

**REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE'S  
BREAKFAST**

**August 8, 2001**

**MICHAEL BLOOMBERG**

**BLOOMBERG:** Thank you very much for having me. Let me preface my remarks by saying I have lived in New York City since 1966 and while I'm not a professional politician, I am a permanent resident of this City, so what happens to it -- particularly what happens to its landmarks and its parks and its economic development impacts me directly. I live in a landmark building, a townhouse on 79<sup>th</sup> Street on the east side, and I must tell you that I have been before Landmarks twice. When I first bought the building with great trepidation I went to landmarks because it's a narrow townhouse but it had to street level front doors, one right in the middle where it should've been, and then one off to the side and if you looked at the building there was just something wrong that second did not belong there. And it was really hard to understand how the original architect ever would do something crazy like that, but if you looked at the history of the building --it's roughly -- I forget now 130, 140 years old -- that one time that block had been all townhouses, all built by the same person for himself and all the members of his family. And today only two townhouses survive although I think the fronts, in all fairness, have been changed many times over the years but I looked and it turns out that this house had had many reincarnations -- it had been a private house, it had been apartments and it had been a doctor's office. So, we know where that other door came from and with great trepidation I went to Landmarks and worried myself sick as to whether or not they would give us permission to get rid of the second front door. Lo and behold, it turned out that the door had been put in illegally. Landmarks had been trying to get the owner to get rid of it for years. So we were instantly blessed and got rid of the front door. And then recently, I wanted to change the windows so I went to Landmarks -- first to the local community board and in all fairness the community board didn't keep us waiting very long. We got to our turn. They looked at the plans, said great idea and then we went to Landmarks where you never know whether -- you always walk in as a supplicant saying I wonder whether they'll let us do this and in all fairness the next thing that happened is that they seemed to want to go to lunch and they took one look it and said great those will look fantastic, stamped the OK, and we were out the door.

So my two experiences directly with Landmarks were nothing but pleasurable things. And if I get the new job that I am applying for I'm not sure whether I have to go to Landmarks to repaint a house on the Upper East Side, but you can rest assured that my former wife and I will not have any disagreements about what color it should be or whether it should be repainted. Anyways, let me talk for a few minutes about preservation and economic development because clearly we need both in this City. And I think there is always a temptation when you're talking to one group to stress one and when you're talking to a different group to stress the other and I don't know that you can get away with that. I don't know that it's

fair and I certainly don't know how to do that. I think that you have to look at both things hand in hand and sometimes you go one way and sometimes you go another and you have to have a balance. In the end balance is the key.

The first big preservation effort in this City came about starting from an event that took place in 1835. In 1835, for those of you that don't remember from first hand experience, there was a cholera epidemic here -- and also there was a fire downtown. The fire started at Exchange and Pearl and basically burnt out an entire section of Manhattan -- every thing south of Wall and east of Broad Street -- six hundred and fifty odd buildings totally destroyed. What happened was the East River was covered with ice so they couldn't get much water and when they could break through it was so cold the fire hoses froze and the fire burnt on and on and they got help from even as far away from Philadelphia. So, obviously the fire lasted for a few days. Well, the next thing that happened is the insurance and the financial interest down in that area said we have to do something about preservation. And so you can argue the first big preservation project in New York City was the Croton Aqueduct so that they could get water here, and it, on its own, became an economic development device; it also became the most basic kind of preservation device. We have to have the ability to protect what we already have. If you worry about saving a building make sure that the Fire Department can get there too. It's exactly the same issue as if you have a great old building in a park and we worry about termites getting in and without any (inaudible) eating it. Preservation is not just sitting there and designating a building and saying this is great, this is our heritage, this is what we should save. Preservation is also about the practical aspects of maintaining buildings and doing the kinds of preventive things that are very easy to postpone particularly in economic down turns, and one of my great fears and I think it should be one of your great fears is it's all very nice to sit around and say something is worth saving, but when push comes to shove and you have to make choices, unfortunately maintenance is always number two -- never number one. And you can see that in our infrastructure in this City. We've done it again and again and again. You can see what happened to buildings on Ellis Island where we didn't pay any attention. It's happened to a number of old buildings in parks. It's happened all over the City, in fact all over the country. We in America are always looking forward, and there's nothing wrong with that as long as you understand that when you want to preserve what came before us, you have to devote some of the resources that would let you do new things -- new projects, help more people to the old. Maintenance, maintenance, maintenance -- if you don't do that you're going to be in a very big problem. Anyway, after that we had a number of preservation projects. There was a surplus of unoccupied commercial space downtown and people went and said, "Hey, there's a better use for this," and out of that came a vibrant Tribeca and Soho. And when we developed that -- the surrounding areas became populated and property values went up and people came in and found new uses and they went out in the streets and they brought their families in rather than running away. The same thing happened over in Brooklyn. The whole district around BAM is just quite amazing. You should go over there. People talk about a revival in Manhattan. There are parts in Brooklyn that make Manhattan look like it hasn't improved at all. Some of the biggest changes I have seen in this City, in all five boroughs, have taken place in Brooklyn. Part of that is because the State has helped and the city government has helped, but all of it is

