

**DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE'S
BREAKFAST**

JUNE 27, 2001

MARK GREEN

I thank you very much Bruce. By the way, I've spoken this morning to Michael Bloomberg and Herman Badillo and they're not coming -- they yielded their entire time to me this morning. So, you needn't worry, this is the final speaker you have.

Thank you for inviting me, thank you for educating me. The education has to include Amanda Burden who is here, who is my appointee to City Planning. As Bob Moses and Amanda Burden will tell you, there are no term limits on talented appointees. And Amanda has been appointed twice by me, but I can't do it again because you all voted for term limits. So I'll be out as Public Advocate. I'm here also with Nancy Youman of my office who has worked with me some ten years -- both, as Consumer Affairs and now as a Public Advocate. A big *mazel tov* to have a hundred and ten random New Yorkers do anything together much less headstrong organizations do something anything together is unprecedented and essential. A very smart federal appointee thirty five years ago once said to me the way to keep government upright is to lean on it from all sides. And I spent most of my life at your side of this podium not my side of this podium, leaning on government officials to do the right things. And so, Landmark West by pulling together, putting out a White Paper, inviting candidates in after they've been "briefed," -- it's a charming word. Lobby -- yelled at about the White papers exactly what you should be doing to make sure that whomever is the next Mayor appreciates and admires all the collective work that you have done on all these issues. My office of Public Advocate has not naturally bumped into landmarks issues. It's just an institutional fact. We have forty staff that's it. And we respond to complaints largely about welfare checks or water bills or policing issues. If people have a concern about a landmarking issue, be it on the commercial side or the preservation side, they go directly to that agency. But, I want you all to know that there are a lot of goals and values that we share and one is people may say they're from New York City when they're outside the City. In people's heads, this is a City of neighborhoods. You know it when you track where people go to movies or restaurants in Carroll Gardens or Mott Haven or Chelsea or the north shore of Staten Island. They stay local. People relate to their community and so that is how I've run my office and I'm running for office. There are fifty-nine community boards that together constitute one New York City. I've had a town meeting in each and every one. I'm now in round two. The sixty eighth was in Sheepshead Bay, the sixty ninth in north central Bronx. The seventieth in Jamaica.

To govern New York City you have to know New York City and there are no short cuts. As the Republican candidate will find out, you can't learn it in four months, it takes either a lifetime and/or a decade in office going to eight thousand events -- none is prestigious but seven thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine events before this. So you understand

what each neighborhood wants, needs, and deserves. Second, on policing I'm very focused on more neighborhood policing. We've never have more cops per capita in our City. Where are they? And so like other cities have done I think more interactive neighborhood policing can reduce crime and reduce the wall between some communities of color and cops.

On economic development, similarly, I have a neighborhood based analysis. Instead of just throwing huge tax breaks on big companies who are mobile enough to threaten to leave -- like Senator Kennedy attempted to do in Bedford/ Stuyvesant -- you focus it on bottom-up neighborhood community based organizations because there is so much unmet demand and untapped talent locally. And preservation, of course, can be an incredible tool for economic development if you look at what the mayors have done in Chicago, in Boston, in Charleston. Yes, thirty seven million people come to this City every year. We're hitting a Yogi Berra-ism where nobody comes here anymore -- it's too crowded! Every time I walk through Times Square with my family. It's like, where are we, where did all these people come from? The slight resentment, why are they here? But there is a great appreciation because it adds to the vibrancy and the economy obviously of the City. And people come here

