THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

URBANIZED: SHAPING CITIES
FILM SCREENING AND DISCUSSION

Washington, D.C.
Tuesday, November 1, 2011

PARTICIPANTS:

Moderator:

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

Panelists:

GARY HUSTWIT
Director and Producer
Urbanized

SHAUN DONOVAN
U.S. Secretary of House and Urban Development

DEREK DOUGLAS
Special Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs
The White House

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KATZ: (in progress) and thank Jessica for traveling. And a couple of my staff, I just want to say to Courtney and Rachel and Matt, this was pulled together very fast in a pretty difficult period for our schedule, I just want to thank them, as well.

To my immediate left is Secretary Shaun Donovan, Department of Housing and Urban Development, thank you for coming, a trained architect. And also Derek Douglas, who really, for the past two and three-quarter years, has been the point person in the White House on urban policy and practice.

And, Gary, I just wanted to start with you, and I'm really struck by what Edgar was saying at the end. I mean this is such a disruptive period, and you made this film, obviously, when we have these big structural changes going on around the world, but at a time of the Arab Spring, at a time of the euro issues and the European Crisis, at a time of occupy Wall Street. So initial question, you've been all over the world, you have more frequent fliers than all of us combined, what inspired, what surprised, what scared you?

MR. HUSTWIT: Everything probably, I guess. I mean, again, it was all new to me, it was really an exploration. My previous two films had kind of really been about how design affects our lives either through manufactured objects and product design or visual communication and graphic design. So, for me, the underlying I guess idea was, well, how does a design of cities affect our lives and what's our role as citizens in the design of our cities?

So everything was a little bit of a revelation. I got to go to a lot of cities I had never been before, but also to kind of see the range of challenges facing cities, which I think is pretty wide, but also to see the kind of response that's happening either from a kind of professional and governmental level, but I think most inspiring for me, at the citizen level, at the kind of DIY level, which it seems there are more and more projects like those happening simply I think in a lot of cases out of need, but also

because I think people are getting more involved in general in their cities and want to play a bigger role. And it's been interesting to also see kind of government's role in kind of empowering that sort of activity or what I think should be more of that kind of stuff happening.

So, I mean, it was all amazing. I mean, I get to talk to, you know, a lot of interesting people around the world and kind of see what they think of the important issues facing cities, and that's really kind of what shaped the film.

MR. KATZ: I wanted to see the outtakes at the end.

MR. HUSTWIT: Well, we filmed 300 hours of footage, and you just saw about a little over an hour, so there's 299 other hours, so that's a big DVD extra set.

MR. KATZ: Wow.

MR. HUSTWIT: But, yeah, I mean, it's starting tomorrow night, it's a marathon screening of the outtakes.

MR. KATZ: So, Mr. Secretary, we were talking a little bit before the film about the immensity and the magnitude of the challenges with this rapid growth in cities in Asia and Latin America and Africa, and you've been to many of these places either before the tenure here or during your tenure. What does the United States have to teach these places? And how can we participate in the city-building outside of our own country?

SECRETARY DONOVAN: Let me just, before answering that, I just want to say thank you to Gary for a beautiful film. Like Bruce, I'm a New Yorker and addicted to cities from a young age. And it made me very sad in many ways, partly because that very last shot was actually a subway stop two stops from my house of 15 years in Brooklyn which I sold last summer to move down here, but also just what I loved about -- it's a film about thinking about cities and planning cities, but it's also a film about the beauty of what happens in cities that can never be planned, right. And that's the idea that you can walk down a street and constantly be surprised and challenged, and was captured really beautifully in the film, so thank you.

MR. HUSTWIT: Thanks.

SECRETARY DONOVAN: A really remarkable contribution. And I think to your question, Bruce, if there is perhaps a contribution that I think the U.S. can make, and this is after, you know, in the last couple of years I've been to many of the places in the film -- to Brazil, to Buenos Aires, to Cape Town, and many of the townships -- and, frankly, come back and think, my God, what could we have to add to this? Because, you know, fast-growing cities for us are 15 or 20 percent over some number of years, and when you think about that happening in the space of a few months or a year, it's just remarkable.

But the thing I have always come back from these trips with a sense of is that one thing we have begun to do, and Amanda Burden talked about it -- somebody I had the pleasure to work with in New York, to work on the High Line and many other things in New York -- is the sense of trying to bring the power of planning and the way that government can work effectively, to bring some order in a way that's positive in a city, but to make sure that that process, that there's an infrastructure to engage citizens and to make the planning process not Robert Moses, but to bring some sense of Jane Jacobs to it. And in particular, you know, I think the challenge in so many of these places is not just to have a single voice, but how do you create a system, whether it's community development corporations or other things, that actually can build that into the planning process in a consistent and strong way?