really because everything has come together. We've recognized our past. We've saved some things but we've done it an area like around BAM where you can have economic development at the same time you can preserve what the best of the past is. That key, that balance is something that is easy to talk about but as you all know, probably more than any other group, hard to actually accomplish when you get right down to saying Yeah or Nay, up or down on specific projects. In this City everybody is in favor of change. But the problem is always getting people to agree to which change. And that's what leadership is all about and the leadership from the community is important, the leadership from government is important, the leadership from the person in the street. If the average person does not understand what you are trying to do and what government is trying to do they will not be there supporting you. And if they don't support you then you will not get things done. You can go up to Harlem and you can see exactly the same kind of economic development. There are places all over the City where once we go and we say we are going to take specific buildings and specific neighborhoods and protect their character, but at the same time let people come in and do some practical things, then everything fits together. There's all the talk about contextual zoning. All that really is, is saying you got to look at the neighborhood. You can't do anything looking at one building or one neighborhood, but you also have to understand the needs of society as a whole. We have to have jobs, we have to have schools, we have to have medical buildings. We have to do those things and they don't necessarily have to be done at the expense of tearing down what history has left us. But what it does require is that everybody work together. And, in the end that seems to me to be government's job. Government's job is to put together conflicting interests and let the people who really know what they're talking about and represent those desires come to some meeting of the minds. I don't think it's government's job to dictate something, other than acting as a threat, saying if you and you are trying to get something done cannot resolve it then government will resolve it and neither of you will be happy. And either way we're locking the door until you come out with a resolution.

You have to do something. We have to support Landmarks. We have to give Landmarks a budget that will give them some enforcement capability. All of the rules and regulations that everybody talks about always leaves me cold when I then go out to the streets and see that it is totally meaningless. It is just a bunch of people talking about solving a problem without ever actually doing it.

The implementation is what's hard. It's when you have to vote up or down -- when you have to chose A or B, and the sad thing -- I talked about my experience before Landmarks -- but the only sad experience I had is afterwards somebody said to me, "Why did you bother to go to them. They would never have known. You should've just done it." Well, I don't think that's the way you should lead your life. And I hope it's not true. But Landmarks has one inspector for a city of 8 million people. And it is probably unfortunately true and we just have to do something about that. I am not in favor of preserving every single building at the expense of economic development nor am I on the other side of that, but I certainly am in favor of having a set of laws that people can understand, have some input in their development and then enforcement. It is hypocritical and not good policy and breeds a contempt for the law to have rules and regulations and laws that we sort of all put on the books to shut people up and then do not

implement. You just cannot do that. So my message, I guess, is we've got to find some balance. What do we got to do? You've got to give tax rebates -- I'm in favor of Pataki's Bill as opposed to the Assembly's Bill. I think rebates make more sense. You've got to find an incentive for people to do what we'd like them to do. People in the end always act in what is their and their families and their companies and their organizations best interest. Matching incentives to the policy that you would like is the way you get people to work together to make progress and to be happy and we've got to make sure that the zoning laws of this City are consistent with what organizations like Landmarks want to do. We've got to make sure that the tax policy encourages the kind of activities that we'd like. We've got to constantly measure and make sure that the policies that we're trying to implement are actually working. There are case after case after case where we start out -- we enact a law, we even get it going and actually some people follow it, and then if you go back five years later or ten years later, nobody can remember they were unintended consequences and we got exactly what we didn't expect or didn't want, and there's nobody around with the sense of history and the fortitude, the consistency to stick and stay the course -- that's the toughest thing for all of us.

Every one of you can make a difference but who carries on that difference when you go on to other things or you're not around anymore?