maybe to see Ellis Island, maybe to go to a gay pride week, maybe to go to a ball game -- we had two World Series contenders last year. But as you know as well or better than I, far more tourists come to New York to visit an historic site than to attend a sporting event, although that will surely change now that the Cyclones have begun their season in Brooklyn. I'm sorry: A stadium in every Borough is not economic development. And I'll have a lot to say -- I have and will have a lot to say on that subject at an appropriate occasion. Historic landmarks are an obvious anchor of our neighborhood revitalization. Look at the re-use on Wall Street of aging, empty buildings and now that they're smart buildings, they're centers of our technology start-ups down there. Look at the gorgeous and empty Lorillard Tobacco Warehouse that is the anchor of the new Brooklyn Park where I was three days ago. The amazing come back of the Brooklyn brownstone belt in Park Slope and Boerum Hill, Carroll Gardens and Fort Greene. You all exist because of the -- next to the Buckley/Vallejo Supreme Court decision on campaign money, maybe the stupidest public thing ever was the destruction in 1963 of the original Penn Station. Out of that stupidity at least grew a movement and an institution to make sure it not happen again. But, we have to be ever vigilant. I'm here with friends from Staten Island who worked with me unsuccessfully on preserving Dorothy Day's home. Here is a woman more likely to be a saint than I or any of you. The question of time -- given her extraordinary contributions to the poor -- and we were working for years to preserve her cottages in what was called Spanish Camp. And then a developer came along and settled the issue by blowing up her home, during the process and I hope out of that catastrophe will come a smarter, sterner landmarks preservation process of -- and I have demanded and I am getting an investigation by the Buildings Department how Mr. Descala somehow got a quicky overnight permit to take down the cottages that at that time were under consideration by Landmarks. So, what is the Mayor's role or more specifically the next Mayor's role in preservation policy? You have to know that I will have respect for our heritage, for our neighborhood context, and for appropriate scale to preserve and enhance the quality of life in our City. And, it is not

an either/or situation; I'm not seeking to be Mayor, so like the current Mayor I can take sides in any dispute – and lionize one and villainize the other. That doesn't work any more in a City that is so diverse with so many interesting competing needs. Take Soho, it wasn't either/or. Thank goodness, public policy figured out a way to encourage the creative recycling here of extraordinary old industrial buildings into these creative re-uses which not only contributed to -- created the vibrancy of Soho and some may say that it's almost a victim of its own success. Now, there's a movement to landmark, of course, the Gansevoort Market. I went down and visited with them about four or five weeks ago with the community leaders there. Obviously that whole area south and west has a very unique character and flavor and is why so many stylish restaurants and shops have followed Florent there. I can't decide, with this microphone, just *ex cathedra*, that that should or shouldn't be landmarked – there's a process to do it. But I'm trying to learn about some of these major venues that are up and ripe for potential landmarking. If you know -- get to know Amanda, she has been so knowledgeable about and sympathetic to your views and goals and I met with some or many of you and I look forward to continuing to do it. And I will share -- the next two and half months are very busy. I have four mayoral forums like this today on different subjects. But being mayor will be relaxing compared to running for mayor -- and if it's not, I have a big misunderstanding. But I'm not running -- to steal from John Kennedy -- because it will be easy – I'm running because it will be hard. And that's the last time I will compare myself to John Kennedy this morning.

Your four-point preservation platform, again, is a smart departure point. Let me just comment on each of the points briefly:

First, our Landmarks Preservation Commission in and of itself, of course, there has to be and has continued to be an independent agency. I don't have a specific person in mind to head it. If I did I wouldn't tell you. I find it improper and pretentious -- even for me it would be pretentious to start naming people before you actually won the office. But, it will be someone who is not just a big donor; it will be someone who is a big brain who has impeccable credentials and a sophistication about the City, that you all will all say, "That makes sense." -- in part, because I will come to you for ideas during a transition. Also, Landmarks is so specialized we shouldn't flirt with false efficiencies by merging it into Planning or Parks or Buildings. I see Mayor Giuliani has an agency Fire Department which, thank God, is less utilized because new technologies, smoke detectors have reduced the incidents of fires and death from fires – last week being a horrible exception. And, he's inherited and has presided over a corrupt Buildings Department. So what's his answer -- merge apples and oranges. And it makes no administrative bureaucratic sense. And I would not seek anything like that for an agency which has a budget only slightly larger than that of Public Advocate. It's about three million dollars; it is extremely small for the twenty-two thousand buildings and six dozen historic districts that it has to preside over, and, of course, as you know, there are more permanent applications and more buildings to review with less real dollars than in 1992. So, I would not want to shrink and would want to increase the size of it to do its mission because otherwise I worry that there could be delays in processing permits for property owners, which is unfair to them. We could lose historic treasures like Dorothy Day, but, even