And I do think, through all of our mistakes in the U.S., through the mistakes of urban renewal and so many others, starting in the '60s with Bed-Stuy Restoration Corporation in Brooklyn and on through the last 50 years, we have been able to create or begin to create an infrastructure for citizen engagement in a way that there is real ownership. It is not government just asking people what they want, it's citizens forming organizations and ways to engage where they have real power in that dialogue.

And that is something that I think -- I found enormous interest in other places and a beginning of that, but not an infrastructure for it, not a developed way of

citizen kind of power and ownership, literally and figuratively, to be carried into the process in many ways.

MR. KATZ: And in your visits abroad, I mean, do you take anything back for us? Because, I mean, I saw the Bogota piece, so obviously bus rapid transit and we're beginning to apply that. I thought the piece about Santiago and the frugal innovation was really quite interesting, right, with the land codes, you know, or the land very sharp standards which tends to probably elevate cost at the end of the day. So have you taken anything back for the U.S. that we can begin to apply here?

SECRETARY DONOVAN: I would say a couple things. One is that, you know, there is a -- on the transportation side, there is an enormous world out there that has just passed us by, right. I mean we're 50 years behind in many ways in thinking about the intersection of transportation and planning.

And I had the great good fortune to go to Curitiba, which is the city whose bus rapid transit system was the model for the one in the film, and sit at the house of the mayor, who was an architect. I mean think about that, mayors who are architects, like, doesn't happen too often. But with Jaime Lerner, who created this model when he was mayor and has been just a fanatical about it and loved it, you know, it was his baby to create this system, and there are many, many places that have done that.

And so I think, you know, certainly the President has -- whether it's the Recovery Act -- literally tomorrow there's going to be a vote in the Senate on a $50 billion infrastructure bill, and as the President said today to a group of activists at the White House that I was part of the meeting, when was it that Republicans didn't like roads, right? I mean, when was it that infrastructure was somehow a politicized Democratic priority, right? And so something has happened in our politics that is holding us back there. But there is I think much we can learn.

The other thing I would say is, and it was really captured well in the film, there are many creative places where we think about not citizen participation in planning in the way I think we've begun to do in the U.S. quite well in many places, but citizen

participation in making homes and making environments very directly.

And whether it's community gardens or actually the piece about the homes that were sort of half-finished and allowed that, that's been very successful in places in South Africa and elsewhere, and we do too little of that in the U.S., I think, is ways of thinking about engaging people very directly as citizens rather than as community development corporation sort of things and literally making things.

MR. KATZ: Right. So, Derek, you know, I thought it was remarkable about this film was sort of the juxtaposition, the visual juxtaposition of the sprawling Phoenix. And I know Grady, you know, the real estate lawyer in the film. Has he seen the film yet?

MR. HUSTWIT: No.

MR. KATZ: Okay.

MR. HUSTWIT: But not for -- I mean, you know, I think he's -- it's not like a minority opinion that he's expressing there, and I think he has balls to just say, hey, you know, this is how I, you know, this is how I like to live. But it was actually his birthday the night of the Phoenix screening and he was doing things with his family and didn't come out.

MR. KATZ: But I thought --

MR. HUSTWIT: It was too far to drive. But he's, I mean --

MR. KATZ: Yeah, he's a character.

MR. HUSTWIT: So much to say on a wide variety of topics. We ended up kind of using him in the film, in the sense, talking about the sprawl issue in Phoenix.

MR. KATZ: But I was thinking about -- again, it comes back to some of the things that Edgar was saying at the end of the film. If you think in a 50-year trajectory, and it really gets to a lot of things that you guys have been involved in, 50-year trajectory, can we build a different kind of, you know, African urbanism or Asian urbanism, right, so we can not heat the planet?

When you think about our challenge, right, we're like making up for the bad habits

of the post war era. And what's it going to take to really not remake the cities, because in some respects, many of the city remaking is underway, what's it going to take to remake suburbia in the United States? Because of demographic shifts and the environmental imperative and environmental economic restructuring, do you think we started on a path to do that because of what -- you all haven't been involved in sort of integration of transportation and housing and these kinds of efforts.

MR. DOUGLAS: Yeah, I mean, also, let me just thank you, Gary, for a wonderful film.

MR. HUSTWIT: Thank you.

