

**CITY PARKS FORUM PROCEEDINGS
PITTSBURGH SYMPOSIUM
SEPTEMBER 2000**

Summarized Proceedings

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Mary Eysenbach: Good morning. We'll start our program with the faculty presentation by Lee Springgate. And then the mayors will present their case problems [along with other faculty presentations]. At the end of the mayors' presentations we will have a discussion. We'll start off with a couple comments from the faculty, and then I encourage everybody please to make comments. We have found in our experience that our mayors and our private sector partners and public sector advisers have a lot of knowledge about these subjects and can offer a lot to each other. That's why we think it's so important to have peers involved in the discussion. So please feel free to chime right in.

Lee is a consultant and the former Director of Bellevue Parks and Recreation Department in Washington.

"WHAT IS A PARK?" AND "PUBLIC PARK FUNDING"

Lee Springgate: What I'd like to do is provide an overview of how we got to where we are in the parks today and offer some suggestions for financing some of the things you want to do.

Part I: What is a Park?

What I'd like to do is develop an historic overview and a respect and appreciation for what we do in parks and recreation and open space, and have some discussion about where we're going in the future. We draw most of our inspiration in the Northwest for our park systems from natural historic systems.

The origins of urban parks go back several thousand years. Persia wanted their parks to be glimpses of the afterlife, the flowers and the trees and the streams and green grass. The sense of where you're going to go from here. Greeks about the same time had these outdoor gymnasiums to train for the Olympics. I've always told people that's kind of the origin of this historic split between parks and recreation that continues to plague my field to this day. In England, the word *empark* meant to put an enclosure around an area so that you could hunt for fox and deer. That's where the word park in the English language comes from.

The European influence includes the Italians, the French, the English, and the design garden. In the 16th century the Italians developed these outdoor rooms to escape the heat of Rome and other cities and they had these beautiful outdoor sculptures and water features and landscapes; small, symmetrical, highly controlled urban landscapes you see all over the place, especially in

urban plazas in this country. Whereas the French took it a step farther in the next century in their own inimitable style, they did these modest kinds of park developments, certainly not Versailles. The idea is these long linear axes where you're supposed to see the whole park in a single glance. The people themselves are the front and center. They're the ornaments. The park sites themselves are supposed to complement people in all their major events. And where do you see that in the United States? You see it in the Mall in Washington, D.C.

The French school yielded the English garden school. This school was much more informal and the idea was it was supposed to be formally planned but informally planted. So you had this profusion of gardens.

The next century yielded the landscape design school which basically tried to come to accommodation with nature a bit more. You started balancing this need to control nature with this desire to work with the land form. Organizing elements are large expanses of lawn, trees, grass, ponds, streams. Hyde Park in England exhibits that.

[Frederick Law] Olmsted influenced so much of the urban parks systems, especially in the East Coast as well as in San Francisco and Seattle and Portland and elsewhere. Olmsted borrowed from the design school but introduced something extremely important: this idea of linkages, where parks should be connected, linked to one another. He called them pearls on a string. He had a real strong social agenda with these parks, large informal unstructured pleasure grounds.

About that time, late 1850s to early 1900s, we had the conservation movement, pioneered by John Muir and Teddy Roosevelt. They went out and identified the major national treasures with the emphasis on resource preservation and protecting these national treasures. That movement created some of the most spectacular landscapes to preserve for future generations.

About this time, in 1900, after Olmsted did his thing, people started becoming a bit concerned about people in urban centers. They felt folks were spending too much time in the gambling houses and the houses of ill-repute and drinking too much and they needed to intercept people and get them engaged in positive, productive activities. This became the advent of the playground movement with small parks and the origin of the recreation professional. We started getting our recreation facilities littered throughout the park landscape. The idea of a park became different than what Olmsted was talking about. It manifested itself in these areas like playgrounds and all kinds of recreation facilities.

The next 30 years you started seeing recreation people responding to recreation demand. Parks became recreation facilities instead of what Olmsted envisioned or produced. For those of us in parks and recreation, in the last 20 years we've experienced an absolute flood of recreation demand (particularly with soccer, fitness, seniors, the disabled, and girls [as new activities or user groups]). Our systems started changing around this. What you see on the outskirts of most of your major cities are cities that provide recreation systems and not necessarily park systems.

In the 1960s we had this open space era. We had this juggernaut of developers coming at us and virtually destroying our landscape. The impetus to buy parkland was really to stop the bad stuff

from happening next door. We didn't want the rendering plant or the heavy commercial growth or whatever to impact our lives.

In 1970 we had the environmental movement [start] in this country with Earth Day. Only in the last 30 years have we recognized politically the importance of the environment. We have to act responsibly at the local level, have more enlightened management. It then became okay to start incorporating into your park systems these major wetlands, farmlands, these places for wildlife, and the urban forest.

All that stuff became the grease for the greenway movement. The linkages of Olmsted and environmental protection that provide recreation, that shape neighborhoods, and shape communities.

Parks systems are clearly complex and significant historically, and they reflect social change. They're important and always evolving. But what I heard every time I went in a budget session was "limited public resources." We have to decide what kind of park systems we want and who's going to get served and how is the service going to be delivered. Fundamental critical questions in front of all of us.

We've got three fundamental responsibilities in parks and recreation: to save, protect, and connect the natural resource lands, the critical lands in your community; to provide organized, structured, scheduled recreation; and to provide parks.

Allow me to give you a quick definition of parks. I think parks are places where people can go, engage in informal, unstructured activities, and have unimpeded access to the space. Parks become particularly critical when land is scarce and population density reaches a certain threshold. If you don't have those two conditions, parks themselves don't make as much sense as they otherwise would. Every survey we did for over 30 years would tell us unequivocally that people wanted parks and they wanted the open space preserved. Yet the public process always resulted in recreation demands being responded to, in my judgment, inordinately.

When my elected official friends think about parks, I would hope they would take into consideration this public good, private good spectrum issue. We in parks and recreation have had this significant problem of not understanding where our services fit in that spectrum. We've been stuck in the middle for most of our time in the last 50 years where we've got some services that have attributes in public good and private good and we don't know how to price it. Because we don't know how to price it we're not getting enough user fee income return and so, therefore, we don't have enough tax dollars to go to save critical resource land and buy land.

You absolutely have to buy land, even in your cities. You have to buy suitable land while it's available at the right locations, at the right prices. You can get to development later. You can also get interim benefits on land that you buy, as we'll talk about later. You also need to be ahead of that demand curve.

Buy land while it's available at a low cost. Typically you don't have the tax-based employment, the

debt capacity and all that to buy the land. You should issue debt now to buy land where there's opportunity to buy it.

If you buy land and you don't do anything with it, it gets perceived as vacant. You have to provide legal protection, market and manage it, and educate people so that it is perceived as public open space.

If you want to be ahead of the demand curve on acquisition, lag behind in development, because special interests distort the allocation of resources in the local government. You typically don't have the M&O [maintenance and operation] dollars you need to maintain this land. Natural systems always improve over time and artificial systems always deteriorate over time. A strong argument not to develop too fast.

Whatever you do develop, please develop at high standards so they appear right, they function well, and they're safe. Long-term credibility to park systems is very, very much related to quality maintenance and quality programming. I don't think people in parks and recreation spend enough time on basic marketing principles. We don't listen systematically, identify our target markets, have a customer service program to respond to, educate people about what we're doing, or evaluate how we're doing it.

We've got a lot of people in our parks and we've got a lot of people in our programs. But for some strange reason when that's happened we also have our budgets cut. You need to have a program that gets that information out in print, radio, TV, the brochures, every conceivable method to get information back to people letting them know that you're doing what they said they wanted done.

I don't think most park systems in this country have a really consistent signage system. Anytime you see one of these parks or when you drive into one or you look at a directional sign or you see some printed material you need to know it's coming from that system.

We can't operate these complex systems without an incredible network of other providers out there making it work for us. One of the partnerships I'd like to emphasize are schools. There are virtually no school systems I've come across in this country that effectively use their available land. We need to go in there and start scheduling the facilities, do master planning. By doing that you're not duplicating an entire recreation system on parkland. Until we start getting a handle on that, there's no point in buying and duplicating facilities. Most of the reason we're not doing this is because of institutional barriers.

We in parks and recreation are on this national campaign here to let everybody know that we provide benefits, not services and programs and facilities. Personal benefits, social, economic, and environmental. Parks and recreation are one of those spiritual things, one of those things that we do in government that no other discipline in government does. We respond to something very innate, very important in human beings.

We have a responsibility to leave a legacy for at least the next eight generations of people. If you

look at what Olmsted and others did, that's just about what's happened today.

Part II: Public Park Funding

What I'm going to do here is shift gears. In the second part of my presentation I'm going to talk about how we can finance all that stuff.

Many of the traditional sources aren't effectively and religiously pursued. Voter-proof bonds where you require two-thirds or super majorities are always on the plate, and we're trying to get money out of the general fund. We're not doing much of a job of asking people to raise their property taxes or their tax sources to generate dollars in pay-as-you-go basis.

Business improvement districts: They are becoming much more involved throughout the country. Bryant Park in New York uses 14 cents per 1,000 square feet to finance a good part of that park.

Grants: We're missing out on a lot of related grants in my field whether it's forest legacy grants or the criminal justice grants or ISTEA grants. People need to look forward beyond the normal park and recreation grants.

Impact fees: Impact fees and mitigation I don't think are used as much they could be.

Let's now talk about entrepreneurial approaches.

Revenue bonds: If you generate enough revenue off a facility you can pay off some bonds that you'd issue to build the facility in the first place.

Enterprise funds: They are being used more and more frequently in park systems across this country. The more your activities are in the private good side of the spectrum, the more your enterprise funds are effective.

Shares: With Post Office Park in Boston, an enlightened developer and his friends issued shares for \$65,000 a piece and they generated \$30 million to build a park over a parking garage, and the money to pay off the shares obviously came from the parking garage operation.

Time-shares: For example, you go find a commercial friend or a private sector friend to go in and occupy a certain percentage of space in the future community center. They say it's worth X number of dollars per hour. We're going to occupy the space during certain hours. We'll give you the money up front for a five-year advance or 10-year advance. You take the money and you build a facility. They get exclusive use of a portion of the facility during the time they need it. The rest of the public has it the rest of the time.

Land exchanges: We're exchanging land at the rate of thousands and thousands of acres in the Northwest. It's a matter of "I'll give you, Mrs. Private Sector, some of that land in exchange for you building us some public facilities." It's an exchange of value.

Sponsorships: They are not used as much as they need to be. You've obviously heard the sponsorships at major ball games. Sponsorships are also a big deal throughout better park systems in this country, as long as you can match up your image with that of the private sector sponsor.

Certificates of Participation: In cases where you're worried about your debt limit and need to find another way of doing a job, you find a third party to hold title to a piece of property. The bank lends the money for whatever you need to do. The public agency builds the facility from the money the bank lent and from the proceeds of the facility that was built. The State of Washington used this to generate about \$600,000, \$700,000 in park improvements.

Tax Increment Financing: Oregon and California have used it extensively and built some pretty fantastic park sites from tax increment financing.