more, if we don't move quickly enough and if it's not empowered enough then the existing rules for landmarking would go under enforced. I'm happy that in '98 Landmarks got the power to levy civil fines. I know how civil fines can occasionally enforced can create a sense of deterrence and law abiding-ness. I learned this from my years as the Consumer Affairs Commissioner. It certainly doesn't work if LPC's one inspector stays one inspector. People can figure out that one man or woman can't oversee twenty two thousand buildings citywide. It is also -- I will give you strategic advice - - if you want to make sure that Landmarks stays in a good solid office and retains your budget, appoint Howard Safir as your consultant because he is getting this patronage special deal from Mayor Giuliani for his Police Museum. They are foolishly spending a lot of money, not on Landmarks which needs it but to move you out of Peck Slip in order to have a musical agency and musical chairs to accommodate Howard Safir's Police Museum -- this is not policy it is patronage. (And while I do not name people who I will appoint, it is not that likely I would pick Howard Safir as my Police Commissioner. But, that's off the record.)

Second, is your historic preservation tax credits and incentive program, and it's clear that historic districts and values can enhance owner property values and enhance revenues to the City and to the State, and so I want to be your ally and continue and have smart tax incentive programs. I support the existing tax credit program that help rehabilitate the Times Square Hotel in support of housing which I visited two weeks ago down by Times Square, of course, that's where the Times Square Hotel would be. And, at 40 Wall Street and many others, I'm impressed with Governor Pataki's Home Rehabilitation Assistance Tax Credit for people in owner occupied historic homes that are listed on the National Register. And I'd try to act consistent and expand on those ideas, your ideas.

Third, on zoning reform. You know, the Zoning and Building codes 40 years ago locked us into a certain approach. Building materials have changed, demographics have changed, the economy of the City has changed -- in four decades? It's a long time. I want to take a fresh look not just at uniform vote standards as Chairman Rose attempted unsuccessfully to do. I really want to, as Mayor, take a fresh look at the whole zoning code and figure out where it's appropriate to place not only, but including, tall buildings. You may disagree with me on some of this I put out a plan for downtown Brooklyn, and I support some of the re-zoning of Long Island City because even though the market for commercial leases has softened, start-up companies are not that excited to be spending \$60 to \$80 a square foot in Midtown Manhattan and eventually will and should spill over into other boroughs. I want to turn downtown Brooklyn into the third central business district of the whole region -- third only to mid- and downtown Manhattan's with a state, city downtown Brooklyn Development Corporation which will do for it what has happened successfully for West 42nd Street. So sometimes you can add bulk where the infrastructure can handle it, as I think you can in downtown Brooklyn. But in other areas, No! For example, in a buffer around some of these brownstones belts you don't want these Trump-like, sore thumb buildings abutting these historic areas, and so we have to have more contextual zoning, so-called. So the surrounding context is smartly taken into account. And finally, the preservation of historic school buildings. This is a terrific idea. Our civic and school buildings are anchors in so many communities and as you know 40

such schools have already been landmarked. But you have to have a balanced approach to figure at what point is it economically not feasible to preserve these old buildings. I hope this is not a clash to come. But I have emphasized and I am sure many of you would agree, one of the top goals, if not the top goal of the City, is fixing the broken school system. To me among, but the best way of doing it is shrinking the class size, K to 3, when kids get literacy and numeracy skills or don't -- to no more than 20 students. And so many of them can go in landmarked school buildings but we have to be careful if it ever occurs that preserving the façade cost so much more than erecting a new building or a build out or transportables to shrink class size. And I'd like to see a harmony of these two goals to the extent possible.

With that, I look forward to any questions you might have.

Thank you very much.

MEDIATOR: Questions?

QUESTION: Governor's Island is a Dorothy Day Cottage, before the destruction, to the nth degree. It's 187 acres of public land that is about to go on the block. It's just the way those cottages disappeared. What do you plan to do before the fact if it can be done now in your present position and after the fact if you're elected Mayor, about Governor's Island?