MR. DOUGLAS: I think I took like seven or eight pages of notes during that back in school, and a lot of excellent ideas that are really going to inform what I do. And I think that, you know, just thinking about it from the White House perspective and the President, who really cares about urban issues, I think it's something that everyone needs to see, because you see kind of what's happening on the international scale, but you also see many of the challenges that we face right here in the United States that we need to address.

I think, Bruce, to your question, it's a very important one, and I have to commend, you know, Secretary Donovan and Secretary LaHood and Administrator Jackson for I think really being a leading edge in getting the federal government to think about how you bring in not just the cities, but the entire region into the process of developing itself and thinking about land use planning and doing it in a more sustainable way. One of the takeaways I had from the movie that was very, very powerful and came throughout was this notion of a whole community, of how, in the United States, given our past habits, everything is very spread out.

And I was over in Barcelona on a study visit, actually I met him when I was in Barcelona, and one of the folks was talking about the United States. And he said everything in the United States is separate. You drive here to go shopping, you drive over here to go to the restaurants, you live over here, you drive here to go to work. And

the type of community they said they were trying to build, which I think is the type of community that was so attractive in the film, was one that's a whole community, where everything you need is right there.

And the guy in Detroit actually spoke about that. He said, when I was growing up in Detroit, everything we needed was right in our community. Now it's not that way. And I think that the work that we're doing around sustainable communities is starting to chip away at the old model of development and is getting cities and getting regions to think about this new approach.

And again, picking up a lesson from the film, I forget who said it, but someone said to bring about change, it was something to the effect of, you just need a few people to demonstrate the power of an idea, and then once that takes hold, it can spread. And I think that our approach, the sustainable community work, has really been trying to get some of those leading lights to look at this new approach. It's not going to be for every community, but it is for some. And then when other communities can see the impact that this has, the better quality of life it provides, that can then be the demonstration that can lead to broader, more system change across this country. So that's one of the ways we're looking at that issue.

MR. KATZ: So one last question for all of you guys and I'll open up for this, you know, partly because you had Rem Koolhaas in this thing and you had Norman Foster, the starchitects, you know.

I'm wondering, Gary, maybe, you know, Shaun, absolutely, how we think about these professions and these disciplines, you know. I mean, are we optimistic about their ability to take on, really in Derek's word, the whole or is it really -- have they evolved to a point where it's almost like an art form, you know, and they're thinking about their particular building in the broader landscape of a particular city?

And, you know, I've been hanging around a bunch of these folks for a while, and it's a hard -- there is obviously a continuum in the -- and we're talking about a series of professions here and a series of disciplines, but should we feel that there's a

new possibility or should we feel that we need some disruptive change, frankly?

MR. HUSTWIT: Well, I mean, I tend to think it's less about the architects and more about the people that are hiring the architects and paying for this development. I think that's probably where we need to see more systematic change.

MR. KATZ: Right.

MR. HUSTWIT: I think the architecture profession has definitely, you know, in a lot of ways always been thinking about some of these issues, about sustainability and about efficiency. And even just in recent -- you know, the past decade, there is more of a movement towards, you know, architecture as an agent of social change, but really it starts with the developers and I think the city in sort of mediating that development.

So I would probably look there in terms of, you know, where this country or where a lot of developing cities need to kind of focus the attention in terms of making sure that development is not, you know, done the way that we seem to always do it, where it's just really about cost and profit and not about thinking of the community as a whole.

MR. HUSTWIT: You know, I think one of the things I really liked about the film, that it brought out the sort of contentious nature of place-making.

MR. KATZ: Right.

MR. HUSTWIT: But I think there's a dangerous sort of idea that somehow great places come out of perfect or simple processes. I mean, I was deeply involved in the rezoning of the High Line in that district, and what's come out is, as beautiful as the film made it, but the sausage making and the contentiousness of -- and look, there is destruction going on there to rezone.

The buildings around it, some of them incredibly beautiful, Frank Gehry building and others, you know, what was there was removed, right. And so, to me, it's not so much about can you get an architect sort of in line with or -- it's about creating a process where there is that controlled explosion that happens and that it's created and

you don't kind of dumb down the tension. It makes really interesting play.

I mean, Koolhaas himself wrote about New York as sort of this incredible intersection of the rationality of the grid with, you know, ramped commercialism which somehow created a really beautiful place. You don't get it by sort of removing that tension. You get it by heightening it and making sure that it's balanced in a way that people can speak.

But architects can also speak with crazy ideas that are disruptive. I mean, in some ways Phoenix or the parts of Phoenix that, you know, we don't appreciate these days are the result of a non-contentious process in some way. And so I think what you need to do is set up a design process that lets everyone speak and to do planning in a way that kind of forces the integration of these things, but doesn't try to, you know, sort of bleach them out of the process, if you will.