Now let me just end what I want to talk about with one of my absolute pet peeves which I wish somebody can give me a good solution for. There are neighborhood after neighborhoods in this City -- not the nice historic districts in all fairness tends to be the neighborhoods with very low economic activity -- where at night every store is covered with these metal graffiti-covered shutters. They are dangerous because the police don't know what's happening behind them. They keep light coming out onto the street and they make the neighborhood look to me like a war zone. If we could just find some ways to incent owners of those buildings or the store -- whoever leases the stores -- to put open grills and keep lights on at night, and if we could plant some trees on those streets. I believe we could renovate those neighborhoods for a relatively tiny amount of money. It would make the streets safe. It would make the neighborhoods look beautiful. If I can urge you to drop everything else you're working on and focus on that, I think you'd do more for this City than anything else. Anyways, thank you very much. I'll be happy to take questions.

MODERATOR: If I may be permitted a moment of personal pride. There are two people in this room who have addressed some considerable part of their efforts to your pet peeve: one is Arlene Simon who on West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street has resulted in the taking down of many of these solid barriers; the other is Assistant U.S. Attorney, Charles Simon -- where is he -- my son who left, who has a project going, among other things, in Harlem where they have taken an entire graffiti wall; got neighborhood kids from the school to paint the mural on the wall and are also working on it. So there are community groups acting on it and I'm sure that there are a whole bunch of folks who would agree with you entirely. My moment of personal pride is over, I will criticize my son as soon as I get out

of here for leaving before he had his moment in the sun and we will open up for comments and questions. Kevin!

QUESTION: Hi, my name is Kevin Cleary. I live across the street. I'm on the board of my building. My wife is Tammy and I raise our two boys, Lyle and Austin here on the Upper West Side. Congratulations on making the cover of the Times today. But I must admit that I got a little indigestion over breakfast when I noticed that you were quoted as saying that one part of your agenda would be to remove what you call "cumbersome land use and environmental reviews that discourage developers. I would like you to be specific as to which environmental issues you think should be lifted?

BLOOMBERG: The requirement for an environmental review is based on whether or not there is government money involved, and I don't think that that's the proper trigger. The proper trigger should be, if you want to develop something that would change the character of the neighborhood whether or not it is funded privately or funded publicly. Donald Trump built a ninety story building and did not need an environmental review because

there's no government money. We should've had an environmental review. I don't if I were doing the review would I come down but if you were going to change the nature of the neighborhood where you may stress the services or destroy buildings that perhaps shouldn't be destroyed or vastly increase the number of people, that requires a review. If you're building a two-family house that happens to have one dollar worth of government money in a bunch of other two-family houses, that's wasting our time. So I'm not against environmental reviews -- quite the contrary. I just think we should do them where there is an issue and unfortunately if I understand the law the way it's done now, it's if government money is involved you have to have it and if government isn't involved -- and that doesn't make any sense to me. Why is that a good policy but I'm not opposed to the reviews, it's just the trigger.

KEVIN CLEARY: (Inaudible)

BLOOMBERG: No, I didn't say that at all. Whenever you're going to change the character of the neighborhood, there should be a review. Period. It should not be a function of whether it's government money behind it or private money. The issue for an environmental review is whether or not you're going to change the environment and then you're going to have to look at that, not who's funding it. That's what I said. I haven't read the article yet, so I don't know what they printed. And, incidentally, just because they printed it, doesn't mean you said it just because it's the New York Times.

MODERATOR: Welcome to the world of politics.

QUESTION: Barry Rosenberg. I'm a member of the Community Board and an active person in the community,  
And the co owner of one New York's and the East Side's great bakeries (inaudible).

BARRY ROSENBERG: My surrogate father, thank you.

As a city official you would have a great deal of opportunity to spend city money on capital projects particularly in buildings, examples being CUNY's building and transforming the old Altman site and the work done at Baruch on a transformation for their library. How would you use your financial skills to accelerate and expand the role of government in spending money on projects that are related to education, transportation and other services?

BLOOMBERG: I think, unfortunately, the economic outlook for the next few years is such incidentally that we're not going to have a lot of money to go and do a lot of things that we'd like to do. But having said that, in the end what government has to do is to find ways to attract private capital to build in this City, and to be the watch dog to make sure that you protect neighborhoods; that you get great architecture; that you keep the kinds of facilities we need for jobs and education and research. Government's function shouldn't be basically and there are not going to have the money to go out and spend government money. There is clearly some of that, but if you take a look at the housing needs of this City, there is no way that the state government and the city government and you're not going to get federal monies for this -- not very much anyways -- particularly if the economy slows down -- you're going to have to get private money to come in to solve problems like the housing problem, to fund the building of university and medical buildings. We've got to focus on how some kind of a balance between preserving all the historic schools -- we've some great buildings that are schools. At the same time we have an education problem. We've got a million one hundred thousand kids in the public school system who are coming out of school without the basic skills to get a job. But, I think Government's responsibility is an oversight one, and an instigation one, a promotion one, not providing the money itself, and we unfortunately don't think of Government's role in changing the infrastructure in this City as important as some of the other things. The Mayor really has to have a focus -- understand why people come here and build what they want to build how it fits in with the neighborhood. I think the community boards have not been consulted in the way they should -- I'm a big believer in community boards as the real public advocate. I think that's -- I've always liked coming down to the neighborhood level, whether it is taking the precinct commander or captain and the police department and letting them adjust the delivery of services for the neighborhood, or giving the principal of a school the authority to run the school suitable to the student body and the staff that that principal happens to have. I also think that Government in terms of delivering services to each neighborhood, the community board is the right level to do that. I'll give you a good example. I'm on the Board of the Central Park Conservancy -- I should have disclosed this before -- and have been a big supporter of that and Randall's Island Federation. Both are parks that my kids have used and I've always liked both of them. A few years ago -- maybe five years ago -- something like that we, had problems with -- I think there're ten community boards, if I remember, that abut Central Park and there were battles all the time and they were sort of the enemy to the Conservancy. So I had a dinner at my home for the two or three people -- the Parks person, the president, maybe it was the vice president, I forget, but two or three people from each of the ten parks. And the staff of the Conservancy didn't really want to do it -- they sort of treated --

why would you ever talk to these people. While I invited all ten community boards to my house and then I called the Chairman of the Board of the Conservancy and the President and said, "They're coming – would you like to join us for dinner?" And that sort of solved that problem. And I can only tell you – I think we've done one other time since then, and we've had nothing but great relations. I think you really do -- I don't mean to just go on -- but I think community boards are the proper place for the public to interact with Government. And I will spend a lot more time and have some bureaucracy in place so that community boards can really filter back to the Mayor. The Public Advocate is one person with a small staff responsible for the whole city. And maybe the community boards are opposed to the Public Advocate as well. There are no objections to that, but you've got to find some ways when you talk about government's role in development -- it's Government role in development at the local level.

MODERATOR: Right Here.

QUESTION: Good morning. I'm Ian Alterman, a 36-year resident of the Upper West Side; former landmarks chair of Community Board 7. I was very impressed by your comments about the lack of teeth that the Landmarks Commission currently has for enforcement in other things. I have a two part question. First.

BLOOMBERG: Does he get a two part question.

IAN ALTERMAN: It's an A or a B.

MODERATOR: It depends on the person.

IAN ALTERMAN: One from column A and one from column B. Column A is can we get – because of what you said – can we get some minimal commitment that you're planning to increase the budget of the Landmark Preservation Commission so that they can hire more enforcement and become a more toothy -- teathy organization, and second of all, stealing a question from Bruce, how would you make you decisions on the appointment of Commissioners and would you involve the community, the land use and landmarks community in those decisions ?

BLOOMBERG: I think that you have to have somebody running Landmarks that has the respect of the constituency that they serve. Any Mayor who puts somebody in the position where there're not liked and respected, just is asking for an organization to not work. I mean that just to me is common sense. And you certainly consult a lot – in the end the Mayor has to pick somebody who they agree with philosophically and who they think is a team player. One of the things that happens unfortunately in cities or in any government is you have these separate entities that think of themselves as totally separate in a world where if we're going to make progress everybody's got to cooperate.

Somebody recently said to me, “How do you deal with all the fights on your campaign staff?” And, I said, “What are you talking about? We’ve never had a fight in my company. I never had fights in my family. I mean I just don’t believe it you go and – you’re intelligent adults – you go in a room and you work together. And I would make sure that the person I picked – that would be one of my key things -- team player -- smart person, somebody whose philosophy I agree with. Somebody who certainly is knowledgeable. You have to have somebody that knows the subject, and it doesn’t have to be a preservationist, for example, but if you don’t have a good knowledge of this City and the issues and the importance of preserving what’s right, balanced and being able to work with the economic development people, you’ve got the wrong person.

In terms of committing. I think there’s a whole bunch of small agencies that we’ve cut back. Landmarks is certainly one of them. Where we’ve been penny wise and pound foolish. They’re small things that don’t really have any great impact on the budget and you can argue that their symbols and everybody should bare the pain but there are certain things which like this you’re doing a lot of damage long term, so you could increase Landmarks budget at the same time you deal with a fiscal crisis -- hopefully we won’t have a fiscal crisis. But I’ll give you another example, advertising for tourism in this City. As economic times get worst and tourism is down, that’s the time we should be expanding our budget, times when we don’t have a lot of money to do things, to buy buildings out of public trust, that’s the time you want a strong Landmarks and a well funded run. And my main objection to Landmarks is any organization that can’t enforce it’s rules and regulations is just not contributing the way it should be.

All you need to know about Landmarks is that they’ve got one inspector for the whole city. Unless there’s an enormous amount of waste which is kind of hard to believe, given this group, you really do have to give them some money and it’s not going to be in the grand scheme of things -- anything that’s going to bust the budget. But those are the kinds of things infrastructure, long term things planning things where you really do want to spend some money. Landmarks is like your top management and organization, that’s where you really want to spend your money. If you’ve great people and structures at the top, it filters all the way down.

MODERATOR: I’ll take that as at least a minimal commitment.

QUESTION: I’m Carol Clark. I’m a member of the Board of Advisors with the Historic Districts Council and for many years we’ve been concerned about two basic things. One is that the zoning that applies within the historic districts is often very much at odds with what the Landmarks Commission might approve in a certain instance and City Planning, and Landmarks have not been on the same page. I’m wondering what you’d do about that. And two, outside the historic district particularly you spoke about Brooklyn which is indeed undergoing a great renaissance but the districts there are very narrowly drawn and yet as you know the brownstone neighborhoods spread widely and there are tools that could be put in place -- you talked about contextual zoning. What would you do there to ensure the long term economic viability of neighborhoods that in fact are not within the historic district?

BLOOMBERG: Well, I think the first part of your question, I am told it is true that the Planning Commission and Landmarks don't work well together. I happen to know – but I'm not going to tell you who – I know exactly who I would appoint to run the Planning. And I don't know who I would appoint to run Landmarks in my (inaudible) stage. But the first thing you have to do is sit down, not just with those two organizations but there's the Department of Buildings, there're a lot of parts of this City just not the organizations outside of government, there are parts in government that have to do with the future of our homes, and our neighborhoods and our streets. And what I'm good at is getting a bunch of people to work together. I'm a big believer you take them and put them away from all the cell phones, and blackberries and you sit down – my background is an engineer – so I start and say, "OK, what are we trying to accomplish." Nobody ever wants to do that. I think one of the reasons we're always in trouble is we always want go and solve our little pet projects -- resolve that issue and then you say, "Well, we're trying to do it in the grand scheme of things. Yeah! I know the grand scheme -- but let me get down to my thing. You can't let that happen." That's what management's all about. And I think the answer is basically working together. I think in all fairness, our Mayor is as responsible as anybody for that kind of development. If you make the streets safe then a lot of other things happen, and I think the second thing you could do for landmarks and buildings and everything else in the City if you could make the schools better. I mean, right now you have a lot of people moving to the suburbs because they can't educate their kids here – they don't want to educate their kids here -- if the schools were better they would stay and that would change dramatically the character of a lot of these neighborhoods. And you just go down some blocks – you look in Harlem -- it's really very noticeable that streets – lots of different brownstones are being renovated – and they're being renovated because people who before would've moved out of the city are saying, "No, the City is better. I can walk down the street without looking over my shoulder. I want to stay here." And in the end, that's what you've got to do. It's got to be grass roots.

MODERATOR: Hopefully, the one of the few owners of a floating landmark, the retired New York City Fire Boat, The John Jay Harvey that's spectacular.

QUESTION: Do you have a position on the disposition of Governors Island?

BLOOMBERG: Yes! I was afraid I was going to get that question. Number one we have to do something – you know -- everybody agrees with that and nobody's willing to pick a thing. We need somebody to stand up and say, "OK, I'll take the grief. Here's what I want to do." Now, if you really want me to do that and I'm not married to the plan which they will write, but I will give you an example – I want to phrase this carefully – an example that you might consider -- not gambling, not a football stadium. I guess if you forced me today to make a decision, what I would do is I would try to convince the Guggenheim to put a Frank Garry building on Governor's Island and I think it could be a big symbol – It reminds me when I look at the plans for it and they want to do it on the East River – where the tennis courts are – it reminds me of the Opera House in Sydney.