GREEN: Not much I can do in my present position because whenever I urge that "X" be done, the Mayor does the opposite. So -- if you'll allow me -- I may come out for.... If Giuliani had any guts he would make it a casino and then he goes "I will be damned if I do this" by the way -- like an erratic child who does the opposite of what you want. This has happened more than once I assure you. First, looking backward, a perfect example of the problems of Mayor Giuliani for all his successes in other areas, is when your report card says "Can't play well with others," when you govern by enemies lists, you act petulantly rather than in the interest of the City. We had a deal with the Clinton Administration for a dollar we could have done so much and turned Governor's Island into something that I desire and you desire which is some commitment to the public good based on open space and public access and recreation and historic preservation of -- and I've been to Governor's Island -- of those unique facilities. Instead, he couldn't agree on anything because of his continuing behind the scenes fights with the Governor and his staff, and now we risk having to pay hundreds of millions of dollars with the -- President Bush, or as Gloria Steinem calls him, "Resident Bush," administration. He's servings, even if he didn't win. And so I am against any kind of casino. There is a unique spot in the harbor and what with the greater economies of ferry service -- it's not like "Oh, no one will ever go there." There are a lot of uses that I look to you but gambling is not among them -- and it won't happen. Nothing the Mayor now says on Governor's Island will happen. This is one of the biggest land use issues in the City and it will probably be on the plate of the next Mayor.

MODERATOR: And the next Mayor will not use it as the next site for Yankees Stadium, I trust.

Yes Sir? David Goldfarb with whom you did work, as I recall, on Staten Island.

QUESTION: Thank you for the work on Spanish Camp and that you were there with the tenants when they were being evicted, when it was low in moderate income housing for people, but even as we speak, in Queens, in Staten Island and in other places, Victorian houses, revolutionary houses are being torn down because the process for getting places designated and getting districts designated are so slow. The Mayor's management plan calls for one district in the outer boroughs per year and maybe one district per year in Manhattan. What would you do or what, as a policy, would you do to help expedite the process, get more appropriate communities preserved and also see to it that buildings are not destroyed during the process?

GREEN: Well, I was really mad about what happened with Mr. Descala because it was four or five years ago that David and I and others, before this current controversy literally exploded, what were...trying to protect Spanish Camp, so middle income people could live on the water and work out some arrangement with the owner. When this happened it made me even more determined to protect the integrity of the preservation process because he was like some terrorist in the Middle East who unilaterally tried to change the facts on the ground, and he did change the facts on the ground by blowing the building up, back to the ground.

So, I want to have an enhanced budget for Landmarks so that these processes are expedited rather than taking 15 years, like Riverside Church, which is an extreme example admittedly.

Look, under two percent of the City is either landmarked or under consideration. We're talking about old New Amsterdam here. We're not going to go back. We have to have new retail and commercial enterprise; we need to attract new companies for good high end, often information technology jobs. But the Giuliani Administration did not make this an emphasis. I will. I think they aim too low in their goals of historic districts and I would like to work with you if not in the next two months, more excitedly in the next four to eight years on exactly this.

MODERATOR: A moderator's follow up. One of the dirty little secrets of the Landmarks Commission over the past eight years has been its determination not to pursue landmark designation unless the owner agreed -- and that was one of the problems obviously in Staten Island. Is that a policy that you want your new Landmark Commissioner to adhere to or would you expect an independent Landmark Commissioner to pursue landmark designation where warranted, notwithstanding opposition from the owner?

GREEN: I don't have a final view of that. Of course, we do not ticket speeders on the condition that they concur with the ticket because they have an interest against getting a

speeding ticket. It is not clear why we can give that deference to people -- now they own the property and have a lot of rights to that property that go along with that contractual privilege. But if you differ too much that mutes the whole process. So, let me take a fresh look at it without committing this moment on a very nuance and important and complex issue.

MODERATOR: Nice try, but no cigar for the moderator. I'm looking for a fresh face that I haven't asked before.

QUESTION: In Upper Manhattan and in the South Bronx Federal tax money is currently being used through the Empowerment Zone. According to a letter that I have from HUD, it would seem to be used in violation of the National Historic Preservation Act and that no consideration is being given to whether these buildings that are being redeveloped are potentially national or state historic landmarks, and, of course, the Mayor is one of the board members of the Empowerment Zone -- and how would you as Mayor react to one of these issues?