MR. KATZ: Right.

MR. HUSTWIT: And it's an incredibly difficult thing to do, but it is -- I think Amanda put it well, it's, you know, how do you bring Robert Moses together with Jane Jacobs and, you know, get something that really has the benefits of both in some ways?

MR. KATZ: That's good. Open up thoughts, comments. We actually do have a microphone. Over here.

SPEAKER: Let me commend you, as well. That was a fantastic film. It made me think of a lot of different issues that you don't necessarily think about when you think about city planning and urban design. So one of the last comments you made was that it's not necessarily the architects, it's the people who hire the architects. I think maybe you could take that a step further and say it's the regulators who create the zoning or who create the rules, the parts of town that want to be focused, for example, high-density around public transit.

So having said that, do you think there were any governments in any of your experiences that really got how to set that balance? And what was it that they did to

make that balance work between encouraging development, but also shaping it in a way that would create smart growth?

MR. HUSTWIT: I mean, it's such a kind of delicate issue because, on one hand, cities, especially cities in the United States, are trying to encourage development, encourage the jobs, and encourage the tax base, and encourage the things that come with developers coming in and building something.

So there's obviously this hesitancy to do anything that hinders business or development.

At the same time, you know, there are ways to, I think, try to get smarter development and try to get that more integrated into our cities without, I guess, scaring away developers. And that seems to be the -- from an outside perspective to me, that seems to be the biggest kind of issue. I don't know.

There is, I think, a -- it's very difficult to do, but I think there is a way to create the planning mechanisms that can sort of help the sort of pure economic factors be balanced against the public good. And take the High Line example. It's the most complex zoning for a neighborhood I've ever seen. And just to sort of simplify a little bit, that's probably the most expensive park per square foot in the universe, right. Like Josh and -- they have fundraisers every year with, you know, Barry Diller and Diane von Furstenberg, and they raise, you know, $100 million at a dinner, so there's a huge amount of private money. But a lot of the initial infrastructure money came from us literally saying to developers, you can develop 10 stories, but if you want to develop 20 stories, you've got to pay into a fund to pay for the development of the park or to do more affordable housing in the community so we end up with a mix of housing, or both, right. And in order to keep light and air around the High Line itself, we allowed those developers who own those pieces of land to sell air rights to sites that were farther away so they wouldn't impede the light and air in use, right, you know.

So it's incredibly technical. There are brilliant lawyers and planners at the Department of City Planning in New York that worked this all out, but there had to be a basic kind of tension in there where if you lose the economics completely, which

happens in a lot of places, you know, say, well, you're going to have to do this and this and this and nobody is going to build, you don't get the neighborhood that's now developing around the High Line. But if you get it wrong the other way, what you end up with is, you know, bland places that, you know, feel the same as any other place in the world, not a place like that neighborhood with the High Line feels like.

And so I think there are ways to do it, but it's a very technically complex thing and it takes an enormous amount of training and skill, but it also takes a sort of fundamental understanding that you have to balance those things to begin with in order to get the results like you see there and not end up with Stuttgart 21, right, where it's Robert Moses again.

MR. KATZ: Right, very good. Thoughts, right over here, Neal.

SPEAKER: Well, I found the discussion of Stuttgart 21 very interesting, and it made me think of occupied Wall Street. And the question really is, how do we make a transition in this country from the form of development that we had to a form of development that is more people-responsive and community-oriented? Because it's really against the way our real estate system has worked for so long.

You all have been saying this, but I'm just trying to think, what are the ways forward? How can the system change over time so that new development is more responsive to the people issues we were seeing in this film?

MR. DOUGLAS: I can start on that one. I mean, you know, where I sit, I'm in the federal government and so I use the levers that we have, which are resources, a lot of resources, although it's dwindling every day.

MR. HUSTWIT: It was good those first few days, wasn't it, the Recovery Act?

MR. DOUGLAS: It was, yeah, it was. But one of the things that we're trying to do is to use the federal money that we put out to incentivize and catalyze activity that is much more inclusive in the way planning is done. And, you know, you may be surprised at the power of what a competitive grant program or something like that can

have on the community.

If you -- again, going to the sustainable communities work, if you look at the Tiger Grant Program, for example, you know, it was a transportation program created through the Recovery Act, you know, for the first time allowing local communities to come in, building into its sustainable principals, community involvement.

I was just on a call today with some folks from DOT, they're doing the third round. They said they have -- it's a $500 million pot, they have over $18 billion worth of applications to get at that money. And every single time it has gone out, the demand has been overwhelming. And by putting up the dollars, people who are coming to get the money are changing the way they do planning, they do design, the way they bring the community into the process. So I think that is one very powerful way that we can do it.

Other ways to do it are to lift up the best practice and the examples. I think Secretary Donovan has done a tremendous job going around the country and lifting up those who were doing developing and planning in this new, much more inclusive and open way, and it has had the impact of getting other communities to look at that, the attention that's being brought to those communities and starting to change their behavior, as well.

SECRETARY DONOVAN: Gary, go ahead.

MR. HUSTWIT: Well, I was going to say, I think it's kind of interesting that if you look at the ways that, in the majority of cases, the ways that citizens interact with their city government when it comes to the planning process, it's generally when the citizens are against something, at a city council meeting or whatever it is, and even then it's only kind of a small percentage of the people that will go to a city council meeting and voice their opinion. It's never the other way around. It's never citizen opinion kind of leading the development, at least the overall kind of direction of how they would like their city to be, and it's not getting citizens involved in every little step of the planning process.

But there does need to be soliciting the opinions. And even those simple

little stickers that Candy Chang did, the "I Wish This Was" thing, those sorts of genius idea, because it gets ordinary citizens who are not designers to think like designers, to think about the possibility. People might walk by that vacant building 100 times and assume it'll get redeveloped or whatever, but very rarely do people ask them, well, what would you want there, you know? In your dreams, what would be there? And I think it's that kind of inclusion that needs to try to, I guess, to try to inform direction of city development and at least -- and not just on a one-time thing, but somehow work it so that those sort of ideas are always incorporated into the direction of the city.

SECRETARY DONOVAN: So I think this ties back to where we have made advances in a number of places. There are -- and I can think of lots of examples in New York where there were citizen-initiated plans in the South Bronx, in Brooklyn. You know, the High Line is a different sort of initiated plan. Josh David, who founded Friends of the High Line, it's sort of a different form that it took, but that's clearly one of sort of the community standing.

To me, the other piece of it, though, is it shouldn't just be around government planning, but what are the kind of structures that it can actually involve people in creating a vision for the community, having ownership? And that's where I think the whole what I described as kind of the third sector that we've developed in this country of community development corporations, they're the most, you know, important housing developers and kind of activists in many ways in poor communities around this country now. And they're not just participating in planning processes, but they're actually owning buildings, becoming developers, so that in the sort of piece-by-piece ways that cities are created which you captured so well, it's not just when government says, oh, we're going to do this or that, but it's, you know, what does that storefront look like, and where are people working, and how do you engage people in a way that isn't just about, you know, where government steps in.

And I think the more we can do -- in some ways I feel like the federal government we inherited, Derek and I and everybody else, was one that was still based

on sort of the urban planning of the urban renewal era and didn't -- you know, we couldn't fund these groups. We didn't have programs that were really mechanisms to get them more directly the funds, and so we've opened up the competitions that Derek talked about, we've opened them up directly to nonprofits and CDCs to come in. Those kind of things I think you can build an infrastructure around it to really make a difference.

MR. DOUGLAS: One other thing I would just say on that that we're starting to explore is looking at technology more. We've been gathering some folks within some of the agencies to think about how you can use technology and information to bring more community engagement, building on some of the examples that are brought to our attention. Like in Maryland, we heard about how a couple of -- they were doing some redevelopment at the university, and a couple of students created a website that allowed community to directly go in and look at the plans and reshape and give input, which had a dramatic effect on the planning that was happening in that part of town, and so thinking about how we can use technology. Also, we have tremendous data sources that can also be used, and leverage by the community for input is another way I think that this could happen.

MR. KATZ: We've got a couple more questions right over here. Maybe just take two at the same time.

MR. ABRAHAM: Hi, Mark Abraham. Indira Gandhi said there are two types of people: there are people who get things done and then people who take credit for it. I try to be in the first group because there's very little competition there. Anyway, this is a movie about -- it's really a heroic film and it's about urban heroes. I'm just curious, two questions really for all of you and Gary. One is, what can we do at a local level to really tell the stories, empower those heroes which are found everywhere, as you saw in Detroit, empower them to do more? And also, to Gary, did you find in making the film and do you anticipate that it will sort of further the development of some of these really fantastic people?

MR. KATZ: Why don't we take one other? There's one question right

over here, let's just add it in.

SPEAKER: Yeah, another kind of film question for Gary. Could you talk about kind of just choosing which stories to focus on and sort of, in terms of a documentary, bringing it together to put the High Line here versus Tidy Street there, and which, you know, you found most interesting, for what reasons? And also, if it was a choice whether or not to use any time motion effects to show everything at real speed throughout the whole film of scenes.

MR. HUSTWIT: Sure. Well, just the first part of the second question, I mean, we realized early on that it was impossible to make a film about the design of cities globally and try to cover everything. I mean, you cannot be comprehensive in an 85-minute film about cities. You can't even scratch the surface, so --

SPEAKER: Three hundred hours maybe.

MR. HUSTWIT: Exactly, a 300-hour film. So what we tried to do was instead of look at issues that face every city, and then let's look at a group of projects around the world and the ideas behind those projects, and let those kind of -- really kind of be stand-ins for every project like that in cities around the world. So that was the only way I could figure it out, and even then we left out so much. I mean, it's, again, it's an impossible task.

So it was really looking at projects that we thought were, you know, changing the neighborhoods, their cities for the better and also have some thinking and some ideas behind them that could be maybe irrevocable or at least, you know, apply to other cities. Everyone in this room, have you seen *Koyaanisqatsi*, the epic Philip Glass scored, you know, thing? Well, that's why we didn't use any fast motion or slow motion. The minute you put anything in fast motion in a city or slow motion in the city, it just -- it is *Koyaanisqatsi*. So that was an early edit, no fast or slow motion in the film, everything is just real time as we'd see it. And now I forget what the first question --

SPEAKER: The heroes.

MR. DOUGLAS: The heroes.

MR. HUSTWIT: Oh, I mean, again, this is such a tiny representation of a few people. I don't think they see themselves as heroes, but I think it's the ideas behind those projects that are really the things that should get propagated.

But, yeah, I would love to see, you know, Mark Covington get this tractor that he's been trying to buy so he can clear more vacant lots in his neighborhood. But, I mean, things like the city -- there's a few more vacant lots that he wants to turn into gardens or green space, and the city wants him to buy them, I think it's like $20,000 or something like that, even though he's not doing anything commercial with them, just clearing them and trying to kind of maintain some, you know, feeling of a neighborhood in his area. So, you know, there's lots of people and ideas in the film I'd love to see kind of get out more, but it's really about the conversation. It's getting these issues and getting these ideas more into the public discourse.

Usually for us that happens when the film is on television and millions of people see it who don't normally come to events like this, who might just be kind of flipping through the channels and stumble upon this. So both the previous films have been on PBS nationally, and this one will most likely be on PBS next year.

MR. KATZ: One last question, back here, and then we'll --

SUZANNE: Thanks. My name is Suzanne. I'm an urban planner and my husband here is a filmmaker, so you've made us both really, really happy, and also robbed us of one of our favorite dinner table fantasies, which is making a film about planning. But we're both really glad that you did it and we really loved the film.

MR. HUSTWIT: Thanks.

SUZANNE: One thing that I was kind of -- I found refreshing about the film is that I think we have not heard yet tonight the word "gentrification," except now I just said it. And I found that refreshing because I think it's sometimes kind of a magnet for very superficial conversation about some of the issues that you touched on very deeply, but I'm wondering if that is in the 299 hours of additional footage. And also, Mr. Secretary and Mr. Douglas, if you have thoughts about sort of how that is being

addressed at the national level. Thanks.

MR. HUSTWIT: Do you want to go first?

MR. KATZ: Okay, next question.

SECRETARY DONOVAN: I'll go first. So there was a really interesting set of studies that somebody at Columbia did about gentrifying neighborhoods in New York. And this is somebody who went in to try to find the definitive evidence of, you know, how terrible gentrification is.

And what was interesting is, what he found is that poor folks in gentrifying neighborhoods actually stay longer in those neighborhoods than poor folks in non-gentrifying neighborhoods; that what really changes neighborhoods is the folks who come in and the inability of low-income people to continue to move into those neighborhoods.

So we often have these discourses about, you know, gentrifying neighborhoods, folks being pushed out, and there's no question, what he found was that there was pressure, economic pressure on those folks, but there were also benefits, too, and that people ended up staying longer.

And so -- and it was interesting because the first question I ever got asked, I went to interview with Mike Bloomberg to be housing commissioner, and I'm sitting at City Hall, and a bunch of other folks that are in the room around the table asked me questions. And kind of halfway through the interview he looked up and he said, so what should I do about gentrification? We ended up having a long conversation about it.

But I think that the bottom line is that it's about how you take economic benefits, a little bit, you know, the discussion about the High Line in a very different way, how do you make sure everyone has access to those benefits and that it's long term? So that low-income people can continue to move into that neighborhood, and that you don't end up 5 years later, 10 years later with, you know, a ghetto of one kind, which is basically all high-income people, which, by definition, means that low-income folks are being pushed into other neighborhoods where there's often concentrated poverty and other things that we know destroy cities and peoples lives.

So the real question is, how do you, through planning, through other techniques, maintain a mix and an ability for people to stay in those neighborhoods, but also move in? And a lot of that, frankly, is about how do you create enough of a mix of affordable housing to make sure that happens. And, you know, there was a building prominently featured, a new building developed by the related companies on the High Line that was in the film, kind of a bland, one of the less interesting -- but, you know, 30 percent of the units in that building are for very low-income folks, and you'd never know. But it's one of the things that you can do to make sure that you maintain a mix in those communities and that you don't have the sort of battles over gentrification that weren't a part of the film, but are very much a part of the lives of everybody who works in cities around the country.

MR. DOUGLAS: The only thing I would add to that, because I agree with what the Secretary said, and, you know, the way we've been approaching it is, you have to be intentional on the front end, which I think was one of the lessons from many of the people in the film, that if you want to make sure you don't -- with the increasing urbanization of the world, if you don't want to have a bunch of slums and all this, you have to be very intentional about how you create access to opportunity and make sure that there's affordable options.

We also, though, are thinking about it not just from a gentrification standpoint. I was actually in a meeting last week with some folks in the federal government, we were talking about some policy changes and the issue of gentrification came up. And someone pointed out, well, gentrification is when there's lower income folks in a community and you're doing something that pushes them out. But if you're working in a community that's already, say, higher income, that's not gentrification, I said that may not be gentrification. But any policy we're pushing needs to provide access to opportunity in those communities, as well. And so you need to be thinking about providing, as you said, access to the benefits across the board, making sure that communities aren't displaced and lose those benefits, but in communities where those

populations don't have access now, finding pathways to do it.

Affordable housing and that sort of thing is a key strategy. But we've been -- I would say that in my work in urban policy, also my colleague, David Agnews here, who works with all the mayors, the number one question I always get around our different policies we're pushing is this: How are you going to guarantee that people can maintain access to all the stuff that you're talking about doing?

MR. KATZ: We'll get maybe Harriett for giving the last question here.

HARRIETT: Thank you. I really love the film. I thought one of the things you did very well was create a lot of tension between different ideas, among different ideas. You started out talking about cities being a pattern of civilization, a pattern of settlement that's thousands of years old. Yangel talked about the human eye and what it can see, and the mayor of Sao Paulo wants screens, you know, bigger than what NASA has, so technology. And so, you know, there's that tension about, you know, how we live. Another interesting tension was about scale. Shaun and Derek, by necessity, because those federal grants are so torturous, you know, work at kind of a big scale. And you had some really interesting examples that were at the scale of a block or even smaller. And I just am interested in this idea that another participant mentioned about heroes, but the notion that everyone could be the hero of their own neighborhood, and that you don't actually have to wait for government to act, that you can do things to make your block better.

Have you seen that video from Oak Cliff, Texas, just south of Dallas, *Better Blocks*? It's kind of guerilla urbanism, where they kind of converted a street. They did a, you know, a streetscape project simply by moving things into the street and creating a one-block bike lane and taking vacant storefronts and filling them full of retail for the weekend to demonstrate what the block could be if they had different zoning, if people thought about it differently.

So I'd love to hear you talk a little bit about how you encourage, even from the federal government level, how do you encourage that kind of ownership and

innovation and sense of the possible, you know, at the scale of something as small as a neighborhood block or a neighborhood?

SECRETARY DONOVAN: Well, I mean, I love all the kind of temporary interventions and, like, using the city to kind of experiment with new ideas about how it might be shaped or looking at areas in a different way. And the beauty is that they're temporary. If it doesn't work, then the next week it's gone, but if it does work, then it kind of can provide the base for some ideas or further development. So, you know, I love things like Better Blocks or Parking Day, which was just last September, where people just put quarters in a parking meter and then turned it into a park, like put down grass and chairs and just, you know, for one day all over the world, people turned parking spaces into little parks.

But that kind of involvement, I think, it's almost in the same way like you might have a book club or something. I like the idea of just getting people together, friends in your city on a, you know, weekend afternoon, and, you know, have a few drinks, and picking one issue in the city or in the block or wherever and just brainstorming ideas about it for a few hours. And do that once a month, and, you know, maybe you might not come up with anything, but you might come up with something that was, you know, worth trying and you could do a temporary intervention or bring it to your local officials and try.

That's the kind of, I think, the energy and ideas we need, which is not just saying, oh, well, government is not going to do it, we've got to do it ourselves. But it's, you know, again, providing that experimentation and working with local government to try to kind of push in the direction of the city in a way that reflects, you know, your ideas and your dreams of how it should be.