And I think the symbols of New York are the Empire State Building and the Statue of Liberty but if the scale, and I don't quite know how big it is – I've looked at the plans but it's kind of hard for me to envision it – if you put that on Governor's Island juxtaposed to two great old forts, then you let the rest of the area be developed with low rise revenue producing buildings – if you can get schools to build dorms there – although I think that'll be hard – but those kinds of things. But the government has got to be the facilitator – that's the government's role here – it's not going to have a lot of money to do it. At best, the government can get the land, and in terms of transportation the only practical ways to get there is an aerial Tramway from the tip of Manhattan and one from Brooklyn – and, you have a ferry. There are some schemes to cut into the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel – whether that's practical or not, I don't know. Let me just re-emphasize – I'm not married to that particular idea, but if that's the way it turned out, I think New York City would be well served. If anybody's got a better idea, for goodness sakes, promote it, because if we don't do something quickly, we are just not going to get that, and if you look at that piece of property it's just so great, it's part of our history. You got to do something folks, you can't sit around -- and everybody's going to be afraid to come out for any one thing because they annoy the other people, but we have to make some progress to preserve – and if we don't find some revenue, incidentally, to be generated on that Island, you're going to see the old buildings that are there now, go the way of Ellis Island buildings. They're going to all fall apart – you have to do something, and, we can't just sit here and wring our hands and say it would be nice to have things that are impractical. That is something that I think, if the City pushed – you know, the Guggenheim seems to be well along in fund raising and they want to build a building, and the Frank Garry building is something different. He certainly did a great job in Bilbao -- you know that's a beautiful building and I've looked at the plans here, it looks to me like it would be something -- so that's what I would do.

MODERATOR: Yes, Sir!

QUESTION: Joel Roscoe, 10021, Community College. You know what I'm going to ask. Sloan Kettering's zoning battle – every community group, including Landmark West, is now against what the hospital wants to do which is break the mid-block zoning. The Community Board turned him down flat. Hopefully, Virginia Fields will vote no. In a meeting yesterday with the community groups and the lawyer for the hospital, we all said, we're going to compromise – give you what you need – keep it in the context of the neighborhood – maybe move part of it to Long Island City or to the Bellevue BioTech area. The hospital's position is, "Forget it. We want what we want. That's it. We're not talking to you." What would you do?

BLOOMBERG: Well I may lose all the votes on the east side. I'm not a politician and this has become more obvious as I talk, and I also think that I should – we had this conversation before – I should in the interest of openness, remind you that I'm chairman of the Board John Hopkins in Baltimore and we're always trying to build more buildings down there, we're in a neighborhood where it's not contentious, generally we build -- at least not in comparison to this – it is contentious – but there is a lot of land there where we've been able to build. Look! I want to protect

the neighborhood, I want to preserve its character, I want to preserve the buildings, but Sloan Kettering is one of the jewels of medical research and of New York City. And while I would certainly do everything I could to try to find a compromise in the end in this case – and probably not in very many others – but in this case I would come down on the side of making sure that Sloan Kettering can continue its work in a fashion that it needs. I certainly would try to put everybody in a room. If we can get a common policy where everybody is happy that's great, but you have got to make decisions and that's where I would come out.

QUESTION: Inaudible

BLOOMBERG: If the alternative is to lose Sloan Kettering or to stop research, yes.

QUESTION: My name is Adrian Dailey. This is just a personal interest. Do you have a position on the disposition of what was the Huntington Hartford Museum?

BLOOMBERG: I drive by it but I could never remember what's happening to it.

MODERATOR: A big gate and homeless people are sleeping at it and it's absolutely un-human.

BLOOMBERG: I never understood why the building was built that way to begin with.

QUESTION: Inaudible

BLOOMBERG: What does Trump want to do with it?

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

BLOOMBERG: I think the easiest answer is I drive by it and I wonder about it, but, no, I don't have a position.

QUESTION: I'm Jo Hamilton. I am with Save Gansevoort Market. We have an issue where we're trying to get historic district status for what is a mixed use, industrial look at our neighborhood and there's a lot of support for it in this community – in the preservation community and in the surrounding community -- but you've got a neighborhood where you've got building owners who are opposed and they say, "I don't want to do this." This Landmarks Commission has historically only really wanted to pursue projects where the building owners were in agreement. How do you balance an historic neighborhood that has something to offer the City, that the business owners are interested in, the community's interested in and the building owners who are saying, "I'm not interested?"

BLOOMBERG: Well, I think the city has to – I'm sympathetic in some sense to an owner -- (inaudible) – trying to preserve the character of this City, and I think – while I may not be able to get Sloan Kettering and the neighborhood together although I certainly

would – I would try – if you ask me where I'd come down, that's where I'd come down. It seems to me an easier thing to find some economic incentives for those building owners to get them to go along and I think that is a good use of the City, whether the City is capable of doing it or whether there is a resolution, I don't know, but that I think is clearly – the City should have a department that gets involved. The City's got to be the catalyst and the City's where the balance comes. That is a neighborhood that probably should be preserved. It clearly has a lot of commerce. We need jobs in the City. We need the supplies that go through there. We all eat – although my daughters probably wouldn't eat anything that comes through there, but that's a separate issue.