Credit holders: You use the bank again or people agree to lend a line of credit to make something happen, buy a piece of ground or develop something. For example, say you want \$100,000 to do something. You have to find 100 people that want to provide \$1,000 line of credit apiece. They'll go to the bank and get a certificate of deposit for that and get interest off of it. During the time that's happening you're building the facility or buying the piece of ground. At the same time you're trying to generate some fund-raising to pay that off or if it's an income-producing facility, you use that to pay off the debt. The credit holders never really were out any money in the first place. They just received some interest on their credit. It's something that's being used by nonprofit groups throughout this country.

Turnkey: An example of using this is with Downtown Park in Bellevue. The private sector raised \$2 million to build the first phase of this park. They were willing to do that because we were able to lease them the site. When that work was done they turned it back over to us for maintenance and operation. It was one of the most effective methods we had for trying to induce the private sector to raise that kind of money for the park.

Donation: The last five years where we were buying land in my city, there were very few times we paid full market value or appraised value for land. There are better ways to negotiate property.

Charitable Remainder Trust: This is where the owner of a piece of property puts a certain amount of what he's getting paid into a remainder trust and draws interest off that trust for their lifetime. When they leave us, that money goes back to one of the public facilities. We had a piece of property that was \$2 million that we negotiated which is \$500,000 under appraised value. By the time these people pass on, we'll have an asset worth \$1 million.

Check-offs: These are becoming more popular, where you ask people to check off a few bucks for parks in the water bill or the license fees or whatever.

Cause Marketing: This is where you line up with somebody like American Express. They'll provide a certain number of dollars or cents for every purchase of some equipment, some supplies, something. They'll donate to a specific cause that lines up with something they think is important and that you think is important. You attach yourself to their enterprise and they agree

to donate because it's regarded as a good marketing technique for them.

Partnerships: I call a partnership a penny saved. Anytime you can save money it's just as good as going raising the money. What we forget about all the time are partnerships with the ports and the utility districts and the other disciplines, like housing authorities and the library districts. They all have a common interest with us.

There are also partnerships from the nonprofit side. In Bellevue, the Boy's and Girl's Club agreed to raise \$1 million for a gym and operate half of the facility. We built the other half, operate the other half of the facility. They do what they do best; we do what we do best.

There's a terrific program that we've used. It's called Your Land, Your Legacy. We gave a land conservancy that operates out of our area \$10,000 to produce the brochure. We sent the brochure out to all the waterfront homeowners and encouraged them to make a contribution to the city. If they want to make a contribution, call up the land conservancy, not the city. We had 14 inquiries and had two pieces of property donated to us worth over \$2 million. So for a \$10,000 investment we received \$2 million in property that met our priority in our system.

Pure private sector partnerships are becoming more and more prevalent. Post Office Park in Boston, Bryant Park in New York are two recent examples. Golf courses are being built all over this country by the private sector on behalf of public agencies. Fitness centers, indoor soccer and tennis, ice skating—they're out there, they're anxious to work with us, they're anxious to take advantage of our facilities and our constituents and our reputation. They have the money, they have the expertise, and they have the management skills to offer to offer a recreation facility better than most public agencies do.

Questions and Comments:

Mayor Ashe: One thing you did not mention is eminent domain. My impression is these techniques are all voluntary. There's some occasions where it's not voluntary. I mean the Great Smoky Mountain National Park wouldn't exist except through eminent domain. But the politics of it can be very difficult. Whereas people accept eminent domain for new schools, prisons, and certainly for roads, when you go to parks all of a sudden it doesn't have the same level of priority.

Mayor Johnson: Your presentation made some excellent points and it raised some excellent strategies. But they may not work in older northeastern cities where we are completely built out. Take a city like Rochester. We've got a lot of abandoned and vacant structures. There is thought about how do you de-densify or how do you downsize. It raises the specter in some people mind's of urban renewal. We struggle to try to remove blight. It does create an opportunity to create more open and more green space, however.

In our city and in our new comprehensive plan, we have a campaign area devoted to what we call urban villages. If you look at cities like Detroit and the city I used to live in, Flint, they have gone and cleared whole neighborhoods and just planted seed and grass. Have you looked at the East and the opportunities that may or may not exist, and some of the political implications of what

you're doing?

Lee Springgate: I think you should do exactly what you're talking about because I do think it's a similar situation to buying land while it's available, isn't it?

Mayor Johnson: If the land is sitting there vacant, it's one thing. If it's got stuff on it and it's dirty, there are a lot of implications.

Mayor Norquist: One of the things that I've learned is that it is definitely a better bet to buy land for parks than it would be to buy it for economic development, because a city doesn't really have the motivation to pull off a profit on economic development. But there is no natural economic party to come in and buy it for park purposes. So I guess that's where the government comes in.

Lee Springgate: If you're going to buy a property, you need to go in and get some kind of interim use in that property so you can claim it for park purposes. And usually even when you put some trails through it or some entry signage and clean it up, you make it part of the neighborhood, part of the community, and there's a sense of ownership.

Mayor Ashe: I liked your point about getting it into some kind of use even if it's just a simple greenway where the public realizes they have ownership. What we've tried to do is we're setting up neighborhood task forces on each park as we acquire it or each new land so they buy into it, they develop a master plan. We may not implement all of it at once. Usually it's phased in and then five years later it may change at some point. But you at least get the buy-in.

Mayor Norquist: I have a suggestion for all of you landscape architects. You should interact with HUD the way some of the architects did on Hope VI. You should just directly intervene in that because the public housing land in big and medium-sized cities across the United States, particularly in the older parts of the country, those are resources that are incredibly valuable. Once you take the tower out of the middle of a block of grass, instead line the park with buildings and create a real park space.

That happens with beautiful parks in cities right now. They do what Corbusier did with the tower in the park, only instead of a tower it's a restroom facility with a rec room. And it just destroys the whole park.

Lee Springgate: I want to make this point about what a park is. We, in our field, have forgotten what a park is versus a recreation facility. I think it's resulting in entire systems, entire park sites being developed differently than I think they should be.

ROCHESTER, NEW YORK – MT. HOPE CEMETERY

Mayor Johnson: I really do appreciate this opportunity to participate in this forum. I'm an early

participant in the Mayor City Design Institute. As a result of that participation we got great help on a commercial project, put on track by the help we got out of the City Design Institute. I'm hoping to get similar direction here today.

Many years ago we turned over the operation of most of our parks to the county; however, we still have a fair number of parks that are under the stewardship of Loretta Scott, Commissioner of Parks and Recreation and Human Services. We have some challenges with some of those, but this one, Mount Hope Cemetery, presents us with a real opportunity. I'm also joined by Eric Logan, President of the Friends of Mount Hope, which is a very important volunteer organization.

Rochester is not often thought of as a waterway city. We're located in Monroe County, midway between Buffalo and Syracuse on the southern shore of Lake Ontario. It is unique that it contains approximately 22 miles of shoreline along Lake Ontario, the Tennessee River, which you see flowing up through the city, and the Erie Canal. The Tennessee River flows northward through the center of the city to the lake and provides our city with a distinctive urban waterfront environment.

There are 11,000 acres of parkland in the Rochester area, which provide recreational opportunities during every season of the year. Highland Park, which is almost adjacent to Mount Hope Cemetery, was designed by famous landscape architect Frederick Olmsted and is a site of the Lilac Festival each May. Maplewood Park Rose Garden features stunning displays in June and September, while Ontario Beach Park beckons with its sandy beach, piers, boardwalk and a 1905 dense menagerie carousel. Tucked along the Genesee River, Seneca Park was also an Olmsted design and holds the Seneca Park Zoo. Indeed, Rochester is the home to five distinctively designed Olmsted parks.

The topic of our discussion is Mount Hope Cemetery, which is located on the southeast portion of the city. This 196-acre facility lies within a preservation district and is surrounded on two sides by property owned by the University of Rochester. The university is the largest landowner in that portion of the city and Mount Hope Cemetery, the second largest portion.

We operate two cemeteries, Mount Hope and Riverside. These cemeteries were both created during the Victorian era in the mid to late 19th Century. Mount Hope was opened in 1838 as a municipal cemetery because of a need for burial space after a cholera epidemic. It is the oldest municipally owned Victorian cemetery in the country. It has 14 and a half miles of roads and approximately 300,000 monuments. Of these 300,000 monuments, as many as 8,000 have been overturned because of erosion and vandalism.

Two rather large hills take up much of the area, making the cemetery difficult to landscape and maintain. Riverside Cemetery is smaller in comparison to Mount Hope at only 96 acres. It was originally opened by a group of local entrepreneurs in 1892 as a profit-making enterprise. The city took over management of the cemetery in 1942. Currently only a little more than two-thirds of the land has been for burials and other cemetery construction.

In the 1970s, about two-thirds of Mount Hope Cemetery was added to the National Register of

Historic Places because of its impressive and rare Victorian architecture and the list of notables buried there. Some residents were leaders of the Abolition and Women's Suffrage Movements, both of which were very strong in upstate New York.

Mount Hope is the burial place of Frederick Douglass. Many people don't know that Frederick Douglass spent a large part of his life in Rochester, and when he died he was returned to Rochester and buried. Another major figure buried here is Susan B. Anthony, the women's suffrage leader arrested for the crime of voting before women's suffrage became law. A number of noted industrialists buried in Mount Hope were responsible for Rochester being identified as the country's first boomtown. The cemetery proudly displays more than 500 statues depicting some of the county's finest funerary art, including the sculptures by Italian sculptor [Nicola] Cantalamessa-Papotti.

Hiking, bicycling, and casual strolling already take place within the cemeteries, which can be glorious settings in the spring and summer. The potential for even greater uses exists such that the parks can acquire and maintain the necessary funding to preserve the interior infrastructure of these facilities. The Friends of Mount Hope maintain many Victorian gardens areas like the one that you see, and many areas of the cemetery are used by thousands of visitors for quiet reflective past time. Students from many local universities use Mount Hope as a site for photo projects.

Mount Hope Cemetery's historic architecture includes an old Gothic Revival chapel built in 1862. The addition of a crematory in 1912 was one of the first in the country. A Moorish gazebo was built in 1872 for the many visitors who came to picnic and wander the glorious landscape. At the height of Mount Hope's history, Rochester architect Jay Foster Warner designed and built a second Gothic Revival chapel at the South Gate of the cemetery. Just beyond the 1874 high Victorian Gothic gatehouse at the North Gate, Mount Hope proudly displays a cast-iron, Florentine fountain, constructed in 1875.

The landscape of Mount Hope provides many challenges for maintenance. More than 50 percent of the cemetery consists of sharp hills and eskers, created by melting ice sheets and glacial kettles. Sylvan Waters, one of the four glacial kettles, remains filled with water and creates the only pond in the cemetery. Such geological features enhance the beauty of Mount Hope but also provide for the tremendous challenges and maintenance and operations of the cemetery.

The central issue is how to change the mind set. As a municipal cemetery, many challenges rise in the transitioning of a traditional cemetery to a park environment. Developing the cemeteries into cultural tourist destinations while maintaining the reverence necessary to honor cemetery responsibilities and expectations is the issue that we grapple with here. Nearly half of the cemetery budget is consumed by operating expenses. The tax subsidy for the cemeteries will continue to increase as the operational costs increase, and the revenue from property sales and service fees decline, due to our depleting inventory. Both cemeteries have a perpetual care fund; however, no trusted perpetual care funds were set aside for future operations until 1979. The perpetual care fund is simply not large enough to produce enough interest for the continued upkeep of the grave sites and overall landscape.

Standard allocations for capital expenditures is at least 10 to 15 percent. The 8 percent budgeted is not adequate to maintain the cemeteries and restrict development that is presently required to increase present and future revenues. Due to many years of inadequate capital funding, the cemeteries are in need of restoration to the historic structures and grounds. In developing an action plan to change critical conditions of the cemeteries finances, a sales staff has been developed and implemented. The capital funds required to expand the inventory and begin restoration are not part of the budget allocation for the cemeteries. Up to 1982, the cemetery division received subsidies from the city's general fund to cover operating losses, much of the same as any other municipal parks operation. Beginning in '82, the city stopped providing direct budgetary systems to the divisions, creating what is termed an enterprise fund, with the extent of creating a self-sufficient operation requiring no subsidy from the general tax levy. This was done at a time when city finances were particularly constrained and all non-essential services were under significant pressure. However, since the designation was made, the cemetery division has not generated enough revenue to cover expenses, and the cemetery fund began borrowing money from other more profitable funds within the government. In fiscal year 2000-2001, the annual deficit is estimated to be \$350,000 and the cumulative debt is in excess of \$1.5 million. The city's cumulative estimate for the debt in the cemetery fund through 2015 is about \$11 million.

In addition to the sales team, the action plan included the development of other constituents and support groups, such as the cemetery advisory committee. This committee provides advice and support to the process of establishing a long-term development plan. The membership is comprised of individuals appointed by the mayor representing a broad spectrum of stakeholders. Members were recruited from groups such as these and local business groups and neighborhood associations. The committee is responsible for analyzing plans and issues related to the maintenance, restoration, and development of the cemeteries, as well as the impact on the cemeteries and surrounding communities. In defining the problem, it appears to be a purely financial solution; however, the issue of mind-set may be the biggest barrier.

The inability of the cemeteries to be financially self-sustaining with current circumstances and programs, and the resulting deterioration of landscaping and park infrastructure over time are the problems. In terms of the success in moving to resolution, establishing revenue sources that will sustain the long-term capital needs of both cemeteries is one issue, and the other equally important is creating an attractive tourism and recreation destination while preserving historic assets.

On that last point let me add that this plays into an overall discussion that's going on in all of upstate New York, because tourism has never been really an aggressive strategy for that entire region. Yet now we recognize that we miss many great opportunities. We have millions of visitors who come to the west of us, to Niagara Falls, and they do not come through the rest of upstate New York. And this is an area that's blessed with tremendous natural resources, lakes; we have wineries, we have a lot of history there.

Let us look at some of the proposed solutions. First one is close the cemeteries, stop burying in them, and reduce operating costs to a minimum. But that even begs as a question because that means that we would still have to maintain them. We could not ignore them, so that means that

there would be some expense and some expenditures required, and that would essentially further exacerbate the need for taxpayer subsidy. Then, additionally, we have some pre-payments, some pre-need services that have been sold so, if we did shut the cemeteries down, we would have to refund a significant portion of revenue that's being held in escrow. Given the historic and cultural nature of the cemeteries, that prominence within the city landscape, and the moral if not legal obligation to those buried there, this option does not appear to be politically feasible or in the best interest of the city.

Second option is sell the cemeteries or turn them over to private management. Now this was an option that was on the table when I came to office, and one that I personally resisted because I happen to know the trends in the funeral industry.

The third option gradually converts the cemeteries into historically and culturally significant parks, recreation, and tourist destination. This option would obviously require an investment of an increasing amount of city tax dollars and a major change in the mind set of both the general public as well as city elected officials. Given the continuing financial burden on cities this may be a difficult option to sell. This option is currently however to be the most feasible by my administration.

We are in the process now of updating our comprehensive plan, the first time this plan was updated in 34 years. Three of the major campaigns of the plan coincide with our cemetery initiative. These are environmental stewardship, arts and culture, and tourism destination. It would be relatively easy to establish short-term solutions, which would be politically acceptable. When we consider what long-range problems that we would potentially leave to future generations, such as bankrupt and deteriorated properties, the solution is much more elusive. This is not like shutting down a company and putting a chain on the door. We have a trust here, and somewhere or another we're going to be perpetually involved in the operation of the cemetery.

Mary Eysenbach: Thank you, mayor. It's a very unique challenge. One of the reasons we were excited to get it was the opportunity to expand our thinking about what a park is and how a number of different spaces in a city might serve as park functions.

I'd like to start out the discussion by throwing a question to Grover Mouton. Being from New Orleans, a place where they have developed tourism in cemeteries to an art form, what do you think about how Rochester might change the image of their park or their cemetery into a park and a tourist destination?

Grover Mouton: If any of you have been to New Orleans you know that the cemeteries have become a kind of a cultural component to the city. In this country and principally in New Orleans there was an enormous cult of death. It provided the cities with a kind of traditional activity, which had an enormous social base, which is why the cemeteries came about. In New Orleans it became the highest art, I think, in America, because for two reasons: the strength of the Catholics and disease. We had a wonderful port just filled with rats so that there was every disease known to man. So we had the highest level of this cult, which then was promoted into its architectural basis in some of these magnificent cemeteries.

This cult of death is now finished, and we're left with these receptacles, which in a form have a fantastic historic cultural base. Now the problem comes in the ownership and the maintenance.

The cultural heritage component is very difficult, because if you can't maintain it, then there's not any way to turn them in another agenda that has a cultural basis that makes any money. We basically turned our cultural heritage of our cemeteries over to the national parks, which goes through and brings tourists through them. So the issue here is a cultural issue, a city issue, and a tourist issue, and it's extremely complex. But from the reactions that we've had in New Orleans, it's very difficult to turn these institutions into a cultural mecca that is going to generate any finance to maintain this thing, in all honesty.

Mayor Ashe: Can you put a greenway through the cemetery? We're extending a greenway through a cemetery. It's a private cemetery, and it's a connector. You can go about 0.5 mile. With the public cemetery, you obviously own the land. Greenways are popular. You do have the cost of actually putting it in, you do have to pay for that, but cost of maintenance of a greenway is not that high.

Loretta Scott: Actually, we do have one going through Riverside. It goes through that and not through Mount Hope. It's a consideration.

Eric Logan: That's actually an interesting concept because we do have a lot of through traffic at Mount Hope Cemetery, due to its location between the southeastern area of Rochester, and the University of Rochester.

Mayor Johnson: I think that's an intriguing suggestion, but I think that before we would get to that point—we have some roadways in there that had to be closed because they deteriorated. So there are some current maintenance issues that would have to be addressed and how we restore some of these toppled gravestones and monuments. Eric's group has got some very diligent volunteers. One of these volunteers has gone through and essentially taken a census of every tombstone in that cemetery: 300,000. That cemetery has been maintained through an effort on the part of staff in terms of us agreeing to subsidize this operation, but also through a heck of a lot of volunteer participation. We've had to sort of close some of that area off because we just couldn't afford to invest, you know, the money in it.

Loretta Scott: Part of the issue with the roads is that while there are portions of the cemetery that are no longer active for burial and they're up on hills, you still have to maintain them at some level. At the point that they were created, they didn't have to worry about trucks, so the roads were fine. But now we still have to get up there and maintain them. One of the considerations had been in some areas to take the roads out completely, to create additional burial space as a way of continuing with the revenue, but you have to balance that off as well.

Mary Eysenbach: Back to the idea of the greenway, is there an open space that's close to the cemetery that might have a linkage that could be created so that the cemetery becomes a part of a bigger open space system? It's along the river, so you've probably got some kind of riverwalk happening somewhat close by. And there's Highland Park across the street, so maybe there's an

opportunity to link to that.

Paul Rookwood: My reaction from the very beginning was that this was a mind-set issue, just as you described. The mind set for me is this has to a park as well as a cemetery. Forget about this being a profit-making operation. It's not going to be. It never will be. But it could be a great park.

You got these five great Olmsted parks, you got a great park system already. Do you really need another one? That gets to the question raised at the discussion last night: How many parks, how much space do you really need? Is there really a demand? Is there really interest? How do you make each park unique? How do you make a park special? How do you make this place a really great park? Because unless you make this into an attractive place you'll never raise the funding from the legislative body, from the nonprofits. You won't get the energy from the surrounding neighborhoods to be there with you. You've got to make it great and you've got to generate some kind of excitement about it. What you need is an imaginative leap about what this could be in the future, to build a new constituency in the near future.

A quick word about the difference between the words conservation and preservation in America. Generally, people often talk about them synonymously. They're really not. Preservation is about taking something, sticking it in the jar, and screwing the lid on, and hoping it lasts forever exactly how it is. Conservation implies a more active involvement. When we deal with most of the historic resources that we have in the country, we should be looking at a conservation ethic. That allows us to take what we got, protect it, restore it, if it's appropriate, but also introduce new ideas. In terms of new ideas here, I thought there are a number of things we really should focus on:

Quality is a key issue. People take visual clues from their surroundings. If it doesn't look right, they won't go in there, they won't be attracted to it. And in that sense, edge and entry are absolutely key issues for this property. The edge condition around the whole property and how it intersects with the surrounding neighborhoods is a key issue. There was one photograph you had of a long roadway that wasn't very appealing with lots of traffic on it and a fence all the way down it. And every visual clue in that photograph says, "Keep out." This is a cemetery and it has got a fence around it that's high enough to keep you out. It's not welcoming you in. Now there are other places clearly where you've got gateways that welcome you in.

Santiago de Compostela is the city at the end of the big pilgrimage in Europe that's in the northwest corner of Spain. There's a fantastic museum of contemporary art that was being built there, designed by Cisor, a famous Portuguese architect. He had taken an adjacent cemetery on the hilltop and made it into a park. It was one of the most beautiful places I had ever been.

They moved the headstones. I know it sounds controversial, but if you move the headstones you can create new spaces, create dynamic new places in this park. Give it a new constituency as a real park. Be imaginative about the design. They created this extraordinary sequence of beautiful calm spaces that rose up the hillside with retaining walls and fountains. And then you look back out so you were connected visually to the city. They made it into something that it wasn't before.

At the University of Pennsylvania, the core of campus is filled with old buildings. But throughout the campus they've created a tremendous amount of excitement by having contemporary sculpture throughout the thing. The gateway to the university is a huge orange metal contemporary sculpture. It's a new thing. It's about moving forward, not just conserving what you have in the past. Why not make this into a sculpture garden? Maybe make it into an arboretum if it isn't already. You have the Lilac Festival. Maybe the cemetery should have four different seasons where it is the most beautiful and extraordinary place to go. Somehow you've got to build a new constituency for this property and make it something special.

Mayor Johnson: In terms of trying to make it into something different or new, there's an implicit commitment here. This is a place of perpetual care. I mean, the people who bought sites in 1850 assumed that they were going to their final resting place and that's where they were going to stay, even though our forefathers didn't have the wisdom to establish a perpetual care fund.

There are a lot of people in that cemetery whose families have died out and there is no advocate for them any longer. But there are people we just buried there yesterday who do have advocates. As we struggle with this issue I think that there are areas of controversy that we could open up by going too far with this notion that it has now become something other than a final burial place.

Mayor Norquist: Actually though, the original purpose of the cemeteries did include picnics, and particularly in that kind of cemetery. The cemeteries were an absolute obsession back in the end of the Romantic Period. Mount Auburn Cemetery near Boston, near Cambridge—people would go there for lunch, they'd go there on the weekends after church and have a picnic. It's probably a part of the history when this cemetery started because it was such an obsession. People would drive their coaches into the cemeteries and hang out. So if you can take that literature and kind of reestablish the history of when the cemetery first started.

Eric Logan: Actually, that's part of what we're doing. As a volunteer organization we in one year righted over 1,600 stones. We repainted all the road markers. We did a fall foliage tour that drew about 75 people. We just had a Civil War tour last weekend that drew in excess of 200 people. We've gotten into collaborations with organizations such as the Rochester Museum and Science Center. We bring their actors—they had a tour or a play that they used to do right on their site called *Meet Rochester's Abolitionists*. We brought those actors, augmented that group, and now have a tour that runs all summer, once a month, twice on Saturdays, called Circle of Friends, based on the life of Frederick Douglass, when he's returned to the very place where his daughter is buried. The play begins at the entrance of the cemetery, and we become, all of the participants in this walking play, become people who are going to give their condolences to Frederick Douglass. It's those kind of innovative activities that we've done. I mean we're doing a lot of things to try to bring people's education back to the point of understanding that the cemetery is a historical cultural resource.

The political issues about people's sensitivity was incredibly difficult. I understood the kind of issues that were facing with this great resource that we have. We're getting involved with things like the Freedom Trail Commission, where we're trying to reestablish Rochester as the last 100 miles in the search of freedom for escaping slaves. We're trying to build on this new tourism

movement—don't give me any more fun and food and festivals. Give me an education. We're getting into a lot of adults who now want to be taught. That's why the Seneca Falls Women's Rights Hall of Fame is so wildly popular.

When I first joined the Friends, when I talked about bringing an acting troupe into the cemetery, they said, "Oh, no. You're going to act; you're going to do dead people? You're going to do like a ghost thing? Oh, we don't want, we don't want any part of that." It has taken me five years to get some kind of vision to get people thinking about this stuff.

Mayor Ashe: How much of the cemetery is still unbuilt out in terms of grave sites? If you ceased to be active, how much land where you're not moving someone's grave or desecrating their memory would you have left where if you did, you know, have these gardens or greenways or tennis court?

Eric Logan: A couple of acres out of 200.

Mayor Ashe: Is it scattered pieces here and there?

Loretta Scott: It is scattered. There may be a couple of acres where there are no burials and that these would otherwise be subject to future internment. But the burials that are done now are done in between others, and they're very pricey. People want to be there because of the historical significance. There are areas where we aren't burying people.

Ron Watkins: It seems to me that, as I read your case problem, the primary issue is a financial issue. You have a budget deficit that's going to grow eventually to \$15 million in 2015, roughly. You obviously don't have much choice but to protect the cemetery and you have the potential to add the greenbelt that Mayor Ashe talked about, or some other green open space elements.

So if we looked at it as a financial issue for just a moment and realizing that for 2000-2001 you have a \$350,000 deficit, you're facing the \$11 million deficit in 2015. If you were to borrow \$6 million under a GO [general obligation] bond or something similar and put that in an endowment program where you could achieve a minimum of 12 percent earnings, you would have the potential of ending up in 2015 with a \$21 million turnaround, by having a \$6 million endowment, and you would have gained about \$1.4 million annually. If you receive as much as 15 percent return, you'd break even annually on your budget and it wouldn't cost you anything out of the operating account. In either event, 15 years out when your debt was paid off, you would have an endowment fund that should generate you close to \$1 million a year.

Mayor Johnson: That's an interesting view. You dealt with the long-term debt issue, if I understand what you're saying. You would borrow and invest, but you would not obviously have the money to deal with some of the infrastructure issues that are still there.

Ron Watkins: You'd have to sit down and do a model on it. You might want to over borrow a little bit to do that on the front end. I would suggest that as you sell plots, maybe you raise the price or a percentage of those sales go into endowment as well.

Mayor Johnson: Mount Hope is already the most expensive burial site in the area. The only way we could even justify that is because of its historical significance. If we're selling a plot for \$1,500 or \$1,800 and the funeral director can go to a cemetery where he can get a plot for \$300, I think we're not in a position where we can mark it up much more than it can be. At some point Mount Hope Cemetery is going to close its doors to burials, and we know that day is not far down the road, so that's why we're looking at the strategy now. When it is no longer generating any revenue it's still going to generate expense, and that expense is going to be coming almost totally from our general fund. There is no choice.

We could never allow that cemetery to just go to seed. You need to see the site to understand. It is never something that you could just forget about. It's on a major gateway into the city. It's a well traveled arterial. It sits next to the University of Rochester.

Loretta Scott: Consistent with your comments about an endowment, one of the things that we've done as part of an action plan is to create a foundation. We have a separate corporation, the Rochester Cemeteries Heritage Foundation. Our hope is that we'll get some movers and shakers and fundraisers that will help us to raise an endowment that will identify some specific projects that can be funded to make the cemetery appealing. The concept about curb appeal and all of that still holds even as we're attempting to maintain it and develop plans to ensure that our legacy is not one of disrepair.

Meg Cheever: Your great advantage is that you have these famous people in your cemetery—Susan B. Anthony and Frederick Douglass and I'm sure others. We have such a cult of celebrity that it seems like that would be the road I would go down, to get people to pay attention and take notice. I was wondering whether you could go to the next level and find a way to combine your foundation with the Friends and somehow see if you could get a champion person who would actually be an employee of, like a joint employee of the Friends and of the city or somebody who could actually spend full-time trying to find ways to collaborate with people and raise money.

Mayor Ashe: Why don't you let it be taken over by the National Park Service?

Mayor Johnson: One of the issues about Frederick Douglass is they already maintain Frederick Douglass's home in Washington. When Victor mentioned how Great Smoky National Park was taken over, that thought immediately came to my mind [takeover by the National Park Service]. But I think that's easier said than done.

Mayor Ashe: Think about tying into Susan Anthony and Frederick Douglass, making it broader than just Rochester. Maybe it's New York State and not necessarily the Park Service taking over. In terms of some funding, there may be some others you can find in other parts of the state.

Mayor Johnson: Here's the issue. The central challenge was how do you go to the mind set. How do you get people to really now understand that this is such a tremendous asset that it requires public investment?

Mayor Norquist: You've got to tell all these interesting stories.

Ann Zoller: The thing you need to do is take the constituency and the passion of the Friends group and really ratchet it up, so that the Friends group is combined with the foundation and there is, as you were saying, a champion. Somebody needs to be responsible for this every day. This needs to be somebody's job. What we're talking about here is the potential for all this opportunity on the federal level, on the state level. But I think perhaps the best way to do it is to create some kind of nonprofit partner. There's Lakeview Cemetery in Cleveland that has several Rockefellers, President Garfield. It is run by a nonprofit organization that is just charged with the maintenance and upkeep and endowment of that cemetery. You could partner that with, if you had an endowment fund that then gives the impetus for folks that are looking to fund phased activities right now. You develop a consensus plan. But you need to have someone who is driving this every day. A Friends group is wonderful, but this needs to be on steroids, so that there's a campaign, a public relations component, so people understand there's someone doing outreach to the community. You're really hitting people everywhere they live. You can take advantage of the park opportunities without providing a conflict to the trust that was established generations ago.

One of the things that is interesting for cities when you're looking for private involvement is you can't have a position where the private sector thinks we are being asked to this because the city couldn't do itself. You need to demonstrate the city's capacity and the strong management and why you are where you are and what the private role, private sector's role, can be here.

Eric Logan: What I'm hearing from you is that we need to do some things that allow the political machinery to move more freely, without being encumbered by lack of information or bad information.

Ann Zoller: You need to take what you're doing and translate it into a constituency that's attached to funding so that there are well-intentioned residents. There needs to be an institutional basis to it. You need to be able to call on your state legislature. There needs to be some kind of arm that represents a community consensus that this is important to our community. Put the cemetery in the middle. Who on any level has interest, is touched? How far out can you extend the partnership, that network, so that you really can mobilize a network where this makes sense to people.

It's positioning someone. It's someone who is out there who understands opportunities, whether they're state funding or federal funds that are available, plus private foundations, family foundations. You can't raise money unless people understand why it's important. It's the programs with the schools, it's articles in local newspapers. You can't just start knocking on doors for money until you have a plan about what you're going to do and what you're going to do first and you can back it up with why this is important.

Meg Cheever: A model for it might be Prospect Park in Brooklyn.

Ann Zoller: It also demonstrates that the city is doing what the city needs to do. If there's a certain financial commitment of maintenance that is defined and at the table so that private

partners understand that it's a partnership.

Mayor Johnson: What would be the success of a major fund drive to raise the \$5 or \$10 million? I mean do you think cemeteries have that kind of cachet that people would contribute that?

Ann Zoller: It would be dependant upon what was determined. What is the request for, and what are the type of capital improvements. Sculpture? Use of the cemetery as a passive park? Perhaps the best way to face something is to find funding and get funding in place for the type of project that demonstrates to the broader community what you anticipate this cemetery to be in the future.

Mayor Johnson: We have someone under contract to actually go out and try to raise us money. So that possibility is there. This notion that there be some angel who could step in who would make a significant contribution, we haven't really haven't found that person.

Mayor Norquist: You got to make it clear that they're not going to be paying for the municipal responsibility. If you're going to maintain graves with donated money nobody is going to give a dime. But if you're doing things that this group is interested in, people might give a lot of money but you got to separate it from the city so that they're not giving it to the city.

Paul Rookwood: You raise a good point. Is there really a constituency that's big enough to take care of your problem? I think you've got to look for a new agenda as well as the cemetery. You got to create some new energy that's going to give you that constituency.

Jim Hecimovich: What's the university's connection? If they have a Department of Feminist Studies and they have a Department of African-American History, draw them in as a good neighbor. The university should be able to act as a champion or maybe a faculty member can get involved as well.

Mayor Johnson: They have just created the Frederick Douglass Institute. But I don't think the university has interest in making any major investment in this. Just across the street from the cemetery, they're making a huge investment in the future. They're spending about \$200 million in a new biomedical institute. What do we do to really get people to talk about putting millions of dollars in this enterprise when they want to put it in something like the biomedical institute, which they view as a new way for entrepreneurial and industrial development.

We're trying to do a major waterfront development. Because the river runs right adjacent to the university, we want to get them to do some community economic development. This is not on their radar screen.

Grover Mouton: I want to bring up one thing. I've had to deal with issue with cemeteries for about six years in New Orleans. I'm very aware of your problems. I think you ought to have, for a better word, the urban cemetery summit, where you bring an economist or someone, a developer, who can really throw out these numbers to people. Then you bring the conservationist. And then you have a group of people singing your song for a while.

Bob Lurcott: One relatively simple thing to do that might raise the profile is the thing that was done in Baltimore for the aquarium, and we did it here for our aviary, is you get national designation. It doesn't bring anything with it in terms of money, but it changes the nature of it, if it was Mount Hope National Historical Cemetery. It can help raise money. You're more likely to get it on a list of tourist attractions if it's a national cemetery.

Mayor Johnson: I'm writing that down now as a fifth suggestion. My first one is takeover by the National Park Service. I added as a fifth one: seek designation as a national cemetery. The second one would be floating bonds to raise an endowment fund. Third one is to ratchet up the marketing of the cemetery by assigning this as a full-time responsibility. And the fourth one is to attract a prominent political patron, using the personages of either Anthony or Douglass as a way to get some political investment, some political funding into this place.

Lee Springgate: I think you need to refine the long-term vision a bit for Mount Hope, so that it does create a vision that's compelling, that draws all this money and support to you. I also think you need a sustained, intelligent, systematic marketing education program that takes place over a period of years. It sets the stage for that kind of activity happening.

"SUCCESSFUL PARK DESIGN"

Paul Rookwood: In theory I will talk about successful park design elements, although I hope it will actually be sort of more broad ranging than just talking about park elements. The focus here is on urban parks. A lot of the park systems we're looking at, in terms of urban parks, are really already built out.

The challenge now is how do we look at parks as part of the urban fabric. What I really wanted to try and focus on is what we see happening, the cutting-edge of how people are creating urban space now in conjunction with a bigger vision for the city and in conjunction with redevelopment activities. I think redevelopment is where the new park opportunities are in terms of urban parks and urban cities today.

I'd like to also talk about how we see parks being brought online, how we see them happening, what is successful in the way that they're occurring now. Mayor Norquist talked earlier about the Hope VI program. There's a redevelopment opportunity there in terms of residential neighborhoods, low-income neighborhoods, for how parks can be developed.

There is a sequence [to park planning]. As you go around the sequence, you start with a vision for the whole city—the city comprehensive plan. Then you look at a neighborhood plan, you look at a redevelopment plan, and how urban open space fits as part of that. You actually get into designing the parks and the greenway connections that connect old neighborhoods together but provide adjacent redevelopment opportunities and on into the individual parks. The first point is we've got to set this in a context that has to do with urban planning and urban design, the vision for where we're going with our communities.

At the same time we have to look at how individual components fit within a bigger system. It's no

good for us to look at an individual property and think about it on its own. In this image of Honolulu, this open space system, in a very dense urban environment, is about how parks and open space interact with private redevelopment opportunities. How you're creating recreation out of the urban fabric instead of thinking about a park being a discrete stand-alone element.

To summarize the sequence again, it's community vision, comp plan, park system plan, before you get to park design.

I wanted to take a moment and look out at a bigger issue. The world population is growing from 6 billion to 12 billion in the next 70 years. Will the doubling of the population in the U.S., which we're also expecting, double the amount of urban land? We think the answer is definitely not. We're not going to give up that much open space anymore to double the amount of urban space. We think the question is about how are we going to redevelop our cities to absorb that population, not how we're going to just go on sprawling out.

Mayor Norquist: What makes you think it's not going to keep going?

Paul Rookwood: We believe there will be resistance to that. We see that already happening in the resurgence and re-interest in redeveloping in the cities, in downtown housing and rebuilding cities as a place to live instead of the suburban fringe. We've also got to a point where the expansion is simply reaching beyond the limits of where people are, what people are willing to live with, in terms of commute times, in terms of quality of life factors.

The question really we're facing, I think, as we move forward is not just how do we stop this kind of thing happening, but how can we rebuild real communities within the cities. There are two issues for parks here. One is, how do parks contribute to building those vital, vibrant communities within our cities that are much more dense than the places that would otherwise occur in the suburbs? There's an issue here about how parks are part of a system. I think that's something the new urbanists actually haven't grappled with very well. The urban form that's in new urbanist lexicon tends to be driven by the design of the street fabric, and the development and open space tends to be a sort of accidental left behind.

Nevertheless, there's a basic premise here. Quality urban environments are a key component of building a sustainable future, and the integrated open space systems are an essential part of that quality urban environment. Integrated means what parks are doing, what open space is doing in the urban environment. It's leveraging urban investment, giving community identity so that people really want to live in those neighborhoods, promoting recreation and health, water quality and natural resources, energy efficiency. Conveying infrastructure is an important part of what open space can do in the urban environment as well.

The origins of park design in this country really started with the cemeteries. What we're looking at now are very different kinds of parks.

Community identity, cultural diversity, are major issues for urban parks. How we reflect that in the way that we design them is a key concern and should be a concern, because that's how we get

people to buy into the parks, to adopt them, to live in them, to make them part of their life. We can build new parks that are just as beautiful, just as exciting and they don't have to look like they were built in the 19th century. Partnerships are where the future lies in terms of how we're going to build our urban parks, maintain our urban parks, make urban parks work. Interconnection with the surrounding areas is absolutely key in terms of where we're going.

The elements of park design—circulation, plantings, the lay of the land, furniture, signage—it would be rather boring to talk about these individual things. What I've done instead is put together a series of projects to look at how these things are occurring and how urban parks are developing as part of the fabric that we're building.

Minneapolis is well regarded as having a fantastic park system. This entire area that you can see in the aerial photograph currently is abandoned or semi-operative industrial land [along the Mississippi River], a terrible waste of a precious resource. The plan that we're looking at here was developed to basically recapture this. This was not about building a park. It was about stabilizing adjacent lower and moderate-income neighborhoods. It was about rebuilding an employment base in the city. It was about leveraging adjacent redevelopment opportunities as a result of public investment in building a new park along the riverfront.

The other thing I think that's key here is talking about how parks are integrated into the fabric of the city. Here is a green space that is not just about the park, along the river, or the amphitheater, but how that becomes the park and the playground and the garden, if you like, for the residences, and how that's tied into the adjacent neighborhoods through streetscapes and other linkages.

I think the environmental function in places like this is part of what we can achieve functionally; improving water quality, improving air quality are concerns for our older cities. There are ways that we can use urban parks to do those kinds of things in the way that they're designed. And also create magical and beautiful places. None of these images would you see in a 19th century park, but they're all beautiful, and they're performing a modern and necessary ecological function.

We're not talking now in terms of new urban park systems, about thousands of acres of parks. My bet is that this 90 acres of parks in the middle of Minneapolis will have a bigger impact on the city than 6,000 acres on the edge of Louisville because it's in the right place. It's dealing with restoring the riverbank, creating new habitat, dealing with a real water quality problem in the river.

[We're projecting] 2,500 new housing units in the riverfront, 2,000 new jobs in the redevelopment along the parks in the environment that we're creating by redeveloping that industrial land, \$10 million in tax revenue, and 30 million vehicle miles traveled saved because we've got a jobs-housing balance in the city instead of people living on the city fringe.

An abandoned landfill on the edge of Honolulu is going to be a new park, recapturing the landfill and linking it into the city center. For urban parks, this is what we're talking about. It's recapturing the landfill, it's redeveloping abandoned or lowly used industrial land.

Go for a strong design concept and do it with conviction, do it with quality, if you want to get a

quality result.

In Vallejo, California, we're redeveloping an industrial waterfront to create the parkland of the future. We all think about Battery Park City now being a terrific park. You know 30 odd years ago, that didn't exist. We had abandoned industrial land and finger piers and they filled out to the bulkhead line to create urban space for Manhattan. When we're talking about cities you've got to be more imaginative about where you're finding new parkland.

One of the things raised earlier is look at how you can fund parks with different kinds of revenues. Look at transportation money, infrastructure money, there's huge dollars there, much more than you need to build parks. With a lot of those projects you can build a park as the tail on the dog, you know. If somebody else is paying for the dog all you have to do is somehow get the tail attached to it.

Cultural identity is an important issue as we look at these redevelopment projects. [Look at] how neighborhoods identify themselves with what they have around them and adopt these places for themselves. So design is not just about function, it's not just about money, but how do you make it work.

Back to Minneapolis, to the Old Mills District. Reopening this up as an urban park is building on the cultural history of the place but it's also about how we tie into the adjacent redevelopment. There are old warehousing units that are being now converted for lofts, a little pocket plaza that's part of now what's an Omni Hotel. You come up the street further and you've got office redevelopment. The park is not a stand-alone element.

Capturing history is also about programming. It's not just about what you have but how you program it. Cultural institutions are not stand-alone elements, but should be part of the park system. That's how we need to think about these partnerships. The surroundings of the Museum of Art in Philadelphia and the redevelopment of the surroundings of it are creating urban park space for the people that live in that area.

One of the things for the cemetery that could be important is that the design of what happens in the cemetery sort of bleeds out into the street, so you deal with the whole street environment around the cemetery, not just what's inside the cemetery. I think that's true for most sites.

Public investment in urban space will generate huge returns to the city if it's done right. Every public dollar invested in Baltimore generated at least \$7 in private investment. The key things that are here are again the connections from the waterfront to the surrounding urban areas.

Parks in the urban fabric and urban open space should be part of a concerted strategy for how you build energy in the downtown or how you build energy in the place that you're trying to redevelop.

Linkages are something that we've also talked about in terms of the whole greenway movement. Louisville has got an extensive greenway program going on trying to reconnect neighborhoods to

the riverfront, a key area for them. Almost every American city turned its back on the river when it was developed. And almost every American city has recaptured it or they're trying to recapture it now.

One of the things we try to do are design tricks, with something as simple as a sidewalk. Somebody talked about, we don't need the Cadillac, we can do with the Chevy. I agree, but sometimes you can design the Chevy in a clever way so it's still appealing. In this case, we took a strip out of the middle of the sidewalk during construction. There's a waving band in the concrete sidewalk, which has exposed aggregate concrete in it. You can follow that waving band any place you are in the city and you know you're going to arrive at the riverfront. It's a simple visual clue to people, and people have gotten used to it now. They know if they arrive at that waving band and they follow it, they're going to get to the waterfront.

We put interpretative panels and poems into the paths themselves, so that they become part of the history. Have fun with design.

Having fun with design is also about creating some mystery. Putting people into places and letting them see the landscape in a different way. [In Louisville] a whole series of limestone columns that grow from short columns that the kids climb over to be 20 feet high march across a floodplain. They mark out different heights of the floods, and they reveal the sedimentary geology of the site that they're in. But nobody knows why they're there. Everybody I've talked to has developed a theory. It's fun. It's creating a new element, a new attraction. It's not just the same old thing that you've always had in a park.

We planted a meadow in this park as well. The city didn't want to have anything to do with it at first. The mayor later told me they've had to set up a meadow police, to stop you from going in and stealing all the flowers. People are attracted to simple things if you do it in imaginative ways.

Tying out to adjacent neighborhoods is really important. Put design clues in to let people know that there's a park there and draw them to it.

Finding other sources of money. In Richmond, Virginia, a canal restoration project [became] an enormously successful park. The great thing about this park is it was all funded with sewer dollars. They had to put a new trunk line sewer in and the team that was working on the project came up with a creative idea of saying: "There was a historic canal here once upon a time. Instead of just burying the sewer in the ground why don't we put the sewer in the ground and not fill it with dirt, but fill it to the top with water and create a new urban park around a canal." The sewer lies in the bottom of the canal, and using sewer redevelopment money, we created a new park for downtown Richmond. Like Baltimore, incredible redevelopment activity is occurring around that park. Parks create a fantastic setting for capturing increased revenue value on adjacent real estate if you do it well. Create an attractive setting. The redevelopment will come. You'll capture far more money than you had to invest in the park, if you can fund it right.

People adjust to their environment. They don't just create their environment. There are little things you can do to give them design clues, like the way that you design the places you're working with,

kind of creates their own energy. In the cemetery, what you put there is going to create the kind of activity that occurs there to some extent. So work with the space, work with the quality of the landscape that you're working with and so on.

I want to sum up by saying a lot of it is about providing a variety of opportunities for people to interact in different ways in urban settings. Funding, creating, and then programming things, making them alive. Putting people into them and making them energetic through events. Programming the spaces, making them exciting, doing the kinds of things on a smaller scale that you're doing in the cemetery is part of how you make these spaces vital and alive. It's not just building them, but how you use them. Thank you very much.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN – KILBOURN PARK

Mayor Norquist: Thank you. This is an area that is near downtown, with the Milwaukee River and surrounding high-density neighborhoods, about 15,000 people per square mile in here in a neighborhood called Yankee Hill. On this side of the river is a neighborhood called Brewers Hill, that's now very wealthy, integrated, and some of the people that used to live there actually have gotten better off instead of moving out.

There's a reservoir up on the hill that's used for water storage. It's not one of our main reservoirs anymore. We're planning on making it even smaller, being less dependent on it. There's a park called Kilbourn Park, which everybody in the neighborhood calls Reservoir Park. It's called Kilbourn Park because the third mayor of Milwaukee, back around 1850, Byron Kilbourn, named the park after himself.

Housing is being developed along here, market-rate housing. There's already a lot of housing built, about \$68 million. This section along here where the park comes down, this would be housing.

The partners are the City of Milwaukee, Department of City Development, Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, and the Milwaukee Waterworks that owns the reservoir. The Milwaukee Rowing Club is a partner, and Legacy Development and Van Denke Developers, they are the next ones.

To give you a context of where this is, the river at this point is about two miles from Lake Michigan. For most of that now we have riverwalk on one side of the river or the other, or both. You should eventually be able to walk along the river, at least one side, through most of the city.

There's an elevation change here, which actually is bigger than it looks in this picture. Some key elements: This is a bike trail that used to be a railroad track, and it's becoming more popular. We put that in about four or five years ago. This is a street that you can access. The Children's Outing Association intend to be a partner with the rowing club.

Something I'm really proud of is we hired Dan Solomon, an architect out of San Francisco, who put the plan for the riverwalk all along there. It's coded clearly so that anybody that was going to

develop what are six development parcels, they know that they have to include the right-of-way along the river.

There's a lot of pedestrianism moving through this corridor, so that there's potentially a lot of users. We're going to put a marsupial bridge under this [vehicle] bridge. This is a high-level viaduct that connects the two neighborhoods. It used to be a lift bridge in the middle when big ships came up here.

Peter Park: It's fixed in place now. And there's plenty of structure. So the idea that it's marsupial is that it's hanging from the existing structure of the bridge

Mayor Norquist: There'll be bikers and pedestrians coming every which way here. So that's a real opportunity.

Having these paths come down is just one way to do it [make the connection to the river]. It could be a staircase. There could be lots of different ways to do it. But we want to accomplish these objectives which are pretty important—linking Kilbourn Park. Kilbourn Park actually goes beyond the neighborhood of Brewer's Hill. It connects with a neighborhood that has a fairly low-income population with huge market housing demand on the river itself. We want to use this project to the maximum to connect the river to the neighborhoods that are less affluent further up on the hill. The rowing club has been sort of on and off through the years struggling with how they can reach out. So that's where the Children's Outing Association and maybe other organizations come in.

We want the park not to appear privatized, even though the land itself is public land. On the other hand, we don't want an expensive park.

Beyond the Brewer's Hill Association, we want to go to the other groups, River West Association and the Northcot Neighborhood Association, all of which are even further up the hill.

We automatically pay half of any riverwalk that's built on the Milwaukee, Menomonee, or Kinnickinnic Rivers. If somebody builds a riverwalk, we treat it like a sidewalk and we pay half.

I think environmentalism is a great way to change the world view that low-income people often have—it's a very inexpensive way. We have these magnificent natural assets, like Bill does in Rochester with Lake Ontario. I imagine you have the same experience Bill that I do, that there are a lot of kids that have never seen the lake, or if they did they can't remember it. It's not part of their lives. And the same thing with the rivers. And it really takes a lot of effort, including reminding myself to do it, to create community using these natural assets.

What I'm afraid we'll miss with this thing is that we'll create a little park, an asset that works from the physical standpoint, but we won't make the most out of this, and we won't have the most value, and we won't connect the neighborhoods. Funding it is a little bit of a problem but it's not as big a problem as the coalition-building and the story-telling around it. Because the Milwaukee River, like the Genessee River or any of the other rivers that we have in most of our big cities, the

people aren't as connected to it as they should be.

In the downtown, we did the Alfred Clas riverwalk plan 90 years after he drew it up. We went ahead and did it and got huge value increases, more housing, and a lot more people using the river well. This is north of the downtown, and we want to accomplish the same thing and even more, if we can.

Ken, why don't you just describe briefly what the rowing club does and what perhaps you guys hope to do if you can build some of these coalitions?

Ken Nelson: What we do now is we're primarily three things. We're a pretty substantial group of adult rowers, about 75 of us. We've got Marquette University that has about 75 kids. It's a very good combination. They use the boats in the afternoon, we use them in the morning. Right now we've got about 10 high school kids rowing.

What the Children's Outing Group will do is deliver a package to us. Here are nine kids that are committed and willing to row, and we've over the years always had a number of people that have expressed an interest in coaching if kids come down. What we'll do is get the package delivered to us and then we'll provide the people who are willing to coach that, either in the morning or in the afternoon.

Mayor Norquist: To add a little more context to this, there's housing booming on both sides of the river along there. It's going into places where I never thought we would be putting housing. The development that's going on, it's largely market-rate. There's lots of low-cost housing nearby. There's sort of an undertone about gentrification. Rather than have the community divide on this issue, I think we need to take advantage of this amenity and try to make it as open as we can. If you have ideas on how we can design this connection between a riverwalk and a park, a well-used public park above on the bluff, so that it's open to the public and everybody feels that they can use it, that's a particular concern to me.

Peter Park: We prepared a plan for this area. It's about 30 acres, former industrial area. The plan was based on using a street grid and extending the existing fabric above the bluff down to the river and creating a code that encourages fine-grained development of multiple developers. We're selling the land in separate RFPs to different developers, because we believe that it'll get the most competition. Not only sale competition, but, from a design perspective, get the greatest variety and get developers to really think about their designs to compete with one another. Design is a very significant agenda for the mayor, and finding ways to foster that competition is always a part of the work.

So this park above the bluff is very important, but dealing with topography and the fact that we don't necessarily have a parks system within the city. So adding more green space to the inventory is not always something that a public works is really anxious to do. So that's what we're here to talk about.

Ann Zoller: Who is right now going to be responsible for maintaining that new private park?

Peter Park: Right now the discussion is that it would be in easement, but the developer would actually be maintaining it.

Ann Zoller: So I guess the thing is, while you have any leverage, to build some things in about neighborhood use. Are they going to permit that space, or is it just open for all things all the time? Will there be a permitting process for events? There are ways you could guarantee X amount of calendar dates or opportunities for neighborhoods, if you get into the discussion now about usage and how it's going to be used and how it's going to be maintained. And if there's going to be fees for permits because the time to have that discussion is while you have any leverage.

Mary Eysenbach: Mayor, I think that you have a strong interest in establishing and maintaining a relationship between the Kilbourn Park neighborhood and this new river site. It sounds like that it's very important to you that the neighborhood feel free and at ease to use that property and be encouraged to come and be reconnected to the river. There's probably some design elements that are going to encourage that sort of behavior and that sort of response. I'm going to ask Paul if you could talk maybe about your experience with connecting neighborhoods to rivers and some of those design elements.

Paul Rookwood: I had a couple of questions before we get to that. On the plan, opposite where the connection presumably would come down the bluff, there's what looks like a very large footprint building. That's a tannery?

Mayor Norquist: It's a dead tannery, part of which has been rehabbed into apartments. The rest of it has now been airing out for more than 20 years, so it's about ready to be redeveloped too.

Paul Rookwood: One of the critical things in thinking about rivers and the way that you design them, is not to think about one side meeting the waterfront, but to think about both sides and how they act in concert with one another. So I would be looking at how you redevelop the other side of the river at the same time as you look at how you develop this. The first step would be to take a design vocabulary of things like furniture, paving, lighting, signage, all the standard features that go into a design for a public space. Make sure that the elements that you use along the riverwalk are fully incorporated into the connection that goes up the bluffs, and then extend on even up into Kilbourn Park. What I'm driving at is that psychologically you're trying to make all of those components be one in the mind's eye of the user. I think people will use it or not use it depending on the visual cues that they get. If it's developed in a way where it looks like a private gateway, even though it's publicly accessible, they won't use it.

What kind of residential you have opposite and above . . . ?

Mayor Norquist: This is a blend of working class and well off. The property values are going up at twice the rate of inflation on the other side of the river. The areas right near the river, particularly downstream on this side, have really gone up. They have beautiful views of downtown. The houses there sell for \$300,000, \$400,000.

Paul Rookwood: What would you have along the bluff here? Do you have good views along

there as well?

Mayor Norquist: They're all good views. These houses haven't quite become as popular as the ones closer to downtown, but that's happening.

Paul Rookwood: So I was thinking, if you make this into a feature . . . The pleasure of this is facing out this way off the bluffs really. If you start thinking about this stepping down as a series of terraces that allow you to enjoy that but carry it on over the river as well, so that you have something happening in terms of park over here in the way that you redevelop this property.

Mayor Norquist: We have a large bluff right about here. At the bottom is a walkway that's now being built in a housing development, with a staircase coming down. So if you were walking toward the river, you would come down that staircase, and you might be able to see this one, depending on how it's built. I was going to ask you if the connection down is a zigzag, does that matter compared to a staircase or . . .

Paul Rookwood: Well you've got ADA [Americans With Disabilities Act] access as an issue. But, if you built a staircase, you might have a big stair that comes down and then has a platform and then there's another line of steps and so on. And eventually you get down to the river. And then the ADA access essentially comes off in a series of ramps. Then this becomes sort of a terrific place for events and for sitting and watching.

You could imagine if it's not real hot, people hanging out on the steps and really enjoying the views, so it becomes a kind of place for gathering. What I was thinking is, if you got the river at the other side, you then make something that mirrors it over here. Suddenly you've made this really attractive, with a big connection across here as well as the view there in both directions. You could even imagine this becoming sort of a small community-oriented performance space. That would make this connection even more, because the grade change is sort of exciting in and of itself.

The other thing I thought about was, where we have grade change and you have river, I don't know what kind of drainage pattern you had here before the historic block grid went in with the city. But certainly it would be interesting to think about whether or not there was ever a natural drainage coming down the bluff.

Peter Park: It was actually all fill.

Mayor Norquist: Commerce Street was a canal. It was meant to go about 40 miles north and hook with a river that would go into the Mississippi.

Paul Rookwood: I was thinking, though, the other thing that might be fun is to think about how water could be part of this. You've got the reservoir up there. But this thing kind of suggests a rather formal sort of Italianate design. But it could also be that the way that water comes through here could be a thing where you have pools that are almost like sort of carrying wetland vegetation or something like that where you're introducing the idea of cleaning urban runoff as it

heads down to the river. That then becomes a sort of interpretative educational thing as well as a thing that's just beautiful in and of itself.

What I'm saying is that all of this could become a design feature. By making a design feature, you have the same features coming all the way along your public space here. They carry on here, and they carry on in the park, to make it obvious that it's a publicly designed space.

Mayor Norquist: We have Mary Miss doing something on the other side of downtown, closer to the—she was the one who did Battery Park. She has a drainage system coming off of a freeway that goes into the wetland that she created and flow[ing] into the river.

Grover Mouton: This statement about your broadened environmental awareness, I think that's an incredible concept. I really have never heard anyone really voice that kind of attitude or put inner-city children in an engagement in an environmental situation. But if you want to do this, how do you get the neighborhood to buy in to what you're talking about from this level because that's what you're saying.

So instead of saying you got to write design guidelines, you got to do an overlay design—that day is over. What you're saying is engage this with the inner city or with the opportunity of the neighborhood. That is diabolically different from design guidelines in an overlay district.

Mayor Norquist: It's about attitudes. From a design standpoint, the first sign of a pulse downtown was before I was mayor, back around 1983 or 1984. They put row houses along the river in the middle of the downtown. Not right in the middle, but on the northern edge of the downtown. And they had no public access. The garage is facing the downtown street, then you walk into your door, and you have your private world on the river. That's one of the places along the river where you can't walk.

Now what we've found out with the riverwalk, that it's not about the riverwalk. It's about connecting the riverwalk to the streets. What we found out was that public access enhanced the value. What we learned from that was that public access actually enhanced the value. We had a home go for \$740,000. You can actually open up to the community and the real estate will sell for more.

If we make this connection, then it's a positive that everybody can kind of get around.

Paul Rookwood: How about getting the neighborhood literally involved in building? I'm not talking about designing it. I'm talking about really contributing to building it. For example, when they did the Boston T, they built the stations on the T, the school kids in every neighborhood around the T stations made ceramic tiles that actually were built into the thing. These stairs, for example, there would be decorative work that could be incorporated into the way that that's built but it's actually done by the school kids in the neighborhood that's above and around here, so that they begin to identify with it.

Grover Mouton: This is a wonderful opportunity if you can define a mechanism to give the

neighborhood the idea of ownership in the connection. It's how do you get this neighborhood to become really connected to your connection. It's a wonderful application to be able to try to do. I think the bluff, as you're saying, is an opportunity. But how can you define this? I mean, this is a very, very serious problem. If this is solved, because it's not going to be solved by design guidelines. It's not going to be solved by an overlay district. We're talking about a community engagement with a developer, a very, very complicated piece of design. I think the key is in this environmental awareness.

Lee Springgate: I love your idea of this youth environmental consciousness center. If I were doing this and designed some kind of process I would go out and have some real attractive recreation magnet to go with this environmental education. You could do all kinds of environmental interpretation down there. You could have laboratories, you could have classrooms, you could have displays. You learn about the hydraulic cycle, about the aquatic life, about wildlife, all kinds of things that relate to that river. You could have some kind of access to the river for these kids to get out on something, go down to the river and learn about what they've just been taught. I think if you had this kind of an idea in place and you worked at it over time I think you'd educate most of the school kids in Milwaukee. In Bellevue our staff committed to develop environmental curriculum that we took to the schools on behalf of the teachers. We said, here is the curriculum to tell you about these park sites and what they do for the environment. They use that curriculum and they brought the kids to our place and we had our people go out into the schools as well. We had interactive process going on. And it does take a tremendous commitment but, when it happens, I think that's when people start claiming these lands as their own and something they value over a lifetime.

Ann Zoller: I think he is absolutely on point. The key thing that you have to ask and I think answer is, who's going to do it? Is the developer going to have the same incentive that you have to really make this an experience that's worthwhile for the kids up the hill? Chances are they won't. There needs to be programming dollars designated and put in place before the project gets too far ahead of itself or the ideas will die on the vine. This is the type of thing that would be absolutely right for a foundation's support if you can find a home for it, either through the schools or through the Children's Outing Association. Unless you have programming dollars set aside for this with a way to operate them, the good intentions, unless there's a home, good intentions will probably wait and the developer is not going to care in six months.

And then create some kind of memorandum of understanding between the city, between the developer, and between a partner that would perhaps manage this and manage programming and be responsible and that would have deliverables that they had to provide to you in terms of programming. Programs with schools, doing the things that have been suggested. This money is available to them if they do X, Y, and Z.

The other concern you're going to have probably is, when the folks buy the new upscale homes along the river, you know, what are they going to want? Are they going to want too many activities? And what they're going to see is their park and you need to make sure that there's a mechanism to safeguard that. Not necessarily buildings, but certainly activities, like an environmental learning center that would share space with the boathouse. That would be a really

great way to make sure that the neighborhood knew that they were invited.

Paul Rookwood: One caution. Let's remember the rivers in our cities are one of the most precious resources that we have. In terms of environmental, environmental function is one of the things that we actually can manage better than we have. The tannery being opposite here is sort of emblematic of our changing attitudes back to environmental resources.

I hate to say this with you here, but the boathouse itself is an abomination. If you think about the boathouses in Philadelphia, they are almost like one of the symbols of the great and beautiful things that have happened in Philadelphia on the Schuylkill River. I'm not saying that you maybe are going to recreate the Schuylkill, but all I would say is that, if you put this here or any other building here, it should be of a quality that matches the preciousness of the environment you're working with. I also wouldn't put buildings down there unless they really have relevance to the river.

Peter Park: One of the things that we were overcoming was a pile of proposals that were made years ago for this area. As I was looking at each of these proposals, they were all introverted enclaves, cul-de-sacs with dead-ends and enclaves of residential development. So the plan as developed was, we sort of took the attitude of, it's just laying out a public structure. And in doing that it helped to do a couple of things. It gave developers some sense of what's going to be across the street or next door, so they didn't feel the need to be so defensive in their design. But now it gets to the less design but more the social connections and just designing the problematic things that let that flow of connection occur.

Mayor Johnson: John, I wanted to offer you a suggestion that charrettes can work. We had a street reconstruction project that clashed with a neighborhood empowerment project we have, called Neighborhood Planning Teams. We divided the city up.

This particular street was a major thoroughfare from the suburbs into downtown. Ran through a commercial residential area and then it got right into the cultural district. And these citizens had engaged in a planning process creating art walks and all that sort of thing. They were very upset to see the design of the street. We had to stop that project for a year, because we were committed to citizen involvement.

The result was that after several months of very contentious meetings we came up with a new design narrowing the street because one of the things they were looking for was traffic calming. They wanted it reduced from a four-lane to a two-lane street. They understood that we couldn't do that, because it was a thoroughfare, but we could create some of the traffic calming they were looking for. They got their art walk design in. At the end of it they took out an ad in the newspaper, complimenting the fact that this does work.

The reason I'm saying this is because I believe that you can offer people the opportunity to participate, give them some buy-in, they learn that their ideal situation can never be realized, but they can get a lot, and we can learn a lot. They now understand that there is another world out there.

If you're trying to get this neighborhood to buy in, slowing up a bit and giving them a time to say what they'd like would give you the kind of ownership that you—now I didn't need to tell you that because I think you understand it. But I just wanted to cite to you an example of where it had worked.

Loretta Scott: We have a project that's almost identical to this one that's now called the Genessee River Waterway Center. It sits right on the river. It houses a rowing club. We had our parks operations facility there. Our trucks, our mowers, all of it on the river's edge. Beautiful space, but that was when people didn't really care that much about what went on at the edge of the river.

A part of what is required of the group that we are allowing to develop that property is public access. We paid \$500,000 to build another building for our parks operations so they can move out and we put money in for trails. We required that. We did a lot to ensure that the public did have access, but we also required that the developer involve the neighbors. We have a neighborhood association that's in that area. They're part of a planning team. They also have to, on an annual basis, report to us on what they've done to have children, area neighbors, and families involved at that site. They have to prove to us that they're living up to the agreement.

Now the danger is that, you know, how things are very important at first and then you get distracted. The moment we get distracted and don't require them to prove that they're living up to the agreement, it'll be private. So somehow we've got to institutionalize something that ensures that people continue to look at that to make sure that people have the access to the river at that point.

Mayor Norquist: If the connection down is strong enough, by the time it gets to the property that the developer has responsibility of at the bottom of the hill, that could really heavily influence—I mean a lot of this is "design affects attitude."

Christine Saum: I agree with you that it can't stop when the construction's done. It has to be a continuing effort to create activities that draw people in after the thing is built.

Paul Rookwood: The other thing I would say about activities: If you create a great waterfront I guarantee that people will be there. You know people want to roller blade, they want to walk, they want to sit, they want to fish, they want to do whatever it is that they do on the river. You may want to program lots of things to happen there as well. There will be people there using it, if it's nicely done.

Mayor Norquist: People use it now for fishing, for example. When I was a legislator 20 years ago, the Department of Natural Resources was planning on moving to a new headquarters. They were in a suburb called Wauwatosa just west of Milwaukee, and they were going to move even further out.

Those of us in the Milwaukee delegation said, "Wait a minute. We want you to go to King and North Avenue," which is the heart of the inner city, because there happened to be a lot available. And they said, "Well, we'd be glad to do that. But our biggest activity is issuing fishing licenses

and, you know, that would be more appropriate way out on the edge." And so then we said, "All right. Well let's just check." So we found out in the highest concentration of people holding fishing licenses happened to be King and North. So that was the end of that. And they're at King and North, which is also up this hill. And they want to have river access, so maybe we can tie them into this too.

Mayor Johnson: Are you afraid that the racial issues might, in fact, deter people from using that facility where you're building?

Mayor Norquist: No, not if we build it right. You know, a great facility with lots of people. There's always racial issues. But I really think that this is more of an opportunity. What would be a problem is if we design it in a way or neglect to design in a way that connects because then we will create that physical disconnect which would then feed into the negative stuff.

Grover Mouton: Do people really use the rivers? The only reason I say that is, in the cities that I work in, they don't use the river and lake fronts. They just don't go to them. We had to create incentives to get the people down there. I mean it's just the facts of life. Now if you don't have that, that's fantastic. Mayor Ashe, like what you had to do to get the people down to your river. I mean, they weren't using the river, really.

Mayor Ashe: No, we had to make events that were of interest to people, and where they want to come to the river. And then we put in some amenities in terms of it, you know, fountains that come up out of the ground. Kids, I mean in the summer any hour of the days there's someone splashing around down there. And we now have three restaurants. And talking about the boathouse with Mayor Murphy earlier, we just built the women's crew boathouse and on the top floor is a restaurant that just opened. So that's created some interest.

Peter Park: Where we've made new opportunities in downtown on the riverwalk, they get quite a lot of use now. New restaurants springing up all along the river.

Mary Eysenbach: We talked about some relationships between this piece and the Children's Outing Association and working with the rowing club. Ann, could you talk about maybe some groups or some associations that the city might be able to tap into that you know of that might be a little bit more unusual, that might bring something pretty unique to the table?

Ann Zoller: I think it certainly varies within each community. I would be concerned about, if your desire is really to get a diverse group to feel comfortable at the river—too much focus on rowing. I think just because there's a perception maybe that that is a sport that's not a populist sport.

What the rowing club could do is as you try to get folks involved is, we've done this with golf programs in the inner city. We have had the Cleveland State golf team go out to rec centers where these kids live and golf with them there, and then take them on golf courses. So if there's a way to do some demonstrations in a rec center, in a pool where, you know, kids really feel comfortable. I think you really have to take that extra step to go where the people live first and then bring them down to the river.

But certainly Boy's and Girl's Clubs, environmental groups, museums, all kind—schools. There is funding for programs and particularly they bring these programs outside. The sewer district, I know you said they were a partner. We get money—they give us money, programming dollars, to do water testing related to our river and we take kids from inner city rec centers and we do that. Look at the institutions that make up the fabric of the city that are related to all the target markets. Churches, all kinds of social groups, and make sure that they know they have a place at this table that they are welcome. But to try to get some key institutions whether it's a children's museum or science museum or environmental center or . . .

Mayor Norquist: There's a lot of other spots along this river where other things can get programmed in. This is sort of like the rowing club spot. The reason they're there is because I pushed through, we opened up the dam further up the river that drained the place they used to row. But that made the fishing better further up the dam. The river is a lot cleaner because it flows naturally now. But they had to move because of what we did.

We have an outfitter that sells canoes and kayaks a quarter of a mile down the river from them on the other side of the river. And, you know, I always tell people you can go there and test ride it.

Ann Zoller: Maybe something more formal than that. I don't mean to suggest that you have to have 100 groups that have programmed activities, but find one or two institutional partners that will take this seriously, that will work with the programming dollars that are available and that will work with existing groups.

Mayor Norquist: One thing we were thinking of is to go to a nearby park that has a lagoon and have the kids row, do row boating and things like that first, as an initial step.

Ann Zoller: Right. So it's not intimidating. Or if you can do it in a rec center or pool. Just to create a couple of institutional relationships where there is the capacity. We do programs where we create environmental education and we do teacher training. There's got to be groups like that that would really welcome the opportunity to have a second home and to do the program that they already do. This just provides a wonderful vehicle for them to raise additional foundation dollars and do it at this location. You just need a couple of those good relationships to make it work.

Mary Eysenbach: We're going to take a five minute break, and then we'll come back and have Ann tell us about some partnerships with private funders.

PARTNERSHIPS AND PRIVATE FUND RAISING FOR PARKS

Ann Zoller: ParkWorks is the nonprofit partner for the City of Cleveland which raises money for park projects. We don't just raise money, we do them. We are a nonprofit that's been around for 20 years. We changed our name two years ago. Partially inspired by a grant from the Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, which we started to receive in 1995, we really started to concentrate on urban parks activities. And, based on that success, we really looked at how we might partner more completely with the City of Cleveland to raise the profile of park projects, to

raise resources for what the city could not do, and to take on some special initiatives for the city.

The primary signature project that we have started on behalf of the city is raising monies to design and build community parks at elementary schools in the City of Cleveland. This is a really ambitious undertaking. There are 82 elementary schools in the city, and when we started probably 10 had what you would determine a suitable playground. Most of these were barren asphalt parking lots that were really in a state of total disrepair. We decided to start at the schools that had the greatest poverty in the surrounding community first. We have currently eight projects under construction. We completed one last year. In 18 months we have raised and leveraged \$2 million for these projects, which are really holistic site improvements. They include not only a playground—state of the art playground—but an outdoor learning garden that we developed in partnership with the Cleveland Botanical Gardens. It's an outdoor classroom that really takes learning outside. As part of our green schools program, we provide teacher training and curriculum support to teachers so that they really understand how to utilize the classroom. We work in a continuing basis with private foundation dollars to support the teachers in using these outdoor classrooms.

We also do a Cleveland Parks Institute, modeled after the Wallace program. What we wanted to do was recreate the passion and the positioning for parks that Wallace had so effectively articulated through their urban parks initiative. The Cleveland Parks Institute is something that we have done with private funding for about two and a half years. We train parks department staff and community development professionals in parks-related activities. One of our thoughts was, when we decided to partner with the city, it's well and good to raise money to do things above and beyond what the city could do. We felt that we had to really enhance that partnership with the working staff and provide professional development activities to them that weren't typically available to them.

We also have a very innovative program with the public housing authority in Cleveland. We take residents of public housing and, with HUD dollars, train them in intensive six- or eight-week training courses in the green industries. We take residents of public housing and they go through classroom training in the morning. We bring in potential employers from a variety of fields in the industry to act as teachers. In the afternoon they go out and they work on-site at CMHA properties to transform them and do comprehensive landscaping projects that improve the properties, while also taking advantage of welfare-to-work dollars and getting these people in jobs. The green industry folks are terrifically supportive because they need bodies and we know that there are bodies and we're making that match that makes sense.

We also have more typical programs like with the horticulture society where we have city side gardens around downtown.

The benefits of partnership. One of the main things that it does for a mayor is it takes your problems and it makes them our problems. When my mayor says to me, "Get school playgrounds done," I may not see him for six months, but that's all I do and that's all my board does and it's all my staff does. What it really does is it gives legs to something you don't have time to do that is important but it's above and beyond what you have the capacity to do. The terrific thing about

ParkWorks is that we have a board of terrifically committed civic leaders and these people raise money. This is a primary way that they give back to the community. They are taking the message of the need for quality parks in nurturing environments at schools to their community, to their audiences, which are not typically city audiences. So you significantly expand the constituency. You multiply your sales force far beyond what the city has the capacity to do.

We've, through our programming base, demonstrated that we also bring a very entrepreneurial and creative approach to problem solving. I think what helps sometimes is to get people who aren't parks people, who aren't typically thinking in the same way all the time. We have challenges that we take on for the city, and we're entrepreneurial, and we're creative. In another meeting I was in I described our organization as scrappy. That's what we are, because we don't have general fund dollars keeping us going. We survive only if we're worthy. That forces us to be creative, to leave no stone unturned, to create unlikely partnerships, and to succeed and only succeed if it's worth our time to be around. That, I think, is one of the terrific benefits of partnerships, because we are forced to be more creative, because we have to be or else we're not around for year two.

We were an organization that's been around for 20-something years, doing a variety of beautification initiatives, environmental education, reforestation. When we had the Wallace grant we really saw the opportunity to contribute to the city in a much more significant way, through urban parks. I previously had served as the parks director for the city and had a good working relationship with the mayor and talked to him about forming this partnership. He really appreciated the idea to have an organization not only share his vision for what parks could do but would keep this vision going after he was no longer mayor. This partnership provides him a mechanism to know that there is a group that will share this mission long beyond he is mayor, however long he is mayor.

If you're in a city where you don't have a nonprofit that fits that mold, you can do a number of things. You can form a board. You can, on an intermediary basis, have a community foundation serves as a fiscal agent with an advisory board that helps manage certain projects, where you had certain funds for programming set up in a community foundation that could only be spent after an advisory board with the community signed off, until you were at a point where you could form an organization that could act on their own.

One of the important things to do for a partner is to define their role. In Cleveland, union issues are a big thing. A lot of folks felt that when we became ParkWorks, that it wasn't going to be long before we took over the city and 20,000 vacant lots and 47 swimming pools and it was just a nice way of shaping privatization. One of the first things that we felt we had to do was articulate to anybody that would listen to us what we were going to do and what we were not going to do. One of our first audiences for that story was the city staff. I had a briefing with the parks department staff prior to officially changing the name, and prior to taking on the mission officially, so that they would know it was our job to partner with them, it was our job to serve as resource for them, but that we weren't after their jobs. We wanted them to know that they could look to us as a resource. But we also wanted them to know that we're going to have to build this partnership slowly over time.

In terms of fund-raising, prior to going out and actually knocking on doors you really have to do your homework on what you're selling. It's important to identify a project that's saleable and that makes sense to the public. If the mayor had just said to us, "Go raise money for parks," I don't think I would have had much success. But when we articulated the need to create nurturing engaging environments at schools in the poorest communities of our city, that's something that we could sell, and that was a project that had immediate identifiable impact that we could articulate to the community. It's important that you're able to articulate clearly what it is you're going to do to be able to put a price tag on it. And also do your homework before you start selling so that you create that clear line between what the public's responsibility is and the private sector's responsibility is. What we are fund-raising for are services and products that wouldn't be here but for this new private partner. It's not a way of raising money for what should be basic city services. You need to be able to demonstrate that there is the appropriate public/private partnership in place and before you start fund-raising. Everybody asked about maintenance. Take care of those kinds of issues first. Get the necessary memorandums of understanding in place. We were working on the plans for our school ground project for probably a year before we started fund-raising for it, so that we had the hard questions answered. Unless you can tell people who's going to repair the slide when it breaks and whose responsibility it is to maintain things and how schools were selected, and what kind of processes were used—you really have to have all those ducks in a row before you can go out and start fund-raising.

Before we started doing this, when we were selling trees, we would raise \$140,000 annually for an annual fund. The basis of our work was contract work that we did for reforestation or other vacant lot programs for the city. When we tapped into this broader issue of parks and the impact that they have on a community, we were simply overwhelmed with the response that we got from community foundations, private foundations, families, corporations. What you don't realize until you have a private partner is the potential that is out there and that exists when someone is pounding the pavement full-time telling your story. Part of what we do is what the city doesn't have time to do. We demonstrate through the look of our marketing materials that this is a professional organization that is doing things well. We sell what makes people feel good and what people care about, as opposed to what potentially we're trying to do.

For example, when I first came to the organization, we used to have advertisements that talked about how trees create oxygen. That gets you like no money, because everybody wants oxygen, but they're not going to pay for it. Parks are for people equals money. I don't care how wonderful your tree is, there are not enough people who care about trees that are going to write you a big enough check unless you can see kids' faces. Part of what you need to do is in a parks department kind of get out of what you do and understand what people are willing to pay.

From a public perspective we position this as motherhood and apple pie. Yet with foundations we talk about economic impact and healthy safe communities. One of the things that we know is that there is no voice for urban parks, there is no resonance for the value that they bring. Until that time that there is, I say you fund economic impact. That's what I do. You fund youth services. That's what I do. I have 15 different tricks in my bag. It's all about parks. But we hardly ever talk about parks. We are selling kids, we are selling schools, we are selling neighborhoods that keep you living there once you have the option to move.

Positioning for what we do is really one of the key things that we do and that we're able to do and dedicate so much more time than the city could do. One of the true advantages for me in having been parks director is, I don't have storms that blow down trees. I don't have the drag of daily operations, which take me away from focusing on these very important things. That's really, from my perspective, the most significant benefit of a partner.

The mayor is great. He comes to all our events, he thanks our board, he surprises them at our annual meetings, