperation and to help create more shared goals. We need to promote best practices. What works in Allegheny County may be something we can try out in Westchester County, but we need to have a better sharing of best practices and experiences.

We need to support smart growth. Earl Blumenauer in the House of Representatives from Portland, Oregon, has been a great leader on smart growth and has promoted many of the ideas that have worked their way into local responses. And we need to provide incentives for change.

Brookings helped put my office in contact with several local communities that are taking bold steps to reinvigorate their first suburban areas. Montgomery County, Maryland, where local leaders are aggressively pursuing affordable housing. Affordable housing has been kind of a taboo in lots of first suburbs. People don't have the idea that we need affordable housing. But when your police officers and your fire fighters, your teachers and your nurses, your aging residents, cannot afford to live in their communities anymore, this is a problem that we ignore at our peril. We are losing the work force that actually keeps the first suburbs going, that provides the services that many who live in suburbs have come to expect.

Arlington, Virginia, planned development around transportation hubs, and I want to thank Arlington County Vice Chairman Chris Zimmerman for his work in collaboration with my office.

Allegheny County in Pennsylvania had creative redevelopment options on blighted properties, and I know the County Executive is here and I want to thank him as well.

Another big issue we've got which has to be dealt with although it is dicey politically is fragmented government. In some of our counties in New York, we have hundreds of governmental jurisdiction. I don't know Tom, but I think the number on Long Island is we have 902 separate governmental jurisdictions, the vast majority of which have taxing authority, and it's comparable in other places as well. That leads to fragmentation, it leads to redundancy, and it leads to competition instead of cooperation. It basically pushes people to play a zero-sum game instead of working together to plan how to grow the pie instead of holding onto a fragmented piece of it. The First Suburbs Consortium outside Cleveland, Ohio, serves as an example. Municipalities joined forces to collectively develop solutions, to gather data and plan regionally.

In February of last year I called a conference on Long Island and we brought together local leaders like County Executive Suozzi, nonprofits, businesses, elected officials, to discuss the evolution of first suburbs. We talked about transportation, economic development,

affordable housing, sprawl, open space preservation, and downtown revitalization. One of the great opportunities that still is not exploited to the extent it should be is the downtown revitalization of the first suburbs. The utilities are already in, the transportation networks are nearby, the sidewalks are there, the retail is not far, and instead of moving further and further out taking green space and farmland, we're trying to encourage people to look at what we already have in our downtown first suburbs. White Plains in New York in Westchester County has been revitalizing its downtown, and it's mostly a good news story, lots of new housing going in, unfortunately it's quite expensive housing. More and more people are buying luxury condominiums in the large buildings that are going up, and so we've got to balance that with making sure that the people who actually live and work in White Plains, not just those who might be attracted to that kind of living, have a place to live as well.

We also need to make sure that the federal government matches rhetoric with resources. We should be looking for ways to invest in first suburbs, and I think that the SCORE legislation that Bruce referenced is an effort on my part and Congressman King's to get the conversation going. Clearly, first suburbs don't qualify for programs like the Renewal of Communities which was the last initiative of my husband's administration, I think maybe if not the last, one of the last bills he signed, and we've used that in New York to go into inner-city Buffalo and Rochester and Niagara Falls and Schenectady, places that are

really under tremendous pressure economically, and that's a good tool for those places that are really in need of dramatic intervention.

But we don't have any kind of comparable preventive assistance for first suburbs, and they need help before they have blight growing out from the places that are already suffering. I go through a lot of our expensive suburbs in New York on my way to meet with people or see people, and you often go through blocks of abandoned housing, of boarded up stores, schools that are failing their children, and then you get to places that look like they're scenes in television series. They're beautiful and obviously affluent. They're living side by side, but they might as well be on different planets, and how we begin to recognize some of that need that is literally next door in the first suburbs is a big political necessity.

I introduced the so-called SCORE Act with the help of people like Bruce Katz and Robert Puentes and others here at Brookings, and I really appreciate their willingness to work closely on this because I wanted to lay down a marker and try to get the conversation going, and both Peter King on the Republican side and Carolyn McCarthy, my colleague on the Democratic side from Long Island, are carrying this legislation in the House of Representatives. The SCORE Act would provide economic aid and tax incentives to help suburban areas revitalize their neighborhoods, create employment opportunities, develop affordable housing, and expand businesses. The key component of the

Act calls for a \$250 million fund administered by HUD to award grants that target older suburbs and fund smart growth development projects like some of the ones that I mentioned that you'll hear more about in a few minutes.

What's different about this proposal is that it calls for collaboration at the local level. The bill requires all stakeholders to reach consensus first on how best to move their local economy forward. It requires public hearings and a specific plan to employ smart growth strategies including increasing a range of affordable housing options, protecting open space, farmland and critical environmental areas, and promoting the creation of new shared public spaces, creating mixed-use buildings or entire areas, enhancing and promoting public transportation including improving access to transit stations and bus facilities, creating commercial and mixed-use development around transportation hubs, and creating more streets and walkways for pedestrians and bicyclists. Those of you know, Earl Blumenauer knows, that his insignia for his campaign is a big plastic bicycle, and all of his supporters proudly wear it on their lapel because it epitomizes what he's trying to do. And I would make a health-related argument. We need to get people in first suburbs just like we do in rural and city communities to get out and start moving again, and if we don't, the prospects for diabetes, increasing obesity and all the related diseases that are connected to and caused by those conditions are

just daunting to imagine, so there is even a health care angle to what we're trying to do here today.

A portion of the revenues generated through economic growth would be stored in a reinvestment fund dedicated to future development, recreating a kind of cycle that people could borrow from and use. The SCORE Act is what a federal economic development program should be, seed money and a road map giving communities the momentum and the authority to help themselves. The federal government should not and cannot dictate priorities for individual communities, but it can be a convener, it can be an incentivizer, and that's what we imagine it becoming.

We have learned a lot from what happened in the 1960s and 1970s when there was a burst of urban renewal programs, and we don't want to go back and have those kinds of programs imposed on people. We want people themselves to work through what they want for their future. I've worked for several years now with a community on Long Island that has had a lot of economic stresses, and we waited, we waited until they had gone through all of the process, New Castle, New York, and it's a perfect illustration about the partnerships we hope the SCORE Act will advance.

In 2002, local residents, business and property owners, civic groups, labor leaders, clergy, seniors, homeowners, renters, government officials, young people, all came together to develop a plan to revitalize

New Castle. They were seeking help and they were told come back with a plan. Don't just ask for help. Tell us what you're going to do and make sure people have bought into it. The idea was to reconstruct New Castle's main streets, create a mixed-use downtown area attractive to new retail and commercial investment, and we were able to get some federal help for them to actually begin implementing their plan, but it is their plan and they had lots of heated meetings about what it would be, but slowly and surely worked to a conclusion. I'm heartened by that kind of example, and that's what we hope will be incentivized both by this conference, enhancing more collaboration, and by the SCORE Act as a model.

So there's a lot of work to be done, but I'm very hopeful and optimistic. People love living where they live. There are reasons why the suburbs exploded in growth, and we know that the exurbs are following in their footsteps, so to speak. In 50 years they'll face the same problem. So part of it is to get ahead of the curve, come up with the ideas that we can begin implementing around the country, create these best practices, make sure that the features of suburban living as many of us remember or certainly understand stood for the American Dream, get reinvigorated, recreated where necessary, and reestablished right where they first started.

So I will look forward to working with you on these issues because they are really near and dear to my heart. I want to see many of

the ideas that you are proposing here come to fruition at the local, state and federal level, and I pledge my continuing support to you.

And I would just end by saying that when we think about the suburbs and sort of the mythology of the suburbs, there was a reason why that was so attractive to Americans, and we have charted the last half of the 20th century by the growth and development of the so-called Baby Boom Generation. As people in my generation age, the suburbs in which they now live will have to accommodate them more and more. We will either do it in a sensible, practical way, or we'll do it in kind of a reactive way, but we will do it because there are too many of us to be dispersed into retirement communities elsewhere.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR CLINTON: So people will want to stay in their communities. They'll even want to stay in their homes. And we have to not only think about the physical infrastructure, the social infrastructure. How are we going to provide services to people who like where they are and want to stay there as long as they're physically and mentally able to do so? How do we enhance the idea of what's called a NORC, a naturally occurring retirement community? How do we do that without putting up a not wanted sign for young families with children? How do the suburbs continue to provide high-quality education as they age and an increasing proportion of the population like Bill and I no longer have children in the public schools?

These are all issues that we have to get ahead of because they are coming right at us, and we're going to ignore them at our peril. But I'm optimistic, and I'm particularly so because I think that the work you've done here at Brookings has the potential to open so many eyes, get people working together collaborating and cooperating and coming up with some uniquely American solutions to a uniquely American way of living. And to that end, I wish you well and look forward to working with you. Thank you all very much.

[Applause.]

MR. KATZ: Now you will be subjected to a PowerPoint. You thought we were safe, but we're going to try out our new system here and see if it works.

So I'd like to introduce Rob Puentes to summarize the findings and recommendations of the study. Rob is a fellow in Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution. He's the co-editor with me of a recent book called, "Taking the High Road: A Metropolitan Agenda for Transformation Reform." And he's also the co-author with Myron Orfield of a widely read 2002 treatise, "Valuing America's First Suburbs."

So, Rob Puentes.

MR. PUENTES: Thank you, Bruce. And thanks every body for coming here today. It really is a wonderful event, I think. It's great

to see everybody here. It's great to see so much interest in this effort and this activity and the research around first suburbs.

I also want to acknowledge Dave Warren, my co-author on this. Dave lived and breathed this stuff for so many months. So if you have hard questions at the end, direct them to Dave because he knows the guts of this thing.

I also want to thank Saundra Honeysett and her team for pulling together this event. It's really hard to pull together these big things. And she's really good. She made sure that it snowed on Sunday as opposed to snowing last night, which what all of us thought when we scheduled this for February 15th.

So as Bruce mentioned, what I want to do then is provide some more, flesh out the report a little further, to build off of the comments of the Senator so eloquently made, Bruce's comments earlier.

The point of the research —and the report is being released today. Hopefully everybody got copies. They're outside on the big table. The point of the research was to identify what we considered to be older suburban America back in 1950. That's where we wanted to start from. We wanted to start from 1950, the era just before the rapid rise of suburbanization in this country, massive federal programs like the Interstate Highway Act, federal housing programs, the baby boom generation. All of that is kind of ground zero for suburbanization of this

country. 1950 is generally accepted as that—it's the first census after that wave of suburbanization that really began to take off.

So what we really wanted to do is track changes over time and some important indicators in these first suburbs. We wanted to test out the hypothesis that these places just looked very different, looked very different in 1950 than they do today.

We really wanted to reinforce the point then, as Bruce mentioned, that suburbs are not monolithic. In this country, we thought for a long time, that it was cities, suburbs and rural areas. And we know those lines of demarcation have long been taken down. There are rich differences between first suburbs, between suburbs in general, between cities, between metropolitan areas.

We really wanted to lay all of that out in this research.

What I want to do today is quickly go through these three points. I'm going to talk about the research and talk about why we selected—which first suburbs we selected for our study. I'll talk about the major findings of the research and then end with what the important policy implications are that arise as result of this study.

And I'm going to go through this kind of quickly because I want to make sure we have time for Q and A at the end of this. And I want to make sure that the panel has enough time too.

So this work is sort of a phase two of the deeper policy work that Bruce already mentioned, the report around valuing America's first

suburbs, which was more of a deep policy paper that we put together, working with elected officials from all across the Midwest, particularly places like Bedford, Ohio. Mayor Jeannette Bell is here from West Allis in Wisconsin outside of Milwaukee.

We worked with these guys for a long time on this policy piece. They had self-selected themselves. They formed these coalitions like the Senator mentioned. And defining first suburbs, we kind of left that up to them. It was hard to do so I just punted and let them select which places they were talking about in Cuyahoga County, Milwaukee County and so forth.

For this undertaking, we had to think very hard about how we were going to define first suburbs, what we were going to include. And wanted to make sure it was a national story. This isn't just an issue in the Midwest. It is something that takes place all across the country.

So for the current project, we had to think about it in a way that was consistent with across metro areas and allowed us also to do these national comparisons. We just didn't want it to be a Midwestern story.

So because there is so much variation, as the Senator mentioned, there are hundreds and hundreds of municipalities in these places. We did rely on county-level geography. It gave us a way to undertake the project in the first place, frankly in a way that we just

couldn't do otherwise. The fragmentation issue is certainly one—I'll talk about that in a minute.

Next, since we felt that the age of suburbs was of primary importance, when these places developed, we included all of the counties that were—or we excluded counties that were not part of the metropolitan area in 1950. If you weren't part of a metropolitan area in 1950, you weren't part of older suburban America.

We also felt that proximity to a center city was important. It gets to the notion that these places are on the inner rings of first suburbs. We talked to—the commonly used name for these places, the inner-ring suburbs and that where these places developed in a metropolitan area was just as important as to how and when they developed.

So we excluded any county that was not adjacent to a center city in 1950.

We then used the size cutoff to make the project manageable, give us a broad distribution across the country.

We were then able to extract the center city data from the counties where we needed to, places like King County and Allegheny County. Where the cities are part of the county, we were able to run the numbers for the county, run the numbers for the city and then take those out so that what we were left with was what we considered to be entirely suburban, or in this case, entirely first suburban.

So in looking at Cook County, for example, you can see the county map there on the left, we ran the numbers for the county, took out the city of Chicago. You can see for the 2000 population, for example, Cook County at 5.4 million, Chicago 2.9. What's left is the 2.5 million in the first suburbs. So this is what we did for each of the indicators for each of the first suburbs and each of the metropolitan areas.

So what we're left with in these 64 counties—they're spread fairly evenly across the country—not surprisingly you do see some concentration there in the Northeast and the Midwest. There are nine of these places located in the West and the Southwest, places like King County, places that are quintessentially suburban like Los Angeles and Orange County down there in Southern California.

There are six in the South and the Southeast. Judge Keliher's Dallas County, Jefferson County outside of Birmingham, Fulton County outside of Atlanta, two down there in Florida. But most are found in the Midwest.

And again, this shouldn't be too surprising. There are smaller counties there. But really, these are the places that were part of older suburban America back in 1950. And the Midwest, as I mentioned earlier, is really kind of the command center for first suburb thought in this country.

Kim Gibson is here from the Ohio Consortium, and these are places that have been working on these issues for quite some time and

have really influenced the work that we have done. They have taught us more than probably we taught them, places like Myron Orfield's Hennepin County, Wayne County outside of Detroit.