MR. HUSTWIT: I mean, I would say, you know, I think, for us, this is a big challenge of trying to pull out the stories and to really lift up the heroes. But I think that what you really have to do is to make, you know, folks, just speaking about this country feel that it's cool to be a hero to do that type of stuff.

And, you know, the President, when he created an urban office, created this urban presence, part of it was to make people look at cities differently. You know, for a long time in this country, cities were a negative thing. It's been you don't want to be in the city, those are the places with all the problems and you want to be away from them. And a big part of President Obama's strategy and his view and perspective was that cities are a wonderful thing. That's where our assets -- a lot of our greatest talent are in cities and we need to change the way society looks at them. And we also need to change the way that we -- that people in this country look at taking action to make cities better, make their communities and their neighborhoods better.

And, you know, when you talked about that or when I think about that challenge, I think about the film. I forget which city it was where they talked about -- it was one of the mayors who talked about trying to change the way people viewed the bus system, trying to change the way people viewed the biking system, and to do it in a way that it wasn't a negative or a bad thing, but it was a positive thing. I think that that's the type of stuff we need to be encouraging and talking about and lifting up, to get people to say I want to try and do that, as well.

MR. HUSTWIT: I also think it's really important for us to know what we shouldn't do at the federal level, the decisions we shouldn't make.

SECRETARY DONOVAN: That's right.

MR. HUSTWIT: And that's a little bit the challenge I think we have is, you know, we're coming out of this period where the federal government sort of retreated from urban policy, right, and so what does an activist, engaged federal presence in urban policy look like that's not urban renewal, right, that's not, you know, literally my employees at HUD sitting and designing what public housing is going to look like in every city around the country? And it'll look exactly the same, which is honestly what happened. I mean, I have the pattern books at home from the 1930s and '40s.

And so I think a lot of this is about finding financial tools that can be enormously flexible at the local level, community development block grants and home funding and

other things, and then figuring out what are the models of sort of engagement and the way places should be working to engage citizens that we want to encourage without telling them what it should look like. And this is where I think -- take the Sustainable Communities Planning Grants, Derek has talked about this partnership. So we've put out -- the first year it was $180 million of planning grants between us and Department of Transportation. It's the largest federal investment in planning in generations.

A lot of what we were looking for was not a specific set of plans, but it was who's at the table? What's the structure that you have? How long has that group been together? Was it formed just to give us an application or is it something -- is it a group that's been working on something engaged in that community for some period of time? What's the planning process that you went through to get to the plan that you're giving?

So it's questions about how do we support the local vision and ensure that there's equity, that low-income folks are represented, that all ethnicities are represented, but not to say here's kind of a pattern book of what those solutions might look like, because those are really only going to come out of a set of citizens that are engaged at the local level with what do I want my community to look like and how are you going to make it different, right. Because, I mean, the thing I love about the High Line, for example, it's unique, right. It is not sort of the type of place-making we've had in too many cities around the country where you don't even know what country you're in or what place you are. It's very much about that place. So what you want to end up with is a way of supporting those kinds of very locally based visions for what communities need to look like, and also knowing not to go too far in dictating those terms.

MR. KATZ: So I'm going to close it out. And, you know, first, obviously, I want to thank Shaun and Derek for coming here tonight. There's nothing like having a group of urbanists together. I mean, we could just, you know, go until 2:00 in the morning, we could just do the whole 300 hours, you know.

This has given me some, like, you know, déjà vu all over again. But, you

know, I think particularly at a time of such polarization, I think at times we forget the people who are in public service and what you give and what -- you know, how much commitment there is here, and I think that's been shown tonight.

I mean, you've been on the job for two and three-quarter years, unbelievable learning has gone on in that period, incredible things have happened, and it is sort of a turning of a super tanker. But I think from people who go around the country, many of whom are here, you see it. I mean, you can see, you know, the real physical manifestation and the human manifestation of your work. So thank you for coming here.

Gary, I mean, you really, you know, A, you honor us with your presence. Jessica, thank you for coming, as well. This is an inspiring film, it's a disturbing film, and I think it's because it's this mash-up of the domestic and the global and the larger and the small all against the backdrop of these unbelievably complicated forces that are unleashed in the world.

But at the end of the day, I mean, what it's going to do is inspire the kind of book club, it's going to inspire the conversation, it's going to inspire the discourse, both in rooms like this, more importantly, on Twitter, social media, and so forth. You've just done a remarkable service, and I really thank you for that.

MR. HUSTWIT: You're welcome. Thank you.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012