ROOSEVELT ISLAND

Roosevelt Island has been planned as a mixed income/race residence, with extensive community and recreation facilities, but minimal employment opportunities. Unfortunately funding restrictions in the mid-seventies severely curtailed construction, diminishing the plan's scope.

Relatively rural and uninhabitated before development, except for three hospitals for the chronically ill, a nursing residence and a fire department training station, the island had inspired a variety of development proposals before Mayor Lindsay appointed in January, 1968, a committee of private citizens and four ex-officio city officials to study the island's development potential. The 'blue chip' committee, chaired by investment banker Benno Schmidt, with such members as Mrs. Vincent Astor, Marcia Davenport, Philip Johnson, privately raised the funds to produce a 141 page report, the background for future development. The city requested the Urban Development Corporation (UDC) to implement the committee's recommendations, and the corporation appointed Philip Johnson and John Burgee to create a master plan, which they presented to the city in October, 1969.

The island is a unique piece of real estate: 2 miles long (47th to 86th street), 800 feet wide - 15 times longer than wide - 147 acres and 30 feet above water at its highest elevation, and covered by a large variety of often spacious trees. A major complaint of all new town developments is their disturbing novelty; there may be style, but no character from age. The development was fortunate in having six recognized landmarks to help provide a sense of depth and tradition,

*Among the many earlier proposals were suggestions for a penal colony, more hospitals, a world center for urban development, a UN annex connected by bridges to Manhattan, a domed stadium, an underground nuclear power station, sports grounds, dog tracks, casinos, a licensed red-light district, etc.
albeit remote: a lighthouse, built in the second half of the 19th century; an octagonal stair tower, praised by Charles Dickens, and originally of the New York Lunatic Asylum; the Chapel of the Good Shepherd, 1889; Blackwell House, one of the last remaining early farmhouses in New York, erected around 1789; Streecker Laboratory, 1892; smallpox hospital, circa 1854, designed by James Renwith, the architect of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

The master plan divided the island into nine alternating zones, four as parks and the remaining buildings. The four mile waterfront was preserved as a continuous promenade.* The multi-mix high-density development was designed to retain the island's natural advantages. As the architects described the plan,

We felt that the only way to create really meaningful open spaces - for recreation, education or both - was to construct our dwelling units and commercial spaces in a tightly structured, fairly high-density town - and leave the rest of the island open. The important elements of the plan, so far as we are concerned, are its spatial and functional organization, its massing, the development of open and closed spaces, and the recognition that multi-mix occupancy and multi-mix use are what it takes to make towns successful. 35

The plan proscribed automobiles, to enhance the distinctions between Roosevelt Island and Manhattan, as well as provide children with the freedom and safety necessary for healthy play. Johnson and Burgee summarized the plan's attractions,

Our island town will be:
* a community, not a housing project
* a low-rise and middle-rise housing group where every inhabitant can see a tree, a river, a park and yet live a totally urban life.
* a safe place for children to live - because there will be a minimum of traffic, a maximum of pleasant walking.
* a town center "where the action is" - a place that will be physically attractive, pedestrian, river edged.
* and a tight, dense group of buildings, surrounded by parks and water. 37

It would be academic to other than sketch the outlines of the Johnson-Burgee plan. The financial distress of the UDC in 1975 bisected the development initiative. Of the estimated

*see appendix 2 for map
$400 million required for the island's complete development, only $180 million was invested, and any further construction will require private finance. The plan provided for 5,000 housing units on 35 acres - 3,402 in Northtown and 1,598 in Southtown. To date, 2,141 Northtown apartments have been built; Southtown lies wrapped in an architect's drawer. A 300-room hotel, an office building and a variety of commercial real estate also remain on paper.

As is evident from the architects' statements, the goal of the Roosevelt Island development is a vibrant residential community. The proximity of job-providing Manhattan permits the scarce acreage to be limited to recreation, public facilities and housing. The two towns were to be located at the island's center, linked by what might be described as a public concourse 'dumb-bell'. A harbor, modelled after the Indian ghat - the lengthy, stepped river approach - is at the western edge, as one lobe of the 'dumb-bell'. The plan called for a row of restaurants and shops to form a backdrop for the river promenade. A glass-covered arcade, consciously reminiscent of Milan's Galleria Victorio Emmanuele, lined with shops, links the harbor to the town center. Designed as a dense active square, the center was to include the subway station, shops, apartments, townhouses, a branch library, 200,000 sq. feet of office space and public meeting rooms. All buildings were to be restricted to twelve floors. No architectural archetype was offered, as

We are very much aware of the fact that this new town will not be built tomorrow morning, and that many architects will be involved in the design of some of the important buildings. So we attempted, in these drawings, to suggest that our concept for this new Island town was sufficiently flexible to accept (almost) any architectural expression.

A dispersed school system for pre-school, primary and secondary levels was proposed, a sports center to be built in one of the park sections, and an electric mini-transit system was envisaged as the major form of transportation. Finally, the island's income mix was drafted for 55% low to moderate, 20% middle income, and 25% conventional housing. It
was estimated that 20-27% of the population would be non-white, depending on the amount of low to moderate housing actually constructed. The present population mix closely corresponds to these projections.

Descending to the factual level, a UDC subsidiary, the Roosevelt Island Development Corporation (RIDC), supervised the island's construction. As the island is the city's property, a complicated lease was designed to enable the UDC to afford the island's development. By accepting the Johnson-Burgee plan, the city had decided to forego the market sale of the island for commercial development which, according to one estimate, might have yielded one billion dollars. Under the terms of the 99-year lease, the UDC would accept responsibility for the installation of infrastructure, public facilities and residential housing. The Corporation would be allowed to deduct a proportion of the rental income due to the city as reimbursement for development costs. The two-part rental assessment plan included a basic rent and additional rent; basic rent was allotted to the UDC until all development expenditures were recouped, while the additional rent, provided the UDC had received the minimum sum set by the basic rent, would be divided, 60% to the city's favor. Rent would be collected contingent on the use and quality of the housing.

As of October 31, 1978, the latest accounts available, no rental payments to the city had been forwarded and "...no payments are expected to be paid during the next several years." The cost analyses for the infrastructure and public facilities were based on the assumption of a 5,000 unit complex. The 2,141 apartment rental income will not be sufficient to recover the $60.3 million invested in infrastructure and public facilities. Unless further apartments are constructed, "...no recovery of UDC's investment in public facilities and infrastructure on Roosevelt Island is anticipated." Tentative plans to engage Starret Housing Co. to build a further 1,000 units are pending the discovery of sufficient private financing.

Although the UDC recorded an operating loss of $2.7 million in 1977 through carrying public facility and administration
expenses, a $325,000 income was generated in 1978. This positive figure, however, does not reflect profitable operation of the facilities. 1978 was the first year the UDC received income from the residential projects, for the years 1978 and earlier. When the back payments are deducted, the operations run at a loss. The forced UDC subsidization of operating expenses is a partial explanation for the many shortcomings in the public facilities.

To further compound UDC's financial difficulties, the four residential projects were developed with three non-subsidized mortgage loans with a carrying value of $66.6 million, and one subsidized mortgage loan of $39.8 million. Although the account statements do not itemize for Roosevelt Island, a general observation states, "Substantially all subsidized and non-subsidized residential mortgages are now or are expected to be in default because the Housing Company mortgagors cannot make full debt service payments they are obligated to make under the mortgages." An article in New York magazine reported that mortgage arrears for the island totalled $11 million, and a rent strike in the winter of 1978 further reduced the ability of the housing companies to repay the outstanding mortgages.

The Johnson-Burgee plan also suffered from a lack of accurate survey and cost analyses. The lower-income buildings, designed by Jose Luis Sert of Cambridge, and the middle/upper-income housing designed by Bhavani and Johansen of New York, are considerably taller than originally conceived, as it was "absolutely impossible, for both physical and financial reasons, to work 5,000 units into a given space without going up 20 stories." The radical exclusion of automobiles has proved impossible, despite resident's protests to the UDC, as Main Street is the only road available to Goldwater Hospital employees. The $4.4 million 'sports park', containing an Olympic swimming pool, squash courts, steam bath and gymnasium remained closed till 1979, as operating funds were not available earlier. The major residential complaints are management's poor response to maintenance and repair problems, local
teen-ager vandalism, and school overcrowding.