Many more there on the Northeast. You can see all of the major cities are represented right up the I-95 corridor from Arlington in Virginia right up through Baltimore, Philly, New York, Providence, Boston, et cetera, all the way up. And not just the I-95 corridor but the cities around Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Monroe, and Rochester as were mentioned.

And I think it's important to mention that although we did use county-level data, we do recognize that these places, the importance of these places really is on the municipal level.

Again, as was mentioned, the county level is kind of the umbrella overseeing hundreds and hundreds of municipalities. So you can see we haven't forgotten about places like this. And Bruce is from Brooklyn and I had to put up—I'm from Secaucus, so I had to put that up there. I am from a first suburb. Teaneck and Secaucus two examples.

But there are lots of examples of these places around the country. Now having a TV show was not a prerequisite for qualifying as a first suburb. [Laughter.]

MR. PUENTES: This is kind of a timeline across the years, 1950 with Dick Van Dyke, all of the way up to today. We actually probably should talk about the diversity question here in a little bit. But

I think we've probably spent too much time on this part of the research anyway.

So again, what we did is we ran a whole series of market demographic and economic trends for these 64 places all of the way back to 1950 where we could, population, race, ethnicity, age, housing, education, income and employment. But we didn't just run them for the first suburb. It wasn't just enough to talk about what was happening in these places. But we wanted to be able to compare them to other parts of the metro area.

So the four geographies we talked about in the report, I'll talk about today are the first suburbs, these 64 counties, the primary cities. Each county had a city associated with it. There were 52 of these primary cities, the center cities in many places. The newer suburbs, which is what's left over in a metropolitan area where the primary cities in the first suburbs are taken out. So the newer suburbs are the rest of the metropolitan area. And the United States is just the whole country without any geography extracted.

So, for example, in the St. Louis metropolitan area, you have—this is the whole metro area—the first suburbs there are St. Louis, Madison and St. Clair County. The primary city there is the middle of the city of St. Louis. And the newer suburbs are the metro remainder, what's left of the metropolitan area.

We wanted to have something to compare these first suburbs to. We know they're not like the cities, but they're also not like the newer suburbs. That's what we did for each of these indicators.

So what are the major findings? One thing that this work does make clear is that first suburbs do retain typically suburban traits. They are beginning to take on tendencies that are like urban areas but they're still not like either one. They're not like the cities. They're not going to be like the cities. They don't want to be like the cities often. But they're also not like the newer suburbs, the places that are new, places that are just developing on the suburban fringe have very different challenges, very different assets, very different opportunities than are found in the first suburbs.

But we also found that the first suburbs were often quite different from one another, especially between regions. The Midwest really sticks out. The experience in the Midwest in first suburbs is very different from what's going on in the Southeast and the Southwest particularly.

But they're also—again, as the Senator mentioned, there are lots of things that do link these places together. And there is a reason to talk about first suburbs as a cohesive whole.

So, first of all, we found that first suburbs have evolved from being fast growing places that accommodate a large share of the U.S. population in the '50s and 60s to slow or no growth places by the

end of the century. And today, as you can see from the chart, they're growing slower than the nation as a whole.

Even though they are continuing to grow in the aggregate, that growth has really slowed down considerably. But you'll also notice from the chart here is that even though we only have newer suburb data from 1970 and beyond, and even though these are the fastest growing places in the country today, their growth rates never approached the growth rates we saw in the first suburbs. You can see the 50 percent in the 1950s, the 30 percent in the 1960s.

So the growth that was happening in the first suburbs 50, 40 years ago is very different from the growth that's taking place today. We just hadn't seen that kind of growth during that time.

So there really is an explosion in the first suburbs, or there was a generation ago.

Nevertheless, by 2000, nearly one-fifth of the nation's population, about 20 percent of the population, lived in first suburbs as was mentioned. That's about 50 million people living in first suburbs today.

When you combine it with the population of the primary cities, you start to see some interesting trends start to appear. It's about 90 million people living in either the first suburbs or the primary cities. And it's about one-third of the population.

So when we start talking about national coalition building, when we start talking about raising these issues up, when we start talking about linking first suburbs with primary cities, these numbers become particularly important on the national level.

Even within states significant majorities of first suburbs and primary cities can certainly form.

As Bruce mentioned, Connecticut, Maryland and Massachusetts all have about 50 percent or more of their population in first suburbs. When you combine it with primary cities, places like California, Illinois, New York, you start seeing super majority. Again, coalition building; these numbers really start to resonate.

So that was nationally. So like the national trends, individually population growth in first suburbs is the strongest in the South and in the West, which is not surprising. Folks are generally familiar with those kinds of trends.

But since 1950, there are huge increases in places like Orange and San Diego County of Southern California, Miami—Dade, and Harris County down there in Texas. This is where a lot of the growth in this country is happening.

But there's also very slow, almost anemic growth in some Northeastern first suburbs in places like Allegheny County, Lackawanna in Pennsylvania, my former home of Hudson County there in New Jersey.

Really slow growth and this is 50-year growth. It really is very anemic for a lot of these first suburbs.

As the Senator mentioned, you can see first suburbs increased by 161 percent in 50 years, the United States by about 86 percent. So about double the population growth rate in the first suburbs.

And since 1980, the growth rates are even starker. While the South and the West obviously continue to grow, several Northeast and Midwestern first suburbs actually saw population decreases. So of the 10 slowest growing first suburbs, only one saw any population growth. And that was Mr. Suozzi's Nassau County, which was just about 1 percent.

So the growth challenges in these places are obviously very, very different. Growth pressures in the South and in the West, in King County and other places, really start to dominate these conversations.

It's just not the same growth that's going on in these places across the country. It's different growth. There are different pressures. These places are entirely built out as is often the case, and the only kind of growth that can occur is growth going up.

So it's very different than from what's going on in the Northeast and the Midwest versus the South and the West.

In terms of racial and ethnic diversity, first suburbs went from being less diverse in the nation in 1980 to being more diverse by 2000. You can see here by 2000, 33 percent of the population was racial and ethnic minorities.

But there's also some interesting regional trends here as well. In 2000, one-third of the first suburbanites were not white, as I mentioned, but this varies significantly across the country. Dade, Prince George's are both over three-quarters non-white. But places like Summit County, Stark County in Ohio, and Onondaga in the Syracuse metro area are almost entirely white. So again, very different trends in these places from other places.

Related to that, in terms of immigration, first suburbs are now home to a large and growing number of foreign born residents. You can see here that particularly in the 1990s, the increase in first suburbs really started to ramp up. And how there are more foreign-born residents in first suburbs than there are in the primary cities.

And we've done a lot of work here at Brookings. Audrey Singer and some other folks have looked at where immigrants are coming to this country, and in a lot of case, they're bypassing the central cities entirely. They're going directly to these first suburbs in many cases. And that's probably what's responsible for some of these trends.

And again, sharp contrasts here between first suburbs. Midwestern first suburbs are experiencing almost no immigration whatsoever. And what's obviously striking from this are places like St. Clair and Madison County outside of St. Louis, Trumbull County outside of Youngstown, these are places where the economy is frankly not

particularly strong. So these are places that are not attracting immigrants whatsoever.

Next, while much has been written about the greying of the population, this trend is especially acute in the first suburbs. The elderly population increased twice as fast in first suburbs as it did nationally since 1950. And you can see from the chart the stagnant percentage of elderly in the first suburbs of the baby boom years—when babies were being born the percentage of elderly obviously was quite low—and then dramatic ramp ups after 1970s. And they keep on growing so now there are more—there is a higher percentage of elderly in first suburbs than in the primary cities and in the newer suburbs, the NORC phenomenon is what I was going to mention here. The naturally occurring retirement community, particularly in the Midwest, which isn't necessarily old people coming to it, but it's young people leaving.

At the same time, however, the population of children under 15 is growing very slowly. In fact, in the aggregate, there are only about 190,000 more children in first suburbs in 2000 than there were in 1970.

Almost the entire increase in children during this time, about 2.3 million children during this time, almost that entire increase was found in the new suburbs.

Yet despite this, households are still larger in first suburbs than elsewhere just as they had been since 1950. All of these geography types, the average household size in the first suburb has always been

higher than the rest of the nation—not by very much. But because of the growing immigrant population, because of their historical role as magnets for married couples with children. Many first suburbs like Dallas, like King, like Nassau County, still have a much higher percent of these so-called traditional households than the national average.

However, the largest increase in household type during this time was in female headed households with children in first suburbs. And partly due to the rise in the elderly population, the number of so-called non-families, folks living alone or living with people to whom they're not related, is now greater than any other household type in the first suburbs. The non-households outnumber every body else.

But there are also many positive trends in first suburbs. Again, as the Senator mentioned, first suburbs have highly—largely retain their position as home to some of the most highly educated and wealthy residents, those with white collar jobs, those with very high housing values. The BA rate like in some Southern first suburbs like Mr. Zimmerman's Arlington County. Montgomery County, Fulton County in Georgia are just off the charts, double the U.S. population, double the U.S. rate.

In these places, white collar professionals are also very high. First suburbs outside of San Francisco and Boston, white collar professionals very high. And housing values in some first suburbs, mainly on the coasts, are also higher than anywhere else in the nation.

But there are some significant warning signs, frankly.

Poverty rates, which are falling over the long term in many places, are steadily rising in first suburbs. You can see that historically they've been very low, but the trajectory of the poverty rate increases in first suburbs, which is why this steady increase is very different from what we see in the newer suburbs in the U.S. and even in the primary cities, which did have these large increases 30 years ago, but actually has kind of plateaued. It's just very different from what we're seeing in the first suburbs.

There's also an unfortunate racial dimension here as well as poverty rates vary greatly by race and ethnicity. Blacks and Hispanics, for example, are two and three times as likely to be poor in first suburbs as whites. And equally disturbing is that while the number of high poverty neighborhoods, or neighborhoods of concentrated poverty, is decreasing throughout the nation, they are increasing at an alarming rate in the first suburbs.

And again, this is not the same trajectories that we see in other urban areas, where Paul Jargowsky and other folks have illustrated that this is one of the positive stories of the 1990s, the breaking up of concentrated poverty in cities. Very, very different experience in these first suburban areas. And it's happening all across the country in many Midwestern places like Cook County, Wayne County outside of Detroit. In the Northeast, in Allegheny and in New Haven. And in the South in

Dade, Harris and Dallas. And in the West, a very high increase in the concentrated poverty particularly in Southern California.

That's actually kind of a downer note in the trend section, but there are many other indicators that we talked about in the report.

Again, I would encourage you to pick up a copy of the policy brief, which is the shorter version of the report. There's a longer piece that has all of this data in it. It's also posted up on our Website. You can dig through this data at your convenience.

But what I wanted to end with was the policy implications that do arise as a result of this work. Through this research, and again, the other work that we've done in these first suburban areas, it's clear that first suburbs do possess many important assets. And again, the Senator mentioned these. Bruce talked about it.

They're home to a large share of the national population, even more so in some states. They're very highly educated residents, very wealthy. They're employed. This is really a success story in many places. These are very stable and very healthy places.

They're also very conveniently located. They're close to the center city, but also close to burgeoning job centers on the fringe. So you can work downtown and your spouse can work out in the suburban fringe. These convenience and this location is a huge asset to these places.

They have established infrastructure which is a problem when it has to be maintained and rehabilitated. But it does provide the framework for how metropolitan growth can be accommodated in many metropolitan areas.

And the potential for collaboration, again, both of the center cities in some areas and with the newer suburbs in other areas.

But it's also important to recognize and take seriously a number of these real critical challenges. Again, a very uneven population growth. There are some places that are growing in stable ways. There are places in the Midwest and the Northeast that are losing population.

There are very troubling poverty increases. Again, the concentrated poverty. We know there are new stats since 2000 that show that the national poverty rates are increasing as well, but what's happening in the first suburbs is disturbing to many.

There is an older housing stock that is very expensive in many places, but it's also uncompetitive in other places.

There's an increasing number of elderly and foreign-born populations and the high level of fragmentation and what we referred to as the policy blind spots.

These places have these challenges, but they're just not getting the attention they deserve, because there's really no national consciousness about these places.

So it's a complicated story, but there are many important reforms that do stand out. There are three that I'll highlight from the report here.

First, is addressing the special challenges of the elderly population both in terms of housing responses, finding housing that's affordable and maintaining existing housing, which is not easy for a large number of elderly residents. Meeting the needs of the rising foreign born population. There's a very prominent debate in this country around immigration policy, but there's really no debate around immigrant policy. What do these first suburbs do with the folks that are already here? What do they do with the folks that are coming here? How do they weave them into the fabric of their first suburban population?

There's really no help for these guys right now.

Creating economically integrated neighborhoods, again the disturbing rise in concentrated poverty really does need some specific attention. How are first suburbs equipped to deal with these challenges? How do they even think about them? Most of these places haven't had a chance to do that yet, and they're kind of playing catch-up.

As was mentioned, they may not want to replicate some of the strategies we use for center cities. There were some strategies that didn't exactly work. There are some things that did. But there are a lot of things that didn't work. They probably don't want to replicate those things.

But first suburbs also need to do several things. They need to remake and renew their fiscal and economic landscape. These places are just the same as they were 50 years ago. They really need to rethink their attitudes towards diversity. They need to rethink their attitudes towards urbanity. And they need to rethink their attitudes towards density.

All of these things are really changing for suburbs all across the country. Now we're going to hear more about that on the next panel.

And finally, these places need to work together. They need to form coalitions to push for regional, state and some federal reforms. They need to collaborate where possible on some redevelopment efforts.

Individually, the first suburbs are really strong and quite important. But together, they really can be more than the sum of their parts.

I'm going to go ahead and stop there and leave some time for questions. Leave some time for the panel.

I do want to mention that we have created a first suburban Website on the Brookings Website, which is listed up here, where we have all of these reports. We collected a lot of the resources that we've done and other folks have done across the country. We have all of this data.

We also have these audio interviews that we recorded with folks like Mayor Pocek around these five policy areas we highlighted.

And I would encourage you to take a listen to it because it gives much more life and much more texture to these issues than some wonky Brookings guy standing up here on Massachusetts Avenue. They really give some real life to these issues. And I do appreciate you guys looking there.

Again, thank you very much for coming here today. And I'll be happy to take any of your questions.

[Applause.]

MR. KATZ: Do we have like one or two burning, clarifying questions? Because I want to make sure that we get to the panel up and we have sufficient time for them have a discussion and some discourse.

So any sort of burning, clarifying questions?

Good, okay.

[Laughter.]

MR. PUENTES: They got the message.

MR. KATZ: They got the message, yes.

[Laughter.]

MR. KATZ: Yes, so now we're going to turn to the panel of local leaders, what I call the A Team of first suburban government in the United States.

Each of these individuals has ample exposure to the challenges facing first suburbs and they really want a national reputation for meeting these challenges in an innovative and thoughtful way.

So I'm going to go in alphabetical order. Margaret Keliher is the county judge of Dallas County, Texas, with a population of 1 million people. In that part of the country, they call these positions county judges. And already there was some confusion about that. But she is the chief executive officer of Dallas County.

Dan Onorato is the chief executive of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, with a population of 950,000. And previously he was the county controller of that county.

Ron Sims is the county executive of King County, Washington, with a population of 1.2 million. He previously served as a member of the King County council.

Tom Suozzi is the county executive of Nassau County, with a population of 1.3 million people right outside of New York. And he previously served as the mayor in the city of Glen Cove.

And finally, Chris Zimmerman is vice chairman of the County Board in Arlington County with a population of close to 200,000. But as everyone knows, Arlington punches above its weight and is a national model on transit oriented development.

To moderate the A Team, we've got E.J. Dionne. He's a senior fellow at Brookings. He's well known in this town for his columns in the Washington Post and his service as a political analyst on National Public Radio, one of the most insightful political observers in the United States today.

So hopefully they've told you where you're supposed to go, because I don't have a clue. But we'll figure it out.

[Applause.]

[Recess]

MR. DIONNE: While everybody is being miked up I want to briefly introduce the panel. Bruce did the formal introductions. I just want to say I'm very honored to be here because of Bruce Katz's work.

I was talking to a mutual friend of ours, Bruce, recently, and this friend said, you know, you go out in the country and talk to local officials, community groups, and Katz is a rock star, he said.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: And so when my kids ask me what I did this morning, I'm going to say that I moderated a panel on behalf of a rock star. And I'll leave it at that.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: But I was thinking Bruce Katz as rock star—the one song we know his group would not sing is "We Got to Get Out of This Place," because that would only contribute to sprawl. And Bruce actually honors places—he honors old places and not just new places.

He used to be a jazz group. His song was called, "Take the A Train," a good Brooklyn guy who advocates mass transit.

But this project reflects a movement of Bruce. He's now listening to songs like "Ventura Highway" and a lot of old Springsteen songs.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: And I think that's very helpful to the country and to the discussion. So I just want to honor Bruce and also Rob for that fantastic report. There's no need to put down think tank guys on Massachusetts Avenue. You guys show that think tank guys think way ahead.

Let me just sort of talk about—so that you can all grade these brilliant county executives afterwards—as to the questions—oh, I just want to say about Margaret Keliher, she is the only one carrying the title judge and she told me before this started that this gives her the power to marry people. So if there's anyone eager to get married, you don't have to go to Las Vegas. You come to Brookings.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: She can also commit people, and she can also declare them dead. These last two, I realize, could be very helpful to a politician on election day.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: You can really alter the electorate considerably.

So we're very glad to have a judge as well as county executives.

As Rob sort of—as Rob and I were talking about this, he has posed a series of questions to these county executives. And they all have to answer them in about five minutes. And then we'll carry the conversation on.

They were asked to think about their county in the context of the rest of their metropolitan area. They were asked to focus on the particular assets and challenges of their county and if possible, of first suburbs as a whole.

They were asked to comment on this idea of a policy blind spot, that the challenges in the place they are from are not being met because first suburbs don't fit neatly into anybody's usual policy framework. Bruce is not yet singing the song, "I Was Born in Small Town" as a Brooklyn guy.

And for several of them, it would be helpful if they could talk about the potential for coalition building among first suburbs.

And finally, all politicians have to answer this question, their vision or their county's vision for remaking and sustaining their own area and for suburbs by extension.

Poor Chris Zimmerman has spent his whole life going last whenever it was done in alphabetical order, but that clearly hasn't hurt his career in the least.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Think about jurisdiction. I've moved considerably up the alphabet.

MR. DIONNE: Oh, that's true. Yes, it's always Arlington County chief executive.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: Yes, but we will go in alphabetical order. So I'd like Margaret Keliher to start. And welcome to you all.

JUDGE KELIHER: Thank you. This has been very interesting and talking also with the other executives about some of the concerns that they are facing and the difference in the way that their counties are run and what the makeup is.

Actually, in Dallas County where we have over 2 million people, we have got in Dallas County only 25 cities. So and throughout all of Dallas County when we're talking about the makeup of the county, we don't have as much as the redundancy problem that some of the other counties, I think are facing and watching them move.

However, we do have throughout Dallas County an effort for sprawls, moving into the other surrounding counties.

In Dallas, needless to say and in Texas as everyone knows, we have no problem jumping in our SUVs and driving miles to get anywhere. And this is actually causing a huge problem for us in several areas, not only in transportation but also in our air quality as we watch this sprawl continue the move out into the surrounding counties.

We are, because of this a non-attainment area, Dallas County is actually facing air quality issues over this. And most of our problem is vehicular, which is a different issue that we are facing.

What we also are finding though, and what's happening with the inner core, is that we also are finding that people who are moving to the surrounding counties are not actually paying their share of costs that are now having to be developed such as the health care costs, the trauma centers that are left to be paid for, the people that are there in the prime city and in the first suburban. And they, as they move further out, then don't have the same costs, leaving obviously the costs to be born by those people that are still living in the first suburbs.

So we do have the health care problems with it and the transportation problems.

What we are seeing, however, and what Dallas has actually done is as the Senator said, we are focused on the prime city and our surrounding the first suburb, recognize that as goes that prime city, goes that first suburb. And so we have worked towards and have developed coalitions with the first suburbs and the prime city to continue on with the growth and the movement into downtown Dallas.

We have now gone to people living in downtown Dallas. The city is focused on tax abatements and the revitalization in using those for the revitalization of downtown Dallas.

So as we continue to revitalize, which we have got great movement in right now with downtown Dallas, we're actually able to maintain growth in those first suburbs because of the growth that we have for downtown Dallas.

So I think that's answered most of my questions as to what I had. And I'll answer any of the specific questions.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much.

I'd like to call next on Dan Onorato, the Allegheny County chief executive.

MR. ONORATO: Well, thank you.

Just so everyone knows, Allegheny County is also known now as Steeler country.

[Laughter.]

MR. ONORATO: Pittsburgh is in the middle of Allegheny County. And I want everyone to know my colleague from King County did pay off his bet.

[Laughter.]

MR. ONORATO: And there were questions as if he did or not. And for the media, I want them to know that he did pay off his bet. And our children's hospital now benefits from games from Microsoft that came in from the West Coast.

I just finished my two years, my second year of a four-year term as county executive. Allegheny County is a little different than

most of the counties here. We have not experienced any growth. If anything, we have declined over the last 30 or 40 years with the mid-'80s taking a big hit with the steel industry just collapsing in Southwestern Pennsylvania.

That's the bad news. The good news is though we're on the verge of starting to grow again. And what I've experience from city council and city government and now the county government is Allegheny County pretty much was dormant when it came to economics and revitalization and participation and let the municipalities deal with it, either the cities or the small municipalities.

And we have 130 municipalities in Allegheny County and 43 school districts. We have 1.3 million people that live in the county. Three hundred thousand live in the city of Pittsburgh and a million people live outside the city of Pittsburgh in the county. So you can see how fractured we are within the county.

Now I have municipalities that are very old, as old as the city. And some of them are very poor as a municipality. Meaning, they're lucky if they have one police car or one dump truck for public works.

And yet, all of the public polities over the last 50 years, like the rest of the country, have been pushing sprawl. And highways and the policies from the state and the federal government, we've watched these affluent suburbs continue to grow.

One of the things that I've implemented and we're working with the local municipalities is the county is doing a comprehensive plan, about a \$3 million plan, that will allow us to work with all of the municipalities and to have a comprehensive plan that allows one municipality to realize that what they do affects the municipality next to them.

And we just don't reshuffle retail developments around the county, as one closes a new one opens and it just keeps moving and no one really communicates with each other.

But more importantly, because of the steel industry's collapse in the '80s, we identified about 2,000 acres of waterfront property—as you know we have the three rivers that run through our county—we have a lot of waterfront property. Every other region of the country has figured out that if you develop waterfront property, people want to be there. It's very valuable.

Well, we have 2,000 acres of undeveloped land or abandoned land from industry. I believe if we change our policies, which we're doing now—the county is helping these municipalities—they can't do it. We have an economic development effort, working with our governor, Governor Rendell. We're getting a lot of state help to clean this property. And we're stepping in and either buying it as the county or cleaning it and looking for private developers.

But what it does, it drives all of the public policies back to the old urban core. Now these are municipalities that have water departments, that have sewage departments, that have schools. They have strong housing stock around them. And if you want to reverse this green sprawl that's going on, start redoing the brownfields.

The only reason there's no development on the brownfields 20 years later, after the steel industry closed, is because the costs of the cleanup. There isn't a private bank or a private developer that is going to take that on.

The threat of lawsuit and the threat of clean-up just prohibits it. So the government—I consider that a public infrastructure issue. If we clean it and we make the brownfields as easy to build on as the greenfields, they'll come back to where the old infrastructure is and will stop rebuilding the schools, rebuilding the roads, rebuilding the housing stock and get development back to where it's already been for 50, 60, 70 years.

That's the beauty of doing the brownfields.

Also, the county has to do it because the municipalities that are housing these brownfields, you simple can't do it.

I'll give you one example. We just bought 147 acres on waterfront. It touches five municipalities. And the five municipalities are probably all financially broke at this point in time. If the county

doesn't intervene, it doesn't happen. So we're focusing on brownfields. It brings it back to the old infrastructure.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. Herding 143 municipalities is harder than coaching the Steelers it sounds. And I want to talk—I want us to talk about that. I grew up in an old city called Fall River, Massachusetts, which is an old factory town south of Boston. Great town. And its rival in football was New Bedford. And which is another old city near by. And the two high schools—Durfee was in Fall River and New Bedford was in New Bedford. And Barney Frank, who represented both places, once called a meeting of the municipal officials and said, you've got to stop treating economic development as a Durfee-New Bedford game.

And I think that is a problem for all of our, for almost every one involved in this work.

I want to call upon now Ron Sims, the King County executive. Welcome, sir.

MR. SIMS: I'm sorry about your football team, by the way.

[Laughter.]

MR. SIMS: Up in our area, we're always hopeful. So we believe that next year we'll get our turn. Justice will be rendered and we will take the Super Bowl trophy back to where it belongs, which is in Seattle and the Seahawk Stadium. King County is the regional government by law and we're in a growth management county.

So let me break away some issues. First of all, what we saw in the trend, the increase in immigration, the number of young people, the fact that the suburbs or—we don't call them suburbs, but the areas that were traditionally older suburbs having older populations, the things that were discussed in the report, are very much characterized in what we call the areas outside of the city of Seattle.

But we're a growth management county. And King County as being the regional government is responsible for drawing what we call the urban rural lines, very definitive lines. Ninety-eight percent of all of our growth is in urban areas. Only two percent are in rural areas.

We lay out the parameters for growth for all cities. We have a comprehensive plan that we adopt. They must do their zoning. They must meet targets for residential, commercial, industrial capacity. If they don't do that, there are legal rights that people can sue their cities for failing to meet the comprehensive plans, including those adopted by King County.

What fascinates us, because we are a growth management county, all of our areas are urban. We adopted what we called a metropolitan approach. We don't have suburban communities. We don't even have suburban by definition. You're either urban or you are rural. There is no—and we don't break it between older suburbs and newer suburbs.

Everybody is urban or you're rural. And as a result of that, what is happened is that we've had an incredible explosion. We believe in densities. If you look at the fastest growing areas of King County today, they're downtown Seattle and downtown Bellevue, one of our traditional older suburbs. And a place called downtown Renton, where we have an incredible investment in transit-oriented development.

We believe we're a conservative county financially. We believe that sprawl is inefficient. And it's inefficient based upon costs. You know, for a county that's a very blue county, I think people have been struck by the fact that we believe sprawl is a waste of money, is an imprudent investment and we think that America proves it.

So our goal is to make sure that we densify the area. It is easier to get an investment where you have existing sewers, existing fire, existing police, existing hospitals, existing schools than to build new schools and then still have to rebuild your older communities.

So as result, what's happened is we have a pretty massive investment taking place in all of our urban areas. Housing prices have gone up. Schools are becoming very successful at getting people to invest in them. Our roadways are being restored. Our bridges are being repaired in those areas.

King County is responsible for the transit system, so we allocate new bus hours based upon where we see housing and job growth.

So 80 percent of all new bus hours are distributed outside of the city of Seattle because that's where the growth is occurring.

If you look at public health policy, if you look at again services because more poor people migrated outside of Seattle which has become very, very expensive and very, very young, we've had to reallocate services for public health, mental health, alcohol and drugs.

If you look at juvenile intervention programs, if you look at immigrant intervention programs, again, outside of Seattle rather than in that area.

Our goal was to say if we're going to be an urban area, meet the needs of an entire urban area, and make those kinds of investments.

Arts money, we used to have a downtown core where all of the arts money, the symphony was downtown, the major art museums were downtown. Once we decided to have urban-rural areas, then we began to take arts monies that we control and invest that throughout all of the suburban areas, but again, we call them urban areas, so that we could get increased arts activity. We've had some fascinating responses. And I'll give you some examples of where federal policy interfaces very poorly with us.

There was an agreement between the county as a provider of services for the poor and the city of Seattle that we would take our applications for homeless money and that we would deal with homelessness throughout the entire urban area, that it wasn't just a

central-city problem. We sent the grants back to Washington, D.C. Washington, D.C. promptly rejected our applications, gave them all to Seattle. Seattle and King County, they had to appeal through their processes and remind people that poverty isn't solely an issue of large primary cities.

Then I had to fly back with the mayor. We had to go through this very extensive process of pointing out, look, we just want to serve poor people throughout our area in a unified fashion because they move throughout the entire area for services, and we got an agreement there. The same thing was true when they changed the work force act so that rather than have private industry councils, you had work force councils with a lot of businesses. We applied for a joint application. By statute there wasn't even capacity to do that. So we had to get the Department of Labor to do an administrative amendment allowing for an entire region of an urban area to be able to apply for work force funds. They were—illegally, but what the heck.

[Laughter.]

MR. SIMS: What we find is that when you talk about the older suburbs and, again, we say that we're in a metropolitan century, so we will quickly banish the issues of older suburbs and exurbs, that we will just have large urban areas, this will be a metropolitan century. We don't think the federal apparatus either rewards that or is sensitive to that

because we're in a bad habit of only looking at primary cities and not looking at we think general metropolitan growth.

We do see the shift. In our county, the densities have attracted an incredible amount of talent. We have a problem of housing affordability. The housing prices throughout the whole county have gone up like everywhere else, but in our area, the east side areas, even the older areas in our east side, the average housing now is sold for \$453,000, in the city of Seattle it's \$357,000, in South County where you can actually get a chance at a house it's still \$310,000. So we have a huge problem providing that first time housing opportunity. But nonetheless, our growth has been extraordinary, our immigration has been extraordinary, our companies, not only Microsoft, but Amazon.com and Starbucks headquarters are there and have done incredibly well. So we have the best of all worlds, but we have some of the greatest challenges.

The poverty rates, the haves and have not's gap, grew faster in our area than anywhere in the United States, so now strategically we've said to those older communities and those newer growth areas as well as Seattle that we fundamentally have to address the issue of providing affordable housing and to begin to address poverty. What we've found is that poor people were pushed to one particular community, what we call the White Center community, and forgotten, and that was by design. We've had to come back and tell people that is not going to happen. We have a policy called annexation areas where cities are to

designate their spheres of influence for purposes of assuming responsibility for those areas over time. White Center had no takers, the only place in the state of Washington that had no takers at all. We through our authority said that the city will take that area and work with the state government as well as the city government and the private sector to get about \$500 million of new investment in that community, and now everybody wants it.

But again, we believe in targeted investments where we have poor people. The rising tide should lift all boats. There will be more and more questions, but I like the report because I think it addressed what we call a fundamental change that needs to take place at the national level which is to understand it's just not central cities or primary cities that we need to be concerned about, it is the areas around them. In our case, it's just an entire metropolitan area where we see many of the trends, some of them challenges, often many of them very, very encouraging, but it was a very, very good report and I was very pleased to see it.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much. You should all know what kind of a skilled politician Mr. Sims is. He recently led an effort to change the name of King County, even though it's still called King County, which is a trick all by itself. The original King County was named after a Vice President of the United States who had been a slave holder and the county was renamed in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King. I believe this is quite a brilliant act, because many of you know, people

hate to change the name of the place they're from. So he managed to send a very powerful message on behalf of social justice and everybody could still call it King County.

[Applause.]

MR. DIONNE: Welcome to Nassau County Executive Tom Suozzi.

MR. SUOZZI: We're going to name Nassau County after Nassau in the Bahamas.

MR. DIONNE: They've got a lot of banking.

[Laughter.]

MR. SUOZZI: I'm glad to go after Ron because we are completely at opposite ends of the spectrum. One size does not fit all with first suburbs.

We are not a growth management county. We have no growth in our county. We were once the fastest-growing county in the United States of America when Levittown was first built as one of the first recognized suburbs in the country, and we went from 400,000 people when our suburbs started in 1947, to 1.2 million people in 1960. We had this explosive growth over a very short period of time. We had 1.5 million people in the 1970s, now we're 1.3 million people. Our population has stopped growing.

We were suburb sprawling throughout that entire period with massive residential home building going on in the 1950s, 1960s, and

1970s, tremendous commercial building in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, and now our property tax base is the same as it was in the early 1990s. We are suburban sprawled. We are on Long Island and there is no place left for us to grow. We're an island. There is no place left for us to grow under the paradigm, the rules, the zoning that was set up in the early 1940s and 1950s. Single-family homes without going up much beyond two or three stories is not going to create any growth in our county for the future.

So what we want to do in our county is become not post-suburban or new urbanism or any of the other different descriptions that have been made, we want to be new suburbia, and we want to be much like what has been described what's happening in King County. We have no city core. We are a series of small municipalities. We are a suburb of New York City. But we want to see new suburbia be a marriage between those things that we love about suburbia that we want to keep, and address our problems that we have in our no-growth environment. So we want to keep our single-family homes and the nice park down the street with the baseball field and low crime and low unemployment and good schools and great health care, next to New York City, wonderful natural environment, we want to keep all that good stuff, but we have serious problems that we have to address.

We have incredibly high property taxes related to our no-growth economy, no growth in our revenue, but tremendous growth in our

expenses, much of which is pushed down on us from the State of New York. We see tremendous growth in our expenses but no growth in our revenue, so our property taxes are making up the difference. New York State has the highest local taxes in the United States of America, 72 percent above the national average. Our county on Long Island is at the high end of that spectrum.

The second problem we have is traffic is getting worse every single day because when we were designed in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, the idea of mass transit was something that people were trying to get away from. For us to survive in the future, we have to create a transit system. We have to put the genie back in the bottle. Our growth is not fueled by our transit system because we don't have a transit system. We only have a commutation system to get from the suburb, the bedroom community, into Manhattan, even though we're not just a bedroom community as Senator Clinton pointed out earlier.

We have young people leaving us in droves because they can't afford to buy a house there. We lost 20 percent of our population between the ages of 18 and 34 in the past 10 years. Our home values are incredibly expensive. Median home price is \$480,000 in Nassau County.

And fourth, we have these pockets of poverty that have been ignored for a long period of time. So our new suburbia is a 10-point plan that we've outlined which is to encourage three types of growth, high-skilled, high-tech industry, sports, entertainment and tourism, and

housing for the next generation of young people. There are three infrastructure supports. We want to preserve any open space we have left, we want to build a transportation system so you can get from the entire region into our central core that we want to try and create, and third, we want to try and help those pockets of poverty that exist.

There are four places where suburban sprawl, no place to grow under the existing model, the existing zoning, we want to encourage growth, similar to some of the things we've heard here already.

Downtowns. We want to make our downtowns more vibrant. We want to go up. We want to have people living in the downtowns. It's antithetical to the suburban model to have that type of growth. We want to have more density in our downtown areas. Second, more brownfields. We want to recycle and reuse our former industrial properties, our contaminated sites or perceived to be contaminated sites. It's better to use those sites than use up our precious remaining open space that we have, and it's inefficient as Ron pointed out as well. It's not worth the money that you have to invest in suburban sprawl.

Third, our emerging minority communities where there is tremendous purchasing power that's always been there, similar to Harlem in New York City where there was always wealth there and once they started investment, it's now an economic boomtown. Sixty percent of the minorities in Nassau County are homeowners; it's just that there is no commercial development in the minority communities.

Fourth, a place where we will call the Nassau Center, the Nassau Hub, which we want to make really the downtown of Nassau County with sports, entertainment and tourism, where the Islanders are, the Coliseum is, with more high-skilled, high-tech industry, with more cultural activities, with next generation housing for young people and for our workers.

There is one thing you'll notice that I saw that really jumped out at me in the map that was presented in the Brookings report that they just presented and that is where is the location of all of these first suburbs, where are they located, and there is something they all share in common. You might first want to say that they're all in Blue States. They're not. Texas is not a Blue State. It's a Red State. They're mainly Blue States. But the thing that they do share in common is they're all donor states. They all give a lot more money to the federal government than they get back. They are donor states. They are good investments, these communities. As we saw, they're college educated, there is high wealth, and there are high home values. These are good investments, these communities. They are donors to the federal government as opposed to takers. They're a good place to invest in.

The Red States where we are seeing suburban sprawl happen more than any place else where the newer suburbs are being created are taker states for the most part. What's happening is we are funding growth in the rest of the United States of America in newer communities which

is nice for the newer communities, but it's inefficient as Ron pointed out because we're paying for new roads and new sewers and new schools and new hospitals and new everything at the expense of our first suburbs. I believe that if we ignore this problem we'll end with a cycle of the death of the cities where they were growing, growing, growing and growing, they hit a wall, and in the 1970s we saw the death of the cities. The suburbs, if they don't continue to grow, if they don't continue to be invested in, will face a similar decline, not around the corner, not tomorrow, not in the next 10, 15, or 20 years, but they will face a decline unless we reinvest in them and make them centers for economic growth. That also helps the rest of the country because of the great wealth that they generate on behalf of the rest of the country.

We need to coalesce as a group to figure out how we can get investment into our older suburbs to try and head in a direction that Ron is at already which is in King County which is to encourage growth that is smart growth that encourages high-skilled, high-tech investments, sports, entertainment and tourism, and housing for the generation. You still have to do the housing for the next generation, so you're not all the way there yet, but you're a good model for the rest of us to follow.

Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. Watch out, King County and Allegheny County, high-tech, sports and entertainment is

going to steal Microsoft from King County and the Steelers from Allegheny County.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: I was very grateful you made the point on donor states, an obsession of the late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan who used to do a study every year. This is way beyond our discussion today, but it has always struck me as fascinating that the Red States which attack the federal government get a lot of money from it, and the Blue States which support the federal government somehow seem to get on the short end, but that's another conference that Bruce can organize.

MR. : I hope I'll be invited to that one.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: I want to welcome Chris Zimmerman, the Chairman of the Arlington County Board. We have a judge, a chairman and some executives. We have a lot of power here.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Our form of government is a little different. We have a county manager system. In fact, among the things we claim is that we were the first jurisdiction in America to adopt the county manager system by referendum in 1932 or something like that. We have an elected five-member board, elected at large of which I am one and the current chairman.

We exist really because of the deal that created the National Capital here and George Washington getting to pick where it went and

the surveying of the 10-mile square. We were the part in Virginia because Washington wanted some in Virginia. Then about 60 or 70 years into the country they decided that the government was never going to need land over there and they retroceded it to give it back to Virginia. So we're the part, you can see it on the map, you can see the lines, that used to be in the District of Columbia, and for that reason it is a separate jurisdiction. Otherwise, we'd be just in the middle of that huge, sprawling suburb of Fairfax. So that's why we exist as an independent jurisdiction.

But basically, nobody lived there for a long time. It was the rural part outside of the then town and city of Alexandria and we didn't really have suburban growth as early in this region as you had it in older cities in the Northeast because the government hadn't grown. Up until 1920, it was basically a rural place, and it was really in the 1930s and 1940s. It grew ahead of some other first suburbs, but it had nothing really there to speak of before that at that time. We went from like 27,000 people in 1930, to 54,000 people in 1940, to 135,000 people in 1950. It really boomed then and leveled off. Around 1960 it got up to around 160,000, in 1970 to 174,000, and then it went down. What you had was a rural period and then a bedroom community. Until we started winning awards for smart growth and they started giving those things out, most people only knew us because of the cemetery. In fact, in the 1960s

it was said that Arlington was America's graveyard and the capital's bedroom. We were one of the first bedroom communities in America.

[Laughter.]

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And that's what happened. Then of course the movement out to the newer suburbs was in full swing and the population declined, the school population in particular plummeted, and there was very little investment in the community. By the late 1970s, every shopping center you could tell was built in the 1940s and 1950s and not anything had been put into them since then. People who wanted to go to any significant shopping left the county; you went downtown to restaurants and theaters, you went out to the newer places like Tysons Corner in Springfield to go to shopping malls. It was following a pattern that inner-ring suburbs all around the country had seen.

Then some very enlightened people who were my predecessors figured out something. I still don't know how they figured it out, when they did, because nobody was figuring it out then, that, number one, it would be a good idea to invest in public transportation specifically at a time when no one was doing that. I know in Atlanta and San Francisco at the same time they got ideas to build subways, too, and they did it, and those three systems, Metro here and BART and MARTA, were developed around the same time. I don't know how people figured that out at that time. It was certainly counter-trend.

But the key thing that they figured out in Arlington that you don't see in very many places until much more recently is really the idea of trans-oriented development. They really went whole hog for it and they built a whole idea of we would not only go in for Metro which was obviously coming with a federal push for D.C., and there was a fair amount of support in Maryland. Just to give you an idea, there are 86 stations in the Metro system which is about 106 miles now of track. Only 20 of those stations are on the Virginia side of the river; 11 of the 20 are in Arlington. What I didn't say was Arlington is the smallest county geographically in America. It's only 26 square miles. It's more of a town than a county in many ways. Fairfax County is 400 square miles and they have five stations. We're 26 square miles and we have 11.

[End Tape 1 Side A. Begin Side B.]

MR. ZIMMERMAN: [In progress] —really went into this idea. They not only went in for the big money that was necessary to pay for that which did involve a considerable local match, but they also went in for the idea that that was going to be your key to the whole development. At the time they were trying to preserve, much as the way I think in Nassau County they're talking about an idea of a distinction of we're not the city, but what do we want to be, and we want to preserve those single-family houses and small garden apartments that were what fueled the development and most people lived in in the 1930s, 1940s, 1950s and 1960s. So they came up with a formula which at the time they

called the Bull's Eye pattern. At each of these stations there is a bull's eye and within a quarter to a third to half a mile or so they're concentrate high-density development. But the deal with the community was that everything else we're going to keep the way it is. You're going to keep your single-family neighborhoods, your parks and all that, and we're going to put this density right up next to the station.

They did that and it's taken quite some time for it to actually grow, but a generation later it has really flourished. As a result, instead of being a bedroom community, we're now an economic center. We have a nighttime resident population of around 200,000 people. We have a daytime population that is somewhere above 270,000 to 280,000 probably because people are coming in there to work. In those areas where the transit was developed, we now have more office space than downtown Denver, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Milwaukee, a whole list of cities, something between 30 and 40 million square feet of private office space, not counting of course the biggest office building in the world, the Pentagon, a federal building they did wind up needing to put in what is now Arlington as it turned out. We have a very vibrant economic center and a lot of business with more people in the daytime than at nighttime.

Along with that came a real change in the way of thinking. While all this development occurred beginning in the 1980s, there was a lot of thinking about it and then that sort of coincided with some of the new ideas that have emerged in this country, the rebirth of the idea of

urbanism as a good thing. I'm sure we all remember that urban was always a pejorative up until about, I don't know, 10 or 15 years ago, maybe, and maybe even less than that.

One of the big changes in my community really was in the 1990s as this all began and new people came into this places that were created, the new residential areas around the Metro stations, was the acceptance of the urban identity so that we don't call ourselves suburb anymore. We kind of consider it a knock. If somebody calls us a suburb, we sort of say, who are you calling suburban?

[Laughter.]

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I get that from the D.C. people sometimes. But we really have embraced the idea of urbanism as a good thing and the kind of community that we want to be, and all those terms have been quite successful. We are very proud to have gotten EPA's first Smart Growth Award for overall excellence in 2002. I got to keep bragging about that as long as I can. It's going to run out at some point.

[Laughter.]

MR. ZIMMERMAN: We do exhibit a lot of the characteristics that were talked about. It is a highly educated, generally high-income community, although all of our people are not high income. We are extremely diverse. We have a substantial population that does not speak English in the home. They speak somewhere between 70 and 100 languages. There was an earlier Brookings study a few years ago

that talked specifically about the Zip code in which I live. I called it the world in a Zip code a few years ago because it's not only that we have a diverse population in gross terms, it's not just that there is a large foreign-born population, but they're from everywhere. About a fifth of my county is Hispanic, but in other places that means a large population of Mexican-Americans, a large population of Puerto Rican-Americans. In my community it means people from 15 different countries. They're from Central America, they're from South America. They're from all over. We have large populations from East Africa, West Africa and Asia. It is really extraordinarily diverse.

That's one of the things we like about it, and one of the things we're concerned about is the threat of losing that because of some of the market forces that were described in a few of the other communities as well, in particular, the impact on housing. Our housing costs have really risen phenomenally. The average house price is probably something half a million dollars, and that would be including town houses and condos. I saw an ad yesterday for a house that was a single-story rambler, probably a 40- or 50-year-old structure, three bedrooms. A few years ago it probably would have gone for around \$200,000, \$250,000 maybe; \$750,000 is the asking price, and that's not atypical. In the first five years of this decade our community lost just about 50 percent of the housing that was affordable to people at 60 percent of our median income which is our usual benchmark for

affordable housing disappeared from 2000 to 2005 just because of rising rents. And if you go a little bit lower than that, it's been three-quarters loss and almost total loss once you get to 40 percent of median income.

More than half our folks live in rental housing. That's been true for decades in Arlington. Some of them are quite high income. A lot of people are paying \$2- to \$3,000 a month to live in very nice places, and also our lowest income members of community. But at the low end they are really getting squeezed, and that is our number one policy concern.

There is a paradox, and this is one of the policy things that was talked about, we have an interesting paradox in being a high-income community, but that doesn't necessarily help the people in our community who aren't high income perhaps more so than in some other places because in part of the tax structure. One thing I should mention is we're in Virginia which means a couple of things. One is that property rights are taken to a greater extreme than in any other places. And other is we have something called the Dillon Rule, which if you don't know what that is, if you know what Home Rule is, this is the opposite end of the spectrum. We have to say mother, may I, to do anything in county government, and go to a state that is not necessarily sympathetic to our situation at all.

But the tax structure, whereas in a place like Nassau you've got all these different governments and single-purpose governments and

they all have a different taxing authority which is its own set of problems, we have a unified local government which is mostly a good thing. There are no separate cities, towns or villages. There's one county government which could be called the city government. It's one government. It's one school district. We have all the budgetary authority and that's good that that's concentrated and can cover everything.

On the other hand, we are limited to property tax, and although my county generates an awful lot of income in sales tax, that essentially goes to the state which distributes things in various ways including by formula, and the school's formula is based again on the overall income levels that you have. It's somewhat like the situation that Senator Clinton was talking about where a county could be worse off but still get less money in the end.

What happens with us is because we have high-income paying those taxes, our index on the school formula is very low, so we don't get much back. That means that the incomes from the high-income people in my community are paying for schools in other communities in other parts of the state, but that doesn't do any good for the low-income people, and as a whole, the school population is lower income on average than the general population. So that's one of the ways in which the structure of things really doesn't serve our needs very well.

We have other challenges. Transportation continues to be a big thing. We need more investment in the infrastructure than we have.

We're working hard to secure better funding for that. Although our growth has been quite successful and we're still a hot market and all that, we do have the challenge of BRAC that is the defense department shifting which is affecting us. In the last round of BRAC, we lost more than any other community in America, but most of the communities get some asset out of it. They leave a base or something and you have a new piece of real estate you're thinking about doing something with. We don't get anything out of it because what they're doing is pulling out of leased space, so we have space that had been paying taxes and it's office that's full, we have to refill and we don't get anything in the form of an asset. But we're hopeful and generally pretty confident that our location is good, that the basic form of development is the right one for the future, and that if we continue to build out the way we have, we'll be an attractive location and hopefully the future will be even better. Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much. I was grateful for Mr. Zimmerman's quip about Arlington Cemetery. I come from Massachusetts where we have many jurisdictions that honor the dead more than most of the country because we believe you don't lose your right to vote just because you find yourself in a cemetery.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: Looking around this room, there is more intelligence on these issues gathered together since Lewis Mumford or

Jane Jacobs dined alone, so I don't want to monopolize the questions. I want to focus on a couple of issues here and then I'm going to turn to Bruce who is going to try to push the discussion along. Then I want to bring as many people as we can into the discussion. We have mikes that are going to go around the room. If we don't, people can just speak loudly.

I wanted to ask two basic questions. The first is a political question, but it's politics linked to substance. If you could comment on, this whole notion of first suburbs is in a sense, don't tell anybody this, but this is Bruce's way of making sure that suburban as well as urban jurisdictions actually care about issues affecting the poor and sprawl and the like. I think it raises an interesting question which is how are your interests aligned relative to the older cities that are part of your jurisdiction versus the newer development? In your case, it would be sort of Arlington and Loudoun versus, say D.C., although that's an odd case because D.C. is over the state line. But could each of you talk, maybe I could start with the Judge, where you have a kind of more unitarian—

JUDGE KELIHER: I went first last time. I think somebody else—

MR. DIONNE: Because you were so disciplined that I wanted you to have more time to speak.

[Laughter.]

JUDGE KELIHER: Actually, the issues that I see, and I'm going to echo some of the comments that were made as far as these gaps are concerned, what we are actually experiencing is we're watching all of the money go to these primary cities. Therefore, in Dallas, taking care of the homeless has become the city of Dallas's issue to have to deal with. When people even say to me, why is that the city of Dallas's problem to have to deal with the homeless, it's because the city of Dallas is getting all of the money to have to deal with the homeless and we can't seem to get the focus that this ought to be much more of a regional issue. Therefore, as long as the city of Dallas gets all the money and continues to provide all the services in the city, the poor continue to live within the city of Dallas because we don't also offer those services elsewhere throughout the community and it becomes the primary concern of the city of Dallas.

MR. DIONNE: So it promotes concentrated poverty, where policy is supposed to be trying to break that up.

JUDGE KELIHER: It does, right. When we try to work together, the same situation of trying to get this to be more of a community issue, we can't get the money from the feds distributed on a community-wide basis, and it doesn't come to the county, it actually goes then to the city.

It's interesting to listen to governmental make-up. We also have some of the same quirks that you all have in Arlington. In the state

of Texas, the counties have no rule-making authority so we are merely an extension of the state. So if the state doesn't give you the authority to do something, we don't have the authority to do anything.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Tom?

MR. SUOZZI: In our case, and I'm sure in everybody's case, the primary city is the mother ship. It's essential that New York City is successful, it's essential that New York City is vibrant, it's essential that New York City is successful, because a lot of our residents work in the city and generate tremendous amounts of income in the city as well as their incomes that they bring home to Nassau County that supports the statewide government, for example.

MR. DIONNE: By the way, there are strong rumors he's running for Governor of New York, just so you know, so those comments will go down very well.

MR. SUOZZI: Right. So we love New York City.

[Laughter.]

MR. SUOZZI: At the same time, there is a problem that exists for our counties that's been alluded to here, that as the statistics of the report show, we have relatively high incomes, high property values, all these different positive attributes. But we still have within our suburbs, and I'm sure the other suburbs, the pockets of poverty that exist and the problems. Pockets of poverty is one part. All the people that moved there between 1947 and 1960 are now 40 or 50 years older.

They're all senior citizens. They're house rich, but they're income poor. So when the state looks at us or even the federal government looks at us through the prism of some formula as a community as a whole, we are perceived as being this wealthy place and, therefore, not eligible for the state and federal aid that we need. The burden falls on our property taxpayers, property taxpayers who include people who are pockets of poverty, senior citizens who are on a fixed income who are house rich but are income poor. So the failure to recognize that we have a set of problems that exist, poverty, senior citizens, high property taxes, that are not taken into consideration by the state government or by the federal government when looking at the problems that we have.

When we're looked at as a whole, they say things are pretty good there in Nassau County, it's a high-wealth community, but we do not have that wealth available to us at the county or local town and village level to address our problems because we're already overtaxes on our property taxes. We need to have the assistance, utilizing our money that we gave to the state and the federal government in the first place, to help us solve the problems that exist in these first suburbs. They are not monolithic communities. They have different problems that exist.

Again I want to emphasize, they're good investments. When you make an investment, you're looking what the rate of return is. Investments in the first suburbs yield high rates of return in what they give back to the state and federal governments in the form of income

taxes and economic wealth that is generated to support all the other problems that exist.

MR. DIONNE: Mr. Onorato, do you want to take that on?

MR. ONORATO: Where we come from in Allegheny is a little different. The county actually controls the entire human service budget, not just for the city, but for the 129 municipalities also. So the homeless the county deals with through pass-through money. Also the county handles the transportation. The Port Authority of Allegheny County handles all the mass transit. The county also handles the Airport Authority.

MR. DIONNE: You can blame him for everything.

JUDGE KELIHER: No kidding.

MR. ONORATO: But what I discovered is that as the county and the federal government and the state rethinks public housing, for example, what used to be in stacked buildings and they're now coming down and a lot of vouchers are being given out, there is no planning for it. The idea of a voucher was that people could live in any neighborhood and you sort of would integrate people into neighborhoods. That's not what's happening. The reality is the vouchers go to the areas where the housing is very cheap, where there's a big building. You have somebody that might have passed away, somebody inherits it and they get real easy rent coming in, and now you have concentrated areas where vouchers are doing and so you don't have any integration that was intended, and you're

having pockets of poverty following the vouchers now, too. That's the bad news. The good news is that in my situation the county has a chance now because we do control those agencies to put some planning in place county-wide.

I do want to comment on the suburbs that surround the city. That's really I believe where the battleground is for all these issues, and here's why. In our area, the city is 300,000 people out of 1.3 million in the county. We know how the city usually votes. It's heavily Democratic; it's 5 to 1 registration. If you go to the outreaches of the county where the newest suburbs are, pretty affluent, and they're pretty consistent. It's a non-diverse group, 99 percent white European, very affluent. If you go to the middle part, that's where the mix is. If you look at the races in our county over the last several cycles, that's where the swing vote is. They're the ones looking for the issues of health care, are looking for federal funding for student loans. They're the ones that are looking for affordable housing. These are the issues, and that's where a lot of the people live in that ring, and that's the battleground for a lot of these issues that we're talking about. Yet, it seems to be missed right now during the national debate and I think you're going to see that become the focus because of the number of people that live there and the ability of this vote to swing on a given issue.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Does anybody else want to take that question?

MR. SIMS: I live in an older Seattle neighborhood and my neighborhood votes the same way that all of the first-time or what we call the older suburbs vote. It's amazing. Got to be green, got to be environmental, got to be fiscally conservative, got to be socially active particularly on issues of marriage equality and on discrimination against gays and lesbians.

This last election in 2006 we saw something that was unprecedented in our area is which is almost the complete galvanization by gender. Women locked up in numbers we had never seen before on progressive issues. It was refreshing, and it was in those areas which are increasingly dense.

MR. DIONNE: Do you mean 2006 or 2004?

MR. SIMS: The 2005 elections.

MR. DIONNE: Counting the votes for the next one is what I was wondering.

[Laughter.]

MR. SIMS: We saw it across gender, we saw it across race, income. The gap was 21 points. Never had seen that before. What we say is, as go women, soon come men.

[Laughter.]

MR. SIMS: But it's interesting because political institutions are still trying to define the issue as there is a gap. Voters are not reflecting that at all, so the political institutions are lagging behind it.

I'll give you some other issues, going back to kind of the central thesis about why it's important to see the investment and reinvestment in all cities and all urban areas, particularly the ones that are longer established. We did a seminal study with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and found out that sprawl is not healthy. We found out in our area that actually most of our people were fit except for the county exec because the density has created walkable neighborhoods.

Secondly, we just got out of some work on global warming with the University of Washington and Stanford that we're now going to impose upon our land use because we now can show that if you look at how to mitigate global warming, you can't do that without reinvesting in your older suburbs or your cities, you got to make urban areas work and you got to stop sprawl because it simply exacerbates the global warming environment. So you can't say I'm going to fight global warming, but I'm going to go ahead and allow sprawl.

Secondly, when our economists looked at the issue of 2050 and that is the value of investments, we saw that sprawl was the absolute worst investment in terms of any resource you could make, that if you were going to look at carbon crediting, carbon budgeting, carbon values, reduction of CO₂, the best strategy was reinvestment in your urban areas. If you look at the ability to reduce what we call the heat print, an area of defined density was much lower in effect than it was in areas that had sprawled out.

I look and say if you're going to talk about global warming, if you're going to talk about health, if you're going to talk about just the fundamentals of money, you've got to back into your first suburbs and this country has make a decision at the national level about whether we're going to be all talk on the issue of global warming or are we going to actually do something about it, and if you're going to do something about it, you put the money in your existing urban areas, you put your growth in your existing urban areas, of do it what we're doing now which is be absolutely one of the world's greatest hypocrites talking about what we're going to do for future generations at trying to mitigate global warming.

MR. SUOZZI: And that should be one of the things that unifies is our first suburbs is the idea of discouraging new sprawl. We've seen sprawl in our places. We need to as a group discourage new sprawl and instead reinvest not only in our urban centers, but also in our first suburb centers to prevent new sprawl. People are leaving our first suburbs because of the expense of living there because of the decline in different neighborhoods of pockets of poverty. We need to invest in those places to prevent sprawl from happening in other places which is inefficient, which is unhealthful, which is more costly, which uses up our open space and has all these negative attributes, and I think that's a very big policy point that should be uniting all of us.

I just want to point out about the politics question, I'm curious about what the politics was in the other places. Our county was

historically Republican for 100 years. I'm the first Democrat with a Democratic Legislature since 1917. I know that four of us are Democrats up here with one Republican, but was Allegheny originally Republican or has it always been Democratic?

MR. ONORATO: It was Democratic for about 6 years, and before I took office the county had 8 years of Republican rule, but it's historically Democratic.

JUDGE KELIHER: We're switching. Actually, we've been Democrat, then we went Republican, and we're now fifty-fifty.

MR. DIONNE: I saw Bruce's eyes light up when Mr. Sims mentioned global warming. The next project of the Urban and Metropolitan Program is going to be on global warming. I could see it in his eyes.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: I want to put a question on the table but don't want you to answer it right away, and I want to turn to Bruce in the audience. The question I wanted to—your heads is something Mr. Suozzi raised which I think is such an interesting paradox. In many of these first suburbs you have extraordinary wealth being created in housing values and you have a lot of people moving to the exurbs because they can't afford to live in many of the first suburbs. So that's on the one side.

On the other side, the population moving to the outer suburbs tends to be reasonably affluent, whereas you guys still have some of the problems that are associated with urban areas. It just strikes me as a kind of nightmarishly complicated policy problem which is why I'm turning to Bruce at this moment.

MR. KATZ: I actually want to get some other questions from the audience, so I'll just say something and then we'll move to other questions.

I'm sort of reminded of a Henny Youngman sort of joke, you're not getting any respect, and so when we talk about these federal policies, infrastructure, brownfields, housing, having served in the Clinton administration, Mike Stegman is here, others are here. I'm trying to remember when we met with groups of urban county leaders as opposed to mayors. HUD was like open for business with mayors. Mayors were just coming through the door every day. Urban county leaders, probably not. Part of it is a question, and then we'll ask some more, do you find yourselves organized as a collective in some respects? There are only 64 first suburb counties in the United States. Obviously, a diversity of experience and a diversity of growth, but there's not a hell of a lot of you really when it comes down to it.

You sort of maybe fit under the National Association of Counties and maybe some of your municipalities hang out with the League of Cities. But as we go forward, one last question, but we'll get

some more in here, will it take some different kind of networking and different kind of organizing across these counties to ultimately get the respect you deserve from the feds and the states?

MR. DIONNE: That was Bruce's first promise as HUD Secretary, by the way. When he becomes HUD Secretary, his doors are going to be open to you guys.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: Does somebody want to take on the organizing question?

MR. : NACO has what we call LUC, Large Urban Counties and there's a County Executives Association. So I think that process has already started where people are trying. The County Executives Association includes the mayor of New Orleans, for instance, Jacksonville, Louisville, Kentucky, San Francisco, Denver, Colorado, where the city's boundaries and the county boundaries are contiguous.

MR. SUOZZI: The growth in the power of the mayors came after the death of the cities in the 1970s. When New York City and Chicago and other cities were in serious decline, there was a massive effort that started in the late 1970s or early 1980s to resurrect the cities and they received a lot of political attention because it was essential to save those places. We're seeing the fruits of that now. New York City is getting better all the time. Other cities are getting better. They're being

beautified, their parks are being enhanced, their income tax revenues are going up, so they are emerging now.

What our challenge is is to figure out how do we get a focus on the first suburbs before they experience some sort of serious decline that would force everybody to do it. A lot of things don't move often until there's a crisis. We are in the pre-crisis stage for many of us.

MR. SIMS: Bruce knows that one of the major issues under the previous administration was the fact that they created a county desk in HUD. The cities have full access to HUD, but we were given a county desk.

[Laughter.]

MR. SIMS: And there are 3,600 counties and only about 70 of them have populations over three-quarters of a million. The rest of them were 10,000. The federal government has never ever really acknowledged urban centers and urban leadership and urban issues on a metropolitan basis.

I can remember trying to get into meetings and the mayor of Seattle could get right in. The mayor of Seattle represents 500,000 people. I have regional authority inside Seattle on a whole series of issues, and we represent 1.8 million people. It took a while for people to say, hold on a second, you guys are actually larger than the city of Seattle? Larger by employment, our county budget is bigger.

MR. SUOZZI: It's worse than that, because I was the mayor a small city of 30,000 people before I became county executive. I had access to the White House and to HUD as the mayor of the city of Glen Cove even though we were a small city because cities had received attention because of—you don't need more than 70 big counties. You need a few big major players to get attention to the issue and then everybody else comes in along with you. Small cities, I came to the National Conference of Mayors meetings and met with the President and met with the leaders and got access to HUD and everything else, it wasn't a function of size. It was a function that the cities because they had gone through such serious decline received a tremendous amount of attention, and then all the mayors came in together.

JUDGE KELIHER: But in response to the question, they do band together and the large urban counties have not banded together. We saw this with homeland security dollars to get distributed. And needless to say, as a major factor in the Katrina evacuees, all of a sudden you ended up having the county who was responsible for a whole lot of that homeland security which fell on me, versus what the city of Dallas was going to be done, versus what homeland security dollars that had been given out on an individual city basis. We could deal with the evacuees on an individual city basis. The evacuees had to be distributed out to larger areas, and yet it was the first time that you ended up having a

situation where it became so much more obvious that the counties play a bigger role.

But we've really in my opinion not done a good job of banding together. We finally did it in Texas on the urban cities fighting the transportation issues because the smaller counties would actually come in in the smaller cities and they ended up having a larger voice in our state legislature for transportation dollars. So all of the people living in the larger urban areas weren't getting as much transportation dollars as the rural areas were getting in transportation. So we finally all got together and banded together to talk about those things.

But I don't see it really happening at the large urban county level. And I agree with you maybe we need to have a louder voice with the NACO group about these issues because these issues are now getting much bigger to me than individual city issues.

MR. DIONNE: Let me get a bunch of people in and come back. By the way, Mr. Sims is going to change names of things, so it's now the Department of Housing and Metropolitan Development that we're going to see, and I think it is fascinating if they were going to do that change, although HMUD doesn't work as well as HUD.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: How much time do we have? Ten or fifteen minutes. Can I bring in at least a couple of people at a time? I want to bring in Tony Downs in the back there, maybe the gentleman in the back

row, and that lady over there. Let me bring in three folks, and then I'll bring in three more in the next round toward the front. Tony?

MR. DOWNS: I've heard a lot of conversation against sprawl as sprawl being a terrible thing, but sprawl is the cause of all of your growth originally. As you said about Nassau County, you were the result of sprawl, and so was King County the result of sprawl. The reason why people are going into sprawl now is that they can't afford to live in your counties. The reason why sprawl is still very popular and it's much more popular than high-density living in urban counties is that people can move out to locations where land costs less and they don't have the full costs of all the interior part of the city's infrastructure, and they can get all of the qualities of living at a price they can afford which they can't do in your communities. So what are you going to do about it?

You can rail against sprawl all you want, but unless you can produce affordable housing within your communities, all your talking is going to accomplish absolutely nothing.

MR. DIONNE: Can everybody hold off on that? Tony always asks the hard and good questions, because I think that's a central question.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: But let me bring in a couple other folks. There was a gentleman back there with the dark hair, and then the lady a few rows in front of him.

MR. MILLS: Good morning. My name is Joel Mills. I'm a consultant that does community building and problem-solving work. I just wanted to say it's great to see a policy think tank talking about community renewal. John Gardner would certainly be proud of the discussion that we're having this morning.

Because we have local officials this morning, I wanted to see if they could address a little bit different aspect of this discussion and one that I see as being at least as important if not more important than the policy piece itself, and that's the process piece. At the local level, most public officials can talk a good game on collaboration, but in practice the experience is quite mixed. Just in the Washington area we've seen a number of policy responses or attempted policy responses to some of these new issues, day laborer issues, transportation, housing, backfire on local jurisdictions because they didn't manage process very well. I'm hoping to hear a little bit more about how you guys manage the process piece of this.

MR. DIONNE: The lady right there.

MS. GIBSON: My name is Kimberly Gibson and I run the First Suburbs Consortium of Ohio. I'm glad to be here today, and I'm so excited that this kind of thing is happening. It's been a long time coming, and Bruce is an amazing convener.

I want to talk today about the concept of the American values system butting up against its current economic reality.

Specifically, we've heard a lot about reinventing and reinvigorating these communities, and the future of many first suburbs is redevelopment. We can't grow up, so we must grow up, we must intensify.

Could you please comment on the use of eminent domain for economic development specifically? I got a good one in, Tony.

And is *Kelo v. New London* more important to first suburbs? As a policy maker, how can you explain the importance of eminent domain as a tool for economic development to voters around the nation who are passing constitutional amendments to limit its use or outright eliminate it?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. Two vote loser questions here, and a process question.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: What's wrong with sprawl? And then I think Tony put his finger on it, if you go out in this area into Loudoun County or Howard County, people are going there because they can find decent housing that they can afford.

The process question is a good one, and then who is brave enough to take on *Kelo*?

MR. SUOZZI: I think that Tony's premise is wrong that people won't move to these locations. What we're finding in my community is everybody moved out to Nassau County's affordable housing for returning veterans after World War II, and their kids have

now grown up, gone to college and are out in the world. What's happening is we're seeing the children of the people that moved there in the first place or even their grandchildren are moving back to Brooklyn. They're moving back to the city to find rental housing, put several people in a rental apartment, friends and stuff like that.

MR. DIONNE: Before they have kids though.

MR. SUOZZI: Before they have kids. That's right. No, but even families are moving into these locations as well because the quality of life has improved because the crime rate has gone down, the parks are better, the streets are cleaner and people are moving into locations.

I don't think that people necessarily define the quality of life solely by the single-family house and the lawn. It's also defined by the quality of life reflected in low crime, low unemployment, clean streets, good schools and the like. So I think that we can attack people to live in our communities if they were affordable. To be affordable we have to go up instead of going out, we have to change the paradigm that was set up in the 1940s and 1950s, and we need to select certain locations similar to that bull's eye concept that I heard used earlier, where downtowns, brownfields, emerging minority communities and a place known as the Nassau Center, where we need to build more density to create this affordable housing and to create a lifestyle and an excitement that will bring young people back into our communities and make them attractive again.

MR. ONORATO: I want to talk about your sprawl question because I have a more unique situation than my colleagues here. Allegheny County lost population over the last 40 years. Every census we're down. Yet, there were three studies; we had the worst sprawl in Allegheny County. So it isn't about affordable housing. We have the most affordable housing in the United States everywhere in the county. We don't have a population problem, and yet we lost more green space than any other county in our state with no population growth. We had a loss, and the reason that is is because of some policies. We had three major highways built in the last 40 years. One dislocated 16,000 people from the middle of the city, 16,000 families, and the highway became the driveway from downtown Pittsburgh out to a bordering county which is now the fastest growing area, Cranberry Township in our area. Before that highway, it just wasn't happening because you couldn't drive. It was too difficult. We created a driveway. There was public/federal dollars that created a driveway that created a whole new community, plus displaced 16,000 families within the city of Pittsburgh and the older suburbs around the city.

So there are public policies that are driving sprawl that have nothing to do with affordable housing, that have nothing to do with outrageous growth, and yet we're gobbling up green space. I think that's why when I talk about our policies now, if we have stagnant growth getting ready to grow, looking at the brownfields, the only reason this

land is not valuable because of the environmental problems there; this is waterfront property. This is waterfront property. The previous mayor of the city of Pittsburgh started this a decade ago. He took an old U.S. Steel site in the city which obviously closed in the early 1980s. It is now the most expensive real estate, housing and commercial real estate, in the city of Pittsburgh because once they cleared the hurdles of this environmental issue, the private sector took off on its own. It took off on its own in the city.

Again, it was a public policy shift. It wasn't because people couldn't find housing; it wasn't because they didn't like the area. They had no choice there. And yet here we were just blowing down neighborhoods, building highways and just moving the population around, and it was the same population. We kept shifting it. My county's population hasn't changed in 40 years, and we lost more green space than anybody in the country. It's frustrating.

MR. DIONNE: I notice everybody is jumping on that eminent domain question.

[Laughter.]

MR. : I think this is the point, that sprawl is cheap because we've subsidized it. Communities like mine are expensive because there is so little supply of it. We've been saying all around we need more competition, we need more people doing what we're doing, stop praising me and imitate me. And that's actually starting to happen.

There is some movement in the area around here to do some more of these kinds of things. But we're not going to have affordable housing in areas that are transit oriented as long as it's a very short supply of things, and obviously that the people with the highest incomes bid up the prices.

But there are tremendous opportunities to do more of this, and that's what we really need, a greater supply that will make it once again affordable to live in the kind of community where you can walk to anything. That's not inherently an expensive thing. We have to stop subsidizing the things that run highways so it's closer 40 miles away than it used to be, and that's where they push all the growth.

MR. DIONNE: Judge?

JUDGE KELIHER: We've subsidized highways, and we've already got subsidized hospital care. For instance, in Dallas County right now, even though we're still growing, the growth is really in our surrounding counties. For instance, in our hospital care, we've got the only trauma centers in Dallas County that has to be paid for by the residents in Dallas County. Collin County right north of us has got no hospital care at all, and according to them, they only have six homeless people in all of Collin County which happens to be one of the fastest-growing counties, but they end up having all of the people who come down. Because of the EMTALA laws, the federal laws, all of the people who live in the surrounding counties get to come in to the public hospital

and be treated for free without any of the surrounding counties having to pay.

So one of the things we really actually need to be doing is addressing the health care issues and how it is that we continue to keep these trauma centers afloat because everybody needs them but we have no way of getting them to pay.

The same thing on transportation. All of our transportation dollars are going to these growing communities that are continuing to sprawl rather than even maybe helping us with mass transit down in our first suburban areas and keeping the sprawl from happening.

MR. DIONNE: Can I ask Mr. Sims to hold for a second, because I wanted to bring in three more voices and then you get the floor to answer all of this.

I'm going to do the three I saw first. This gentleman here, the very familiar face behind him, and this gentleman over here. I apologize to everybody else, but I suspect these folks will stay around for a bit afterwards.

QUESTION: [Off mike] University of Minnesota Law School—half of black and Latino [off mike] half of the black and Latino people that live in the suburbs are living in the first suburbs.

MR. DIONNE: Can we switch mikes? See if it's the mike.

QUESTION: Half of black and Latino people in the United States are living in the suburbs, and a very large percentage of the black

and Latino people living in the suburbs are living in the first suburbs. National suggests a growing pattern of segregation in the older suburbs, that the patterns of the cities are repeating themselves in the older suburbs. Is this an issue where you are? How does this relate to the redevelopment of the older suburbs? Are you doing a better job in terms of racial and social integration than the cities did, and is that an issue?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Then right behind you.

MR. GLENDENING: Parris Glendening with Smart Growth America. First of all, I was impressed how just about all the panelists came back to one core part of the problem and that is federal policy, whether it was on work force training, whether it was on transportation or even access to policy decision making. I think about what is going on in various states, at least half of the states making significant changes one way or another to start address this issue, and yet the federal government seems to be backing further and further away, and in fact causing more and more of a problem. Bruce, to your very good thinking, we had one of the few federal officials here today that gets it, and I was by the way pleased with her courage that she actually used the words smart growth. As a potential person going around the country, that was exciting.

But I think about what is going on here and I guess part of the question is, how do we make these concerns really part of the federal agenda in a real meaningful, meaningful way? In fact, we're going in the exact opposite way. Chairman Zimmerman, as you know, the GSA is

proposing that new buildings as well as new leases must be 82 feet is it? Eight-two feet back from the sidewalk because of security interests. Do you know what this is going to do to not only central cities, but first suburbs in terms of policy? I think part of the answer of how do we do this came a little to the fact that some of you quite naturally talked about the political aspect, and the political aspect is, who is starting to connect the dots and really understand what is happening here? Interestingly, Ron, I think you're exactly right, women voters who more often are concerned about impact on families in issues like health or availability to be home for the soccer game in the evening or something are starting to understand that quicker than white males.

So the question I guess for the panel is how do we make this a political equation that will start to become a serious consideration, because otherwise we're constantly doing rear-guard action?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you, Governor. Then this gentleman had the first hand up, and I want to get you in, if you could be brief, and then we can just go right down the panel starting with Mr. Sims. Sir?

MR. POWERS: My name is Ed Powers. Senator Clinton alluded to fractured government as an issue in all this and that really wasn't discussed a great deal here. But very briefly, I grew up in Nassau County for high school, college and first job, and I've lived most of my live in Montgomery County which is just a few miles over that way.

Both are wonderful to live and bring up families, school systems, et cetera.

The difference I've found over the decades was that the property tax rate in Montgomery County was like one-half, one-third of that in Nassau County. I think government and the way the places are governed is the factor there. Nassau County had a village system and the villages had the school system, the police, everything, whereas Montgomery County was at the county level.

I've had this question for decades, why pursue something that is so inefficient? I couldn't think of any other reason why the difference between these two counties was so enormous in terms of what it costs to live there from a property standpoint.

MR. DIONNE: That's a great question. Bruce is going to kill me, but this is why he's a good politician. I promised this gentleman a long time ago and he's been polite. If you could be brief, and then we'll close down.

MR. ANTHONY: My name is Carl Anthony and I'm with the Ford Foundation. My question really has to do with the emptying out of middle America. I noticed on the map of the 64 first suburbs that there was a number of them in the old Rust Belt that were facing major problems that had to do with the loss of industry, with the loss of kind of a central purpose for being there, where we have it seems to me a kind of bicoastal framework for urbanization.

So my question has to do with what are the sort of challenges that have to be faced by those first suburbs in communities that are really suffering from major deindustrialization and the challenges of developing a new purpose?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. I'll summarize this list and then we'll just start with Ron and work all the way down.

Hang around is that process question and that tricky eminent domain question. There's a question on segregation out there. The property tax question which is a very interesting question. The emptying out of the middle of the country and deindustrialization. I put Governor Glendening's question last because it gives you a great way to sort of sum up which is, how can all of these things become part of the federal agenda. Let me start with Mr. Sims.

MR. SIMS: Let me see if I can remember it all. In our state we don't use eminent domain for purposes of economic growth. It's considered to be bad form. It's allowed by the State Constitution, but you just don't do that. And the group that did it which was the Monorail Society inside Seattle, the Monorail Authority inside Seattle, just got spanked, got put of business in part because they used eminent domain to construct their monorail. It was just bad form. You don't need it for economic growth and we don't use it.

Secondly, race is a factor in America. It's not going to change. Whether it's older cities or the older suburbs, race is a factor.

America does not want to talk about it and doesn't want to deal with it, and we're going to see the continued segregation by neighborhoods and religious groups probably for the rest of my life. One of the things I'm very pessimistic about is America being able to actually fully embrace diversity. We talk about it, won't do it.

All over the world, costal population growth is occurring where people are abandoning interiors and moving to the coast not only because you can trade there, but seemingly costal areas develop dramatically differently from the interior areas. So in the United States what you're seeing here in this country actually is occurring, if you look at all the census data around the world, all over the world. You see it in China, you see it in India, and I don't know how you begin to try to change that momentum because I think it's a newer phenomenon and will continue for a while until the cities are so overburdened that you begin to see the remigration back into interiors.

In our county, one of the things that we found for growth, there was a statement about older people leaving. What we found is that those are the people that are actually moving into the cities. The issue with like Nassau County, what happens when you get taxes, what we found is that older people actually downsized and moved into condominiums inside cities which is what I'm going to do when my son goes to school this fall.

MR. DIONNE: I'm going to have to ask you to stop there. This is a good thing for any politician. You can skip all the questions you don't want to answer because we need short answers because Congressman Turner is kindly here and I've let this run on too long. So if everybody could have a brief closing statement so we'd have a chance for the Congressman I'd appreciate it.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: *Kelo* doesn't really apply to us because we actually don't have to use eminent domain for purposes of economic development, so it's really not a factor. It's a factor though in that it's been a wonderful tool for people who want to limit the power of government, so even though it's not an issue, of course it's made into an issue which means it may impinge upon the ability to use eminent domain where you absolutely have to have it. That's one of the most significant things, that if the result of this is this sort of knee-jerk wave of legislation that makes it harder for us to do things like build a transit system or even a sidewalk, then it will have real consequences even where there is no economic development issue at all.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Judge?

JUDGE KELIHER: The eminent domain issue is a huge issue right now going on in Texas. The legislature is going to try and curtail what you're able to do with eminent domain. However, Dallas County did lose the Dallas Cowboys Stadium to the next door neighboring county and one of the reasons is because of the fact that

Dallas County has been willing to pay for mass transit and the surrounding counties have not been willing to pay. So they had room in essence to pay for a stadium. Now they've gone in and condemned all the homes so that Jerry Jones could build the Dallas Cowboys Stadium. And even if we end up coming up with some eminent domain, it will exclude Jerry Jones and the Cowboys Stadium.

[Laughter.]

JUDGE KELIHER: So it has been a huge issue in Dallas. Also the Governor has got a Trans-Texas Corridor that he thinks he ought to be able to go in which is a huge issue also taking our farmers in the State of Texas and what we're going to do with that eminent domain.

I really want to say on the public policy issue which to me is part of the real big benefit of being here and what kind of direction maybe we could give the federal government, I think there are issues that need to be addressed. I think health care and how health care is going to be funded where certain counties are left to pay for it while surrounding counties under the EMTALA laws can use the hospitals and not have to pay for it ought to be addressed.

I think more money ought to be going into mass transit so that we stop some of the sprawl and actually end up keeping people in closer to the inner-city. I would like to see some of that happening, and those are probably my two, along with some of the things that it would do for air quality. So I guess those are my two biggest.

MR. DIONNE: So, the main who has a lot of waterfront to develop instead of a coast will—

MR. ONORATO: We have the same battle in Pennsylvania in eminent domain. It appears that the Governor is possibly going to veto a bill that restricts it. Like Ron, I don't think it should be used often, it isn't used often, but the ability to have it is very important. That option is important for planning, and it might be used one day, you might have to use it and you shouldn't bar it but it should be used sparingly.

On your question about the size of government and how many different units, in Allegheny County it's a big problem, 130 municipalities, 43 school districts. I think this is where the county can continue to take a leading role. We can merge one of two ways. You could abolish the municipalities that and continue to gobble them up, or you can start consolidating functions.

When I took office 2 years ago, we had six 911 centers in the county. We now have one. The city and the county used to both have their own city court system. It's all now one court system. We used to have our own police fingerprinting. It's all now one. The county now provides detective services for all municipalities. So we've found ways to consolidate functions, but at the end of the day, we probably have 20 to 50 municipalities that shouldn't exist on their own. But the real big issue is the school districts as opposed to the municipalities. That's what people are very protective of.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you, and finally, Mr. Suozzi.

MR. SUOZZI: We definitely have very, very high local taxes, property taxes in Nassau County. It's attributable to the fact that we have no growth going on, it's attributable to the fact that we have all these governments that are left over from the early 1900s is a big part of it. We are a very segregated community as well, as was pointed out before. And it will not happen in the normal marketplace that there will be any change in what we have. It will continue to decline, taxes will continue to go up, people will continue to leave, unaffordability will continue to happen, because sprawl is happening naturally in the marketplace, not because of public policy but because of developers who go where they can make their investment the safest, where they can get the clearest rate of return and they create on a clean canvas without a brownfield, without a dense area, without having to condemn properties, without all the headaches that go along with fitting into our communities, sprawl will happen naturally in the marketplace because it's easier and it's a sure-fire investment rate of return that you'll get.

So what we need to do to address all the different problems in places with declining industries and segregation and high taxes and all the other things that we're talking about is develop a policy that will encourage investment, and what is a good investment place? First suburbs, but it needs to be directed with help from the federal and state governments to highlight these locations because the marketplace won't

do it for it. The marketplace will go to where the investment is the cheapest and the safest investment. So we need to figure out how to develop a policy and pick these 64 places that have these same problems that we face and invest in solving those problems which will result in a high rate of return for society and for the government as a result of that investment.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. First, thank you to Congressman Turner for his patience. Everybody has plugged a football team. I'll resist the temptation to plug my dynastic New England Patriots except I just did.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIONNE: We now know why Bruce called this the A Team. We have a whole lot of questions we want to discuss, and I'm grateful that Bruce and Rob were around because we're going to keep this discussion going. Thank you all very, very much.

[Applause.]

MR. KATZ: Congressman Turner has been listening to this for about 20 minutes and he's probably wondering why he agreed to do this because we've enjoyed the sort of normal level of fed bashing at the Brookings Institution. But he is clearly the right person from the Congress to be here because he is not just a Congressman who is the head of Speaker Hastert's Task Force on Saving America's Cities and Communities, he's not just the Chair of the House Government

Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, he's the former Mayor of Dayton, Ohio, and he has a district, the 3rd District of Ohio, which includes the city of Dayton and Montgomery County, Ohio, which is very unusual to have really the city and the bulk of the first suburb county in one congressional district.

So the Congressman will speak for some period of time and then we'll take some questions as well.

[Applause.]

REPRESENTATIVE TURNER: Thank you, Bruce. Thank you for having me, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you. I also want to thank each of you for what you're doing in your communities in taking what is obviously a very thoughtful approach to how you can enhance economic development, how you can work coordinatively, and how you can try to look at some of the issues that you're facing in economic development and community development and join together in taking some of the best practices and best ideas from each of them.

I'm going to talk to you about three things, really, and that is, first, to tell you a little bit about Speaker Dennis Hastert's Saving American Cities Working Group and the effort that we've undertaken there, the work that is ongoing in the Federalism and Census Subcommittee which I care and the way we're looking at urban issues and economic development for communities, and thirdly, a brownfields tax

credit bill that I have that will provide some I believe great fuel to the pent up demand of revitalizing our brownfields.

But before I do that, I want to talk a little bit about Dayton, Ohio, and my experience in serving as mayor because a lot of the analysis that we went through about our community and how we were going to prepare for economic development is the type of analysis that leads you to the conclusion that perhaps you need a strategy for first-ring suburbs.

When we looked at our city, our urban area, we divided it up into three rings. We had our inner ring which was largely made up of historic structures, those that were built in the 1800s or right at the turn of the century, that were oriented and integrated more towards a downtown focus both in their transportation and in their commerce, many of which had been violated by the overlay of the Interstate Transportation System as it sought access to our downtown, and that were in a significant area of decline, slums, lighting, and were as a source of crime a significant negative impact on the next ring or the middle ring of our city which I would describe as the type of density and uniformity in housing that you see in the beginning of the Archie Bunker show where they fly over their neighborhood and see the rows of houses.

Those neighborhoods, although geographically separated from each other by the interstate system that had been overlaid on the community, really had not been marred by it such that the natural travel patterns had not been removed. They had some homogeneity, some sense

of being a community. They had been stable both in property values and in the people that lived there. High home ownership. But there was a growing sense in those middle communities that the inner-core neighborhoods were a significant threat to that middle ring both for their property values, their safety, their economic future, and so there was a significant flight that was occurring out of those middle-ring neighborhoods. We began to see the types of patterns of decay, the shifting to rental properties, the abandoned properties, which we saw that led the decay of the inner ring.

Then we had the outer ring which we considered to be largely our almost suburban in nature ring of the city, those neighborhoods that really their whole orientation is to the suburbs to which they abut, both their commerce and their social situations and their housing stock were very familiar and similar to the suburban neighborhoods to which they abut.

Our focus was to go into the inner ring and began a revitalization both in looking at the downtown area but also our housing stock so that we could raise the property values in those areas, provide an increasing buffer for those middle rings, a greater sense of security, opportunities for shopping and retail that the middle ring might once again orient themselves toward the downtown. We began a process where we did a public-private partnership with our home builder's association and our local banks which we called Rehabarama and Cityrama. We

would go into a neighborhood and we would acquire abandoned housing stock, we would renovate it and much like you would see in the suburbs where there would be a home show called Home-arama, we would have a Rehabarama or Cityrama and invite the community back in to see what was possible in these neighborhoods.

We accomplished several things by this. One, we got people off of our major thoroughfares from downtown and into some of these neighborhoods to see the quality of the housing stock. Some of these neighborhoods they were familiar with, they knew someone who lived there historically or a family member who lived there so they were reengaged and interested in the neighborhood. We made the houses that were the abandoned houses that we rehabilitated at the top of the market so we set an equity level where people could acquire other properties in the neighborhood, come in to invest and have confidence that their equity would be protected. By taking the worst properties we had eliminated some of the worst blight that was occurring in the neighborhood.

We coupled that after our first several shows with new construction which then evolved into Cityrama, and the city of Dayton by entering into this partnership actually became the lead single-family housing producer in Montgomery County. We had passed within 3 years of this program our suburbs in the actual production of single-family housing by doing this partnership.

In talking about first-ring suburbs, what's so important as you look at this analysis is that you're going to have to look at of course the urban core because that's your inner ring, that's your threat that is occurring of decline and decay that people are concerned with and perhaps wanting to move farther out from.

Secondly, the problems of the urban areas, those that we've seen historically over the past 20 or 30 years, are the problems that we are now beginning to see that are expressed in the first-ring suburbs. It's interesting. If you look at your title, A Comprehensive Guide to America's First Suburbs, one could first conclude does that mean all of the issues of the urban areas are solved? I know that your answer of course is, no, it means that they have now arrived in the first-ring suburbs.

So our strategies for their economic development and our strategies for the revitalization are going to be very similar. First-ring suburbs like urban areas have an impediment for economic development which is the availability of land. They have usually been platted out, they have been developed—

[End Tape 1, Side B., begin Tape 2.]

MR. TURNER: [in progress] the area that you have to discuss in urban issues. There's something else, in a way, either land that needs to be placed together, buildings that need to be removed or new

planning concepts that need to be overlaid on the communities that have already been established.

Our "Saving America's Cities" working group that's been established by Speaker Dennis Hastert is an effort by the Speaker to pull together members of the Republican House that have life urban experience, local government experience to talk about ways that we can assist and be a partner for urban economic development.

We've entitled this group the "Saving America's Cities" Working Group. We've been working for 2 years now as a—almost a caucus inside the Republican conference. And what was interesting is it was our very first meeting, we began the discussion of if the title is "Saving America's cities." What is a city?

Is it just the urban core? There are, as we know, first-ring suburbs that have large enough populations that outpace many urban cores. Is it the entire metropolitan region? Is it a smaller urban area that is isolated from the urban core but yet it may be close enough that it shares in its amenities?

And what we decided and what we concluded was if you think of yourself as a city, if you call yourself a city, then you're encompassed in the umbrella of the issues that we're look at. So although we're looking at cities, first-ring suburbs are certainly encompassed in that; many on the own right constitute very large cities, and also they're incorporated in the overall metropolitan area.

We began by taking up what we believe are five—four issues where the Federal government has a role in economic development and revitalization of urban areas. The first is the issue of public housing, probably the largest single investment that the Federal government makes in both housing and in development in communities, in urban areas. It is significantly a blighting influence on neighborhoods and their fabric. It has an impact on those who are there and their ability to transition for economic diversity.

So taking up the issue of public housing is not only an issue of the resources that go there but also looking at how we can impact the lives of the people who are in public housing and how we can assist communities in utilizing public housing as an economic development tool.

Secondly then, we picked up the issue of market rate housing. So many times Federal strategies are all focused on low-income housing. Many cities have access to more low-income housing than they need dollars, but they don't have access to dollars perhaps to provide them economic diversity in their communities. As they look to ways for economic development, they also need strategies to make certain that they can have a diverse economic population, and we want to make certain that we look for ways we can assist in that.

Thirdly, we picked Brownfields and Brownfields revitalization. It is a federally created problem and one that needs

Federal attention and assistance to communities as we look to ways that we can attract capital back into our redeveloped areas.

Fourthly, we picked historic preservation. Many communities use historic preservation to distinguish themselves drawing to the historic fabric both of their architecture and of what occurred there to tell their story to attract retail, to attract unique experiences that bring people back into their environment.

And the fifth is what we call sort of the nitnoid. All of those topics that are currently encompassed like Federal rules and regulations whereby perhaps getting just a little bit more attention can make the existing programs better usable and more effective.

The Brownfields Tax Credit Bill is a bill that we've been working on with a lot of national associations. It has been endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Industrial Parks, and the National Association for Shopping Centers. And it provides annually a billion dollars that is divided by—to the states by population.

Like the low-income housing tax credit, it would be administered by the State development agencies. There would be a competitive process in states for determining where the tax credits are awarded. It would permit 50 percent of the environmental remediation costs and the building demolition including petroleum removal at a site to

be applied for the tax credit that would be transferable so that capital could be amassed.

It does require that this is not just a clean-up Brownfield Bill; this is an economic revitalization bill. It does require that the standards that are utilized by the State in the competition for awarding the tax credit take into consideration the amount of economic development investment that is going to occur at the site, job creation, the extent of poverty in the community and the extent of environmental contamination that is there, because we of course, want to pick some of the sites that are the most different for remediation.

I wanted to tell you about the Federal—Federalism and Census Subcommittee that I chair. This is a Subcommittee, of course, that has the issue of the census and the apportionment, but we've also been taking up the issue of what information is in the census that itself could be utilized for communities, for economic development decisions? How do we better communicate what the census data tells us, and also, how can we better tailor it to the needs for communities so that they know how to plan in the future?

On Federalism, last year we took up the important issue of CDBG. And you might recall that the Bush Administration had zeroed out the CDBG. And it was the "Saving America's Cities" Working Group on the House side and the Federalism Subcommittee that deployed into action on the House side to make certain that it was funded, both within

the budget—and it was preserved as a program at HUD—we once again are faced with what will be an important discussion as to the transition for CDBG.

Our committee passed out of the full government forum committee a 75-page report which I would encourage you to pursue anytime that you should be more tired than you are. Looking at can CDBG improve other ways that we can reform CDBG, as with many Federal programs, when they reach a time period that—where they have not been reviewed, not only are there some aspects of them that become stale, but they are targets on the chopping block. And our efforts to reform CDBG are efforts to save CDBG. We've been working with national associations; we encourage each of you to participate and give us your ideas.

As we undertake the issue of reform of CDBG, the practitioners and users of CDBG need to be at the table, because there are ideas and important issues that they need to bring forward so that we don't miss items that could be important to enhance its use.

This year, we're taking up the issue of public housing, both the reforms that have been put in places at the end of the 1990s; how they're being impacted; what do we need to do now to impact the lives of the people who live there and the communities that are the hosts for public housing.

I encourage you to look at the Federalism and Census Web site and the issues that we're taking up. We'd appreciate your comments and your input as you see ways that we might review topics that impact your communities.

I appreciate the Brookings Institute inviting me, and I appreciate certainly the substantive information that you're pulling together that will help all of us, both in Federal policy, State and local policymaking so that we can assist in economic development and revitalizing the communities.

Thank you.

[Applause]

MR. KATZ: We've got some time for questions. And there were a lot of questions that came up for the prior panel that would also apply to the Federal government, so if people want to restate questions, you're free to bring up eminent domain again. And we can bring up some new ones. We can go—

MR. : Bruce, thank you for being free with—

MR. KATZ: [inaudible]

MR. POCEK: Congressman Dan Pocek, Mayor of the City of Bedford, Ohio, Chairman, the First Tier of Suburbs of National League of Cities. I want to say that I had opportunity last spring to testify at your Brownfield Committee. And as a success story of the City of Bedford with Brownfields Redevelopment, I had a former—it's actually a

[inaudible] facility that was abandoned back in the mid-80s; sat vacant for almost 20 years, and it was—nothing was happening. And then we started talking to the company about redeveloping it.

And then at the same time we started to talk about redevelopment, I was faced with a major business leaving my town, and that was Taylor Chair Company, which is the oldest operating concern in the State of Ohio—been in continuous operation in the State and my city since 1816—moving to Mississippi, which was—

And amazingly, what happened is a success story. Within a 10-month period we had a rallying of not only the city but the county, the State and the Federal government, and I was able to put together a package of a million dollars from the State. And through the help of Senator DeWine and Stephanie Tubbs Jones we got a [inaudible] from HUD, and now Taylor Chairs' is—a new building is being built, and it's being done, so these things can be done.

And this is not only a redevelopment for my city, it's also regional issues, but this Industrial park will bring 1,000 new jobs to the area.

MR. TURNER: Thank you. It was great to hear of your success and also of your leadership. It is amazing today that those communities that are successful where you see revitalization occurring, where you see economic development occurring, the leaders of those communities, the skill sets that they must have, both in real estate

development, in how to put a deal together, in land use and in planning, are a pretty impressive set for communities to have to reach in order for them to be successful, and you certainly have a great model.

MR. POCEK: Well, it was 10 months from start to finish; it was amazing. I mean, never in my mind I thought that would ever happen. But the problem was theirs, and it was recognized by all levels of government, and it happened.

MR. KATZ: Questions?

MS. CANBY: Anne Canby's my name. [inaudible] I'm wondering what your thoughts are on the role of transportation?

MR. TURNER: Say that again. You said that so fast; I missed it. Could you repeat your name and your—

MS. CANBY: Anne Canby, Surface Transportation Policy Project. I'm wondering what your ideas are on the role of transportation and how the investment in that infrastructure might play in helping working cities and helping cities work.

MR. TURNER: Well, having said to the last panel in the end of their discussion—I think they made some excellent points; I think we're all aware as groups that are focused on issues of revitalization of mature communities, that we understand the impact of the decisions that were made in the past of investing in transportation systems that—I heard the comment of, you know, basically is a driveway out to the suburbs.

I've heard comments such as the highway going through downtown is basically just an onramp from downtown to the suburbs. So I think that everyone recognizes that the decisions that we have made in the past in transportation have affected the way that we live today without us having going through the process of making the choice of the outcome, and that has brought communities, I think, more focused on how they deploy transportation, how they look overall at their systems.

I think there's some excellent planning that's going on today as we try to respond to not making the same mistakes that we did in the past. There is no question that any real estate developer or any housing developer will tell you that housing and therefore families follow transportation systems.

Communities that are the first-ring suburbs like urban areas are faced with a more mature transportation system, but many that are being successful are looking at current planning philosophies and processes and how their systems can be modified, how they can improve both flow and traffic to make them a higher standard of living, higher quality of life. Those are certainly very important, and I think that as communities do that, the opportunity to use Federal transportation dollars to address those issues are there.

QUESTION: Congressman Turner. It's good to see you. You know, we have been very pleased with the work of the task force that you had. We acknowledge that it is Republican task force, and of course,

we have quite a few Democrats in Congress who work on similar issues. I'm wondering if you could talk about the potential for this becoming a more bipartisan issue, especially with regard to the First Suburbs agenda.

MR. TURNER: Well, I think any issue that's successful in the House and even on the Senate that result in issues of legislation or a formulation of policy are bipartisan in nature. The focus of the "Saving America's Cities" Working Group is really at the initiation phase rather than the final phase of deployment of policy and legislation.

Let me explain to you: it's really its impetus. When I first came to the House, I looked at the—and it's much like getting in college, you get the book that shows you all the classes and the different, various departments. And so being a mayor, I opened the book, and I begin to look at, you know, where do I go with 8 years of being a mayor of an urban area—\$1.2 million SMSA, metropolitan area—where do I go to take the knowledge and experience that I have from that, and what committee should I look to?

My community has a very large Air Force base, so I know I'm headed toward armed services, but where else do I go to utilize these skills? And I found, as you find whenever you take up an issue that affects economic development in the [inaudible] or urban areas, there is no one place. There's ways and means and revenue and tax policies; there's housing with respect to HUD; there's my committee with respect to reform of existing programs.

The fact that a person who has an urban agenda must go trick-or-treating, basically across the spectrum of committee structures is why the Speaker organized the "Saving America's Cities" Working Group. It is an effort for the Speaker to have a one-stop-shop, a place where groups and organizations can go to begin a discussion with the House leadership on issues that are important in urban economic development.

We have people from every committee, a broad spectrum there. Many times, national associations when they do their legislative agenda for the year, they have their meeting; they bring everybody into town; they give them their legislative agenda, and they send them all up to go meet with their members. There's no one place, no one in-box where that legislative agenda was able to be dropped, and this is the Speaker's effort to say, "Drop it with us; we'll review it; we'll make certain that the people who on the various committees have the information and that the leadership of the House and the Speaker are aware of the particular issues.'

Now, obviously, as things move forward, there are plenty of bipartisan structures for us to be able to use and deploy, being able to accomplish the end result.

MS. KELLER: I'm Beth Keller with the International City/County Management Association. And I've always said I'm a native of Dayton, Ohio, but in fact it's Butler Township, as I reflect on that.

But I think it's a reflection of how we really live in metropolitan areas. And we talked a little bit today about fragmentation and how we can encourage our communities to think on a more regional basis and be regional problem solvers.

When you think about the Federal role here in terms of incentives that may be feasible, what are the incentives that you think we might look forward to to promote a more regional perspective?

MR. TURNER: Well, I think that there are certainly regional planning responsibilities with respect to transportation. But really the communities that are successful in looking at ways that they can engage Federal resources are communities that work in cooperation.

My community has a regional organization that has the business community, the elected leaders at the table. And annually, they go through not only planning issues, but they go through funding issues of community priorities, both for State funding that they're going to be seeking and Federal funding that they're going to be seeking.

It's hard from a Federal level to impose that, but it's something that is absolutely essential. And I think by the fact of how communities piece funding together the evolution of communities working together and seeking pieces of funding for larger regional projects is occurring.

I think one thing that we're trying to do is certainly working with the national associations—is to find those issues that are in common

with the National Counties Association, the League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, and getting those organizations to help us fashion what is a legislative agenda from their part, and that certainly helps as we access then their deployment down at the local level.

QUESTION: The low-income housing tax credit is the largest part of the Federal government's commitment to building housing. There's a priority in the statute that rewards the vast majority of very low-income housing units—or builds the vast majority of very low-income housing units and qualified census tracts, census tracts that are very poor. Is this a good tool too?

Is this a good tool to revitalize central cities? In your experience as a mayor, has the targeting of the low-income housing tax credit to very poor neighborhoods been a good tool to revitalize cities?

MR. TURNER: It has. I think that it is a program that is going to have to be reviewed in some other special motion [inaudible] these credits that are producing housing units that we need to review? Are they—do we need to modify the rules and regulations under which it's operating so that we can retarget and refocus where those resources are going?

Let me talk to you about my experience personally in Dayton. One of the things that we found in doing our inner-ring, middle-ring and central- and outer-ring analysis is that in our middle ring—it's that picture again that I gave you in the beginning of Archie Bunker

where the houses are together, and it's a mature developed area—we found that we did not have adequate senior housing so people would be able to stay within their own communities.

We were losing the senior population who wanted to stay in their own communities, who wanted to age in place but did not have any place to go. And their departures, both out of our community and their transition of their house through either rental or owner-occupied, was so important to the future health of that community that we began a process of building low-income senior housing units in the middle ring that were accessible to those neighborhoods.

And they were highly successful; the demand was huge. We continue to see that strategy being implemented in the city. It allows for people to stay where they're familiar; many times, move in to facilities that are perhaps in better condition than the houses they've left, and with increased focus on the community that they're in, they also have care as to how their house transitions.

When they begin to contact one of these senior housing facilities that we've used as sort of intervention senior citizen centers, they also get advice and assistance as to how you look at the house as an asset to their future planning.

So as a tool to allow for housing redevelopment, that's important to us—we also took the low-income senior housing tax credit and married it to historic tax credits to rehabilitate and convert to senior

housing some of the larger abandoned structures that we had that did not have other uses, that in our neighborhoods we were fearful as to what their impact would be as to how they would redevelop, one of which was a historic school that was converted. My grandmother moved into it; she ended up living her last several years in the art classroom where her son had gone to school.

And we did—one building that was a Terra Cotta retail-front old apartment building that we [inaudible] retirement housing, and that made it an appealing affect in the neighborhood because it got rid of what could be a blighting influence and also provided an environment to seniors.

MR. KATZ: I would like everyone to thank Congressman Turner for coming. [Applause]

And you are the survivors of another Brookings forum, and I really appreciate your time and your patience. And I really urge you to go on the Website; join the list serve; become part of a virtual network of first suburban leaders.

Thank you for coming today.

- - -