MODERATOR: I've been fairly well behaved, so I'll violate the proper role of the moderator just this once to pick up on that question because there is a strong feeling on the part of the preservation community that under the current Administration, it has been almost an ironclad rule that without the owner or developers agreement, the Landmarks Commission would not move forward. And, while it may impact on Gansevoort, where it really impacted in a way that I think there is widespread regret, is the Dorothy Day Cottage exercise where the Commission, bending over backwards yet one more time to accommodate what turned out to be a rapacious owner and developer, and perhaps worse, we lost one of the great historic social history treasures of the City. I guess I would just like to emphasize the importance – obviously an appropriate case for the Commission to stand up to, and defy, a recalcitrant improperly motivated, unwise owner, and we'd hope that you would join in that regard – if you want to add to that or comment on that.

BLOOMBERG: No, other than I'm going to check my dictionary on the way out for "rapacious," but – let me just say – I think you've got to be careful here. We do need development, we do need preservation, but everything that is old is not good, and everything that's new isn't necessarily bad. I've always cared very much about, in our company, our employees and their work environment. When I had a chance 15-16 years ago – 16 years ago, I guess, to move to an I.M. Pei Building on Park Avenue, I always thought it was a great building and I just remembered being so proud that we were moving into a building where I knew the architect. It was, incidentally, I think the first commission that he had gotten after the windows started falling out of the John Hancock building in Boston. Nobody would hire him and so he does small building. One of the things that gives me enormous pleasure in the neighborhood – and maybe you guys don't like it – but we're going to move into what I think will be a signature building in Manhattan, Cesar Pella (sic) building on the old Alexander's site. It's big and it's modern and I can see some people not – you know, feeling it fits into the neighborhood, but one of the things that's always struck me – when you go to Hong Kong, they all try to do masterpieces. Now, not every architect there succeeds. There are some buildings there that – I think – really are ugly. But, you can look at every one of the architects and the owners, they try to do something innovative and creative and help the community. I think, hopefully, this building, this Cesar Pella building, will be exactly that. It is big, and I'm sure, controversial, and we are a tenant, not the developer, so let me dot the question that way, but when given a chance to have great buildings, whether it is a landmark building that I live in or a signature building that's brand new for our

employees, the environment that you live and work in, is, if not everything, it's pretty darn close.

QUESTION: (Inaudible) about the architect...and the follow up question to that in a public vein, when you have public spending in the selection of architects for public projects as opposed to your headquarters, would you as Mayor be in support of a quality based selection similar to what ... of the federal government where it's the technical and prior successes of an architect leading to the selection, rather than a combination of fee ....

BLOOMBERG: One of the reasons I've always been a great supporter of private philanthropy, is, not that it's in the scale of – in the grand scale of things, a lot of money, but private philanthropy gets you trying new things, gets people that innovate, gets people that go against the conventional, and what always worries me is whenever you try to pick by committee, people are afraid to try new things. I think the most impressive thing about the Frank Gehry building in Bilbao is not the building – it's absolutely – if you haven't seen it, it's worth a trip – but that a town council or whatever the local bureaucracy was, was willing to go so far, and think so far out of the envelope, to do something that turned out to be great. Now, sometimes when you do that it's a failure and people in government need their jobs and they don't like to fail – yes, you want to have a group pick an architect, but you want to make sure that you're not going to rush to the lowest common denominator when you pick an architect. This is the Big Apple. This is the center of the world. We have to think big, and we have to think forward. And, thinking big and forward includes taking whole districts and preserving them, but it's looking at the picture and not just worrying about the minutiae again, and again, and again. That's what other cities do. That's not what we can do if we want to stay number one.

QUESTION: Hi, my name is Joshua David. I'm with Friends of the High Line. We're trying to take the High Line elevated rail viaduct from Gansevoort to the rail yards and enter it into a rail ... which would make it open space – 1.5 miles long, and also see it as a catalyst for economic development in an area that is currently being viewed for economic redevelopment possibilities.

My question is what is your position on the High Line and also would you tell us a little bit about some of your thoughts about plans on the West Side from the rail yards down into West Chelsea and the Meat Market district.

BLOOMBERG: Well, number one, I think the High Line is one of those things that -- it's almost a no-brainer because it would help the area – it's there – would not be terribly expensive – you don't have to tear anything down -- quite the contrary. To get more park space for this City at a low price without annoying anybody – anybody that doesn't want that one seems to me to be very strange. Maybe there's a whole dimension to it that I don't know, but I'd certainly be a big supporter of that.

I think that in terms of just general development on the West Side, the whole area, the Javits Center area, I'm not sure where I'd come out on, and whether we need a football stadium there, I don't want to get into all of that but I think that whole area is – I'm in favor of economic development – I'm going to take the Number 7 line if the money can be found – take it over – you better improve transportation over on the West Side, but that's the next big commercial office development area in this City. Of all of the choices that you have, and there's always going to be somebody that unfortunately gets displaced or inconvenienced, doesn't like it – that is probably a project in some form of hotels, an expansion of the Javits Center, there's an awful lot of development that I think could go over there. Whether it's done as part of an Olympic thing, I don't think you should worry about it. It doesn't have to depend on the Olympics. It does need better transportation. If you take a look at a transportation map, you can't get there from here. If we could solve that problem, I think you'd have a lot of economic activity. I've been in favor of developing it.

MODERATOR: We'll have one more question, but before we do, I want to take the opportunity to present you with a memento of this morning, the official landmarks book. It is usually autographed by the author. It has been in the prior four occasions. This is not a political statement, but Andrew is not here to have a personal endorsement, but we will have him do it and forward one on to you.

BLOOMBERG: And I will send him a copy of "Bloomberg by Bloomberg," an autographed copy.

MODERATOR: We'll take one last question or comment.

JACK GRAY: I'm Jack Gray. I'm a resident of the Upper West Side. You've spoken a lot about trade-offs between new development, preservation, you got into some specifics on Sloan Kettering situation and several others. Can you expand a little bit more on your broad principles of who wins, who loses, what's the priority? You mentioned Sloan Kettering as a clear engine for New York – one of many. Do you see others that deserve the same kind of priority relative to the choices, as you indicate, which indeed must (inaudible).

BLOOMBERG: Number one, I think what you said at the end is the key. Somebody has got to make choices, and it is never easy and it is never politic, but if you make the choices and if you give everybody a chance to input before you make the choice, then generally speaking you'll make the right choice, number one, and everybody will go along with you. The Mayor's job or any official's job is to, on one hand, make sure that everybody can give input, but once you do that sit there and say, "OK, we've taken all the input, we've asked for the best advice, my job is to make the decision – it's an executive job -- here it is and then let's take the ball and then that's the play that we're going to execute." We, unfortunately, are always afraid to do that and once we get into things, we start obfuscating, and changing, and compromising, and there's the old adage, "That a camel was a racehorse designed by a committee," and I'm

not in favor of that. I'm a big believer in representative government where you pick somebody, and if they're good, and if they listen, they do that.

In terms of where I stand on specific projects – you know, you've got each one – I'm not an expert. My whole management style is to have people and delegate authority to go along with responsibility. I would put a lot of focus on who runs the City Planning Commission; who runs Landmarks. They would be people I have enormous confidence in and then once I pick them, they would have to go a ways before I would ever try to overrule them or replace them. You have to be able to delegate if you are going to run anything complex and you also want to make sure that when you personally have conflicts that you can separate yourself from those conflicts. So, there's issues where they say, well what should you do here and my answer is, "Well, the Commissioner is going to make a decision and I'm going to tell him or her you make it without consulting with me. That's what you're there for, and I am going to back you no matter what the press says." Up to a limit, and if the person does something that is absolutely – you can't live with, then you don't overrule them, you replace them. Delegating authority to go along with responsibility, and doing it at a level as close to where the needs are. So, delegating down to the precinct level, to the principal's level in the school, to Landmarks or having Landmarks have a special interest in Gansevoort, that's always been the way I've approached problems, and that's exactly what I would do.

MODERATOR: One more arrogation of Host prerogative. As you leave the hotel, after you go down the stairs, you look to your left and you will see Lincoln Center which, I suggest to you, will be, with the exception of the West Side corridor you've described, the landmark issue and land use issue that the next Mayor, assuming he has eight years, is going to confront. Lincoln Center, once it gets through its various iterations is either going to renovate, restore, redevelop, or reconstruct, some or a significant part of Lincoln Center, earmarking, at least so far, a billion and a half dollars to that exercise and stonewalling everyone who has asked what their plans are going to be with a variety of Gordon Davis's best obfuscation.

Do you have preliminary views? If you do, you may care to share them but in any event let us sensitize you to the fact that whoever sits in the Mayor's in the next eight years will hear from a lot of folks in this room and out of this room on that issue.

BLOOMBERG: Let me show you that I've learned something on the political trail. In the interest of full disclosure, I happen to be vice chairman of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, and so I think I should recuse myself from any further discussion, and thank you very much for having me.