A New York magazine phone survey of 200 residents revealed that 95% considered Roosevelt Island a 'good place to live', but 83% rated management as only 'poor to pretty good'. The UDC divestiture of operating management to housing companies immediately after construction results in inept post-construction service. Two years after the residents moved into the development in 1976, a wide range of maintenance and repair requests remained neglected by management.

During Roosevelt Island's first two winters, 300 apartments were so poorly heated that UDC had to spend $100,000 just to survey the problem and install new heaters. Rusty water in Eastwood and Island House, which caused illness among residents, required the replacement of water pipes. Wide-spread flooding of apartments, cracked windowsills and walls, doors that don't shut, and locks that have never worked are routinely reported to management, but it is months before repairs are made - if at all.

Teen-age vandalism is but an extreme example of the social difficulties of organizing communities in which insufficient attention is devoted to social concerns. An RIDC spokesman admits, "We've solved the really serious problems which initially threatened the viability of this island. Now we're moving on to the more difficult social and human problems which have historically occurred in all new towns." The inability to integrate contemporaneously housing and public facility construction has resulted in the anomaly of teenage scratching and whittling of a $180 million investment because the construction of a $180,000 youth center was delayed for two years after the residents' arrival. Of course no youth center will immunize a community from vandalism, but it will moderate its outbreak. Without a sports center or youth center, the lone street and building corridors are convenient alternatives. One resident, for example, wrote in a letter to the New York Times, "...it is a place that people should see and that sociologists and urbanologists and a multitude of other 'ologists' should study. Roosevelt Island is depersonalization itself." Another stated, "...the UDC considered everything
when it built Roosevelt Island, except that someday people would be living there.\textsuperscript{48} The printed, public sources are not sufficient to form an academic assessment of Roosevelt Island social conditions. The proximity of mid-town Manhattan with its cultural and social opportunities clearly are a diversion for most residents. Further research is required to determine the extent to which Roosevelt Island is an integral, independent community, though on the basis of the RIDC spokesman's statement and random vandalism, there are, at least, social teething problems.

The five mini-schools have become overcrowded, and design errors have hampered novel education techniques, such as 'non-graded continuous progress programs'. The classroom windows were unable to open, and poor ventilation caused students to become nauseous and faint. In one school, raw sewage backed into the rooms on four different occasions, closing the building for several days. A year of complaints to the UDC and Board of Education was required to open the windows. It is precisely this type of limited autonomy which demotes the label NTIT to an advertisement. Unless greater independence through administration reform is granted, a new-town-in-town quickly becomes an old-town-in-town. If community spirit and enterprise are to develop, administrative flexibility must be introduced. The Roosevelt Island Residents Association (RIRA) predictably increased its membership activity and interest when members were sufficiently irritated to organize a rent strike in protest against rising rents and management ineptitude. Whether the RIRA will continue to be motivated to press the housing companies, the UDC and the city for greater efficiency and responsibility, and in so doing form a new coordinating, administrative link, remains to be seen.
An irony of planning is that the reach for success inhibits success. Perfection is a static concept, and gathers consensus in generalizations. Flexibility is essential if a community is to survive and prosper; amelioration, with its connotations of process and perspective, should be the planner's watchword. Evolution, not revolution, is the path of natural development. It is revealing to note that most science-fiction/futuristic models of civilized life show the same disturbing monotony of design. The variety and diversity of the great cities is very much the result of individual efforts compounded over time. Uniformity and conformity, the perils of mass society, should not be promoted by planning. The European New Towns, and to a lesser extent, Roosevelt Island, have contracted social tensions as the new population adapted to the new environment, with transformation hampered by administrative incompetence and rigidity.