GREEN: Never heard about the issue until now, and I am very glad and Congressman Charles Rangel is glad and responsible that we have an Empowerment Zone there which is helping -- it's among the reasons that Harlem is being economically revived but obviously it has to be done consistent with our national and city law. So, without knowing about location of or the exact context of the conflict -- if you want to send me and Nancy Youman information as Public Advocate, because while I have this interesting relationship with the Mayor on public policy issues, I have a very good and close relationship with Congressman Rangel, generally -- and since he is both the dean of the delegation and frankly the dean of empowerment zones, I would be glad to convey to him the information that you have.

QUESTION: My name is Cheryl De Lescio. I'm an urban planner with an engineering firm. As you know, New York City is currently studying the feasibility of a cross harbor freight rate tunnel -- one of the portals which will be located in Sunset Park Brooklyn. I was wondering if you were in support of the tunnel and the active re-use in return of the industrial waterfront to the Sunset Park neighborhood as well as the Brooklyn Army terminal and the Bush terminal?

GREEN: I am a big booster of the cross harbor freight tunnel -- not as important a booster as Jerry Nadler or as knowledgeable a booster as Jerry Nadler who knows more about the freight tunnel than I do about myself. But he is an example of a public official who when you focus your intelligence on a particular issue you can really move it -- but for him it wouldn't be any where. He helped persuade the Giuliani Administration to discuss it and push it modestly in two State of the City's ago.

I have a concept that I will be discussing more extensively tomorrow morning in a talk to a construction assembly, on how we have to take a regional economic view of what we do. As Public Advocate -- as potential Mayor of New York City -- I want every company

to locate in the five boroughs. OK -- write that down. Having said that, regions compete and I would far prefer a company be in Jersey City than in Phoenix or Paris, because we have to interact economically, and, second, there are plenty of cities where a quarter of their products in and garbage out are railed in and out. In New York City three percent is by rail because we don't have a direct rail link from New York to New Jersey, and then the mainland. It is economically essential that we have a cross harbor freight tunnel. The economic studies done by EDC justify it. They're about to start an environmental impact statement. I visited Sunset Park and have seen what is going on there in terms of industrial use. There are some parts in Brooklyn that may not be entirely happy with this and we'd have to mitigate any environmental impacts on them, because the long term goal is a cross harbor freight tunnel will reduce by a million trips a year truck traffic in our city especially through Brooklyn. This truck traffic adds to congestion, adds to pollution, shakes up buildings and streets in a very damaging way.

And, so, in my mind there're about four huge infrastructure goals that the next Mayor should focus on -- and it's the Second Avenue subway, it's expanding the Javits Center which was obsolete the day it was built. It's a cross harbor freight tunnel; for me, it's building up downtown Brooklyn as the next venue for the next Bio-Tech or Microsoft; extending the 7 line south and maybe even into New Jersey is on a list but a lot of these monies have to come from the Port Authority. It is sitting on a ton of infrastructure money far more than the City has.

And there are all these ideas on the shelf that will be ready to go in 2002, once there is a Mayor who gets along with the Governor. And, let me end because time is short on a political point which bears on the substance point. A novice might think that if you have a Governor and a Mayor on the same party, "Oh, they get along." The opposite. And you saw how in New Jersey, when you have two Democratic Senators like Torricelli and Lautenberg, they were so at odds. And we've seen that with Pataki and Giuliani in our state because they have trouble sharing credit, sharing donors, sharing voting bases.

But when you're a different party -- I get along with George Pataki -- I myself do not want to be on the Republican ticket in 2008 -- there, I've never said that before. And so when I'm Mayor we can sit down, share credit, negotiate in a smart tough way, and the cross harbor freight tunnel will be at the top of the list, for the next Mayor, the next Governor and this Port Authority.

MODERATOR: We're going to impose on the candidate for three minutes longer than he wishes. One, to give you the book, the official NYC Landmarks book with an absolutely inappropriate inscription from its author who is present which I will not read, but you can read for your pleasure.

GREEN: The \$4,500 check is coming. How so I make it out?

MODERATOR: We're going to have one more question from the floor and then I'm going to end with the question I've asked each of the candidates. You can think about it now while I'm taking the question -- just remind yourself as you leave to look on this

face of this brick pillar for the wonderful watercolor of the building we are now standing in which will generate the question and also across the street at Lincoln Center which will be something you will have to deal with if you are the Mayor of the City of New York, but we have one more question. Yes, Sir.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

GREEN: One percent for parks? Definitely.

QUESTION: Good Morning! My name is Mr. Brooks and I am with Parks 2001. Many Landmarks and historic houses are in city owned park lands and at Parks 2001 we believe that well maintained parks play an essential role in every aspect of community economic development. What are your plans to revitalize the parks for the economic benefit of all five of New York City's boroughs?

GREEN: Especially in low-income communities where under parked, Central Park, where I announced my candidacy in the extraordinary Prospect Park -- but a lot of communities look to their parks at their Hamptons. And if they're run down and their bathrooms don't work and their trees aren't pruned, it's a real loss to the City. My wife and I visited Chicago two conventions ago and were struck by how beautiful the city was, with a beach in the city. It's like a New Yorker had trouble understanding it. And park spending per capita in Chicago is double New York City. And it looks it. This is not a failure of this Administration, over the last three administrations funds for parks and real dollars have fallen by half. Oh! Let's double it and so 2001 Parks people have come with a brilliant political idea. It is the kind of idea I would that have come up with when I was a young radical. Let's have just one percent for parks. One percent -- it's so little. It would double the Parks budget in my first year in office. But wait a second, doesn't Landmarks want more money for staff? Don't I want to find more revenue and bond it and put up more affordable housing? Don't I want to shrink class size which could take some expenditures? In other words, I have almost with no exception pledged a specific percentage or amount of money as a candidate because while some of the candidates have pledged all kinds of big numbers for headlines -- forgive me -- I'm the candidate who is going to have to redeem these pledges in six months as Mayor. And I do not want to kind of give away the store and be dismissed as a tax and spend liberal. We have a tax and spend conservative now in City Hall squandering money on minor league baseball stadiums instead of the cross harbor freight tunnel, instead of a Javits Center expansion. So I'm going to be as fiscally tight with your tax payer money as I have been as your consumer advocate with your consumer money.

Having said that, I do look forward to sitting down with your 2001 Parks people for a briefing which will be smaller than this, but probably every bit as focused and intense. And with a name like Green, you gotta be for the parks.

Thank you very much!

MODERATOR: Now the abuse of the chair.

GREEN: That was my final answer.

MODERATOR: The building we are standing in and you will see it when look is a glorious example of New York City architecture threatened -- the current tenant including the Saloon, our host, who I may have forgotten to thank, are threatened with eviction on January 31st. So if elected you will have all of one month to undo the three and half years of indifference that the Commission has shown to our concerted efforts with all sorts of professional reports rendered to achieve landmark protection to this building. While your spending that month saving this building begin to think about the fact that Lincoln Center which is now landmark eligible and is under consideration and has past its first hurdle for listing on the State and National Register of Historic Places is scheduled to spend one and a half billion dollars for what is either a restoration, a rehabilitation, or a reconstruction of Lincoln Center including a tower in Damrosch Park, the demolition of Philharmonic Hall or its gutting, and moving the Metropolitan Opera twenty or forty feet into the plaza. Any preliminary thoughts about the building you are standing in and across the street?

GREEN: Nice try! I didn't get breakfast and I'm supposed to. Look I know about Lincoln Center and I know about the renovation and the reconstruction and I have been visited by the past and the new executive director and Beverly Sills, and I have been lobbied by -- and Lincoln Center, if it's not landmarked, the system doesn't work -- that's easy.

As for the location I'm in, I obviously will give it every consideration January 2nd -- give me one day of revelry and I'll take a look at it -- but obviously you don't expect, nor do you expect someone standing up in the middle of a campaign to bypass this process and just suddenly announce Yea or Nay. I'm not expert enough and I'm not foolish enough -- but I really have enjoyed the morning. I really do enjoy the view. From here it looks like the answer should be landmark it, but allow me to appoint a very capable person to see whether we can do something quickly or eventually to protect this Michael Weinstein Arch facility.

Thank you very much.