The lessons of past urban development programs/housing projects are clear: it is impossible to create a community in concrete, without explicit attention to employment, educational and recreational needs. The theoretic recognition in NTIT planning of community requirements is healthy and refreshing. NTITs should incorporate to the greatest extent possible existing community infrastructure and real estate. This policy should be pursued not only for its economic rationale, but to help temper abrupt change.

If NTITs are to be built they must be incorporated in the larger context of an urban development/economic stimulation strategy, as success depends on the integration of economic, social and community elements. NTITs are representative of the current debate on the degree of government regulation, the characteristics of public/private cooperation, and the limits of planning. It is not the intent of the paper to ruminate on the approaches, let alone resolution, of these questions. However, some general observations and recommendations are offered.
The state governments have been lax in dismissing urban development as a municipal or federal responsibility. Regional, coordinated land use and redevelopment must be formulated as a state level. A HUD report comments,

The inefficiencies of urban governance are based, in large part, in state constitutions, laws, policies and programs. It is an irony of frustrating significance that while the federal commitment to relieving urban decay has been sustained (if unsuccessful), so much actual responsibility for relief and reform should rest on states. But while the state's capacity and authority for dealing with the structural bases of urban problems has been recognized for decades, it is also true that state governments have been indifferent toward the growing problem in their urban centers...The federal government should develop strategies which induce states to make reforms which will help solve the urban crisis. 49

NTITs, as part of a comprehensive development strategy, should be the obligation of a State Development Corporation. While construction would be a responsibility of the Corporation, its principal function would be the coordination of existing programs, and the introduction and integration of different government and private entities toward specific goals, within the context of a regional land use policy. The Corporation would be responsible to the state legislature, and its land use policy would have to be approved by the legislators. Subsidiary development corporations would be maintained at state expense in all cities above a certain size -- say 200,000 -- while smaller cities could acquire the services of a regional development corporation. The local corporation would have the responsibility for assuring the integration of local planning with the larger, regional land use policy. Funding for construction and services would be raised by the State development Corporation through the independent marketing of bonds, with additional backing, either in the form of loans or guarantees, from a National Development Bank. The Corporation would purchase vacant or deteriorated real estate in urban areas for immediate or future development, and greater use of eminent domain is expected, with an independent
review board to assure fair compensation, in addition to the standard legal safeguards.

Local government in the smaller cities, lacking administrative and technical skills, would request the Corporation for NTIT development. The Corporation, with its greater knowledge and access to federal and state programs, would design the NTIT program in conjunction with municipal authorities. Corporation subsidiaries would develop the communities with municipal officials authorities 'on the board' and in some administrative positions, to help promote non-academic awareness of local needs and conditions. As the Corporation is fundamentally a coordinating body, with powers of eminent domain and borrowing facilities, it is a flexible administrative entity. In times of budgetary restrictions, it would be active in the dissemination and coordination of existing programs as well as the continuing endeavor of land planning. If the legislature desired expansion through construction, it would be the vehicle for increased expenditure.

The momentum and dynamic impulse in America remains in the private sector. No NTIT will be successful if it does not specifically include private enterprise in its development plans. A survey of prominent urban developers and planners recorded the clear consensus that housing should be de-emphasized in favor of economic and social considerations. Representative R.W. Edgar underscored the importance of economic development in urban re-vitalization schemes, "All the latest buzzwords - targeting, leveraging, public-private partnership - point to economic development as the most popular and logical strategy for attacking distress." The Corporation would offer a 'one-stop' service to the private sector, avoiding the time consuming filing and requesting at a score of federal and state agencies, for approval and assistance for land development. In a fragmented administrative system, accountability is elusive. The Corporation and its local subsidiaries, on the other hand, would be readily identifiable.
The fracturing of responsibility is a major problem in the administration of most housing projects, a reflection of an over specialized 'bricks-and-mortar' approach to development, with little attention to social concerns. The development subsidiaries, with visible local officials (some of whom would be elected officials), would be responsible for a set period after construction, when most repairs and adjustments are required. After a successful transition from construction to operation, the buildings could be managed by private housing companies. The Corporation subsidiary would be a legally identifiable and responsible body, minimizing 'recognition' difficulties for residents if problems arose. The community could also establish an ombudsman, as Reuss recommends,

I propose that in each standard metropolitan area in the country which wanted a person like that, that there be set up a highly visible citizen, someone with a lot of experience...who would be appointed by the Federal, state, local government and regional body if there is such a thing, and that person would have the duty and responsibility of cutting red-tape, expediting, encouraging. He would have access to the printed media and the radio and television...Just as a lot can be done by a Congressman who will focus the spotlight of publicity on asininity over and beyond the call of duty by government agents, so a person of the stature that we are describing might be able to do some good. 52

It is very important to integrate community groups with development planning and construction. Space on the subsidiary board should be made available to prominent community group directors, both to grant them an important and recognized avenue of expression, as well as providing comprehensive information. Their participation and connection with the subsidiary would help provide exposure to the needs of the city as a whole, a view which many do not entertain. The inclusion of community leaders also stimulates responsibility on both the board's and leaders' part.

As a side note, the greatest opportunity for NIITs is in the area of fastest economic growth, the 'sunbelt'. The
paper has not examined NTIT construction in this region, but
the opportunities, particularly in the smaller cities, for
integrated development and extensive private leveraging are
the most extensive.

The flexible qualities of the Corporation and its
subsidiaries mean that the Corporation will supplement and
integrate, rather than supplant, the activities in diverse
agencies. By making coordination less of an ad-hoc affair,
and more contingent on recognized objectives, the Corporation
can play a valuable role in urban redevelopment and revitalization.
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# SOUTH BRONX DEVELOPMENT OFFICE EARLY ACTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>COMMUNITY BOARD</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST ($ Millions)</th>
<th>NEW MONEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woolworth Building</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDA-Title IX</td>
<td>350,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA Bus Garage</td>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UMTA</td>
<td>6 acres</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathgate Industrial Area</td>
<td>Planning for industrial park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None in this phase</td>
<td>45 acres</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 174th Street Area</td>
<td>Preparation of land for industrial use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EDA-Title IX</td>
<td>8.7-11 acres</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham Plaza Area</td>
<td>Preparation of land for commercial/government use</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 acres</td>
<td>4.0*</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUB - Parking Lot</td>
<td>Commercial revitalization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>250 parking spaces</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Boulevard - Parking Lot</td>
<td>Commercial revitalization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>125 parking spaces</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These costs are included in the EDA package shown on the next page.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (cont'd)</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>COMMUNITY BOARD</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>NEW MONEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDA Package</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDA Public Works Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of industrial land/buildings</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>EDA-Title IX</td>
<td>2,000,000 sq. ft</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bronx Redevelopment Bank</td>
<td>Research Study</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>n.o.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial infrastructures</td>
<td>Improved business environment</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>n.o.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial strip revitalization</td>
<td>Improved business environment</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>n.o.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition and clearance</td>
<td>Prepare industrial land</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>n.o.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan packagers</td>
<td>Serve South Bronx firms</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n.o.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDA Direct Loan Program</td>
<td>Serve South Bronx firms</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>EDA Loan Program</td>
<td>40 loans (estimated)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>n.o.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a. not applicable
## SOUTH BRONX DEVELOPMENT OFFICE EARLY ACTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. MANPOWER</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>COMMUNITY BOARD</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST ($ Millions)</th>
<th>NEW MONEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Supported Work</td>
<td>Prepare unemployed for unsubsidized jobs</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>DOL-CETA, NYS-CETA, HEW, HRA</td>
<td>1,000 jobs</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South Bronx Referral Center Demonstration</td>
<td>Coordinated manpower delivery system</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>NYS-CETA</td>
<td>10,000 clients</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training In Item Superintendents</td>
<td>Expand superintendent training program</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>CETA</td>
<td>300 jobs</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vocational Exploration</td>
<td>Work experience for high school students</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>DOL-CETA, HEW</td>
<td>3,500 jobs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Young Adult Conservation Corps</td>
<td>Youth employment to create open space</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Dept. of Interior</td>
<td>100 jobs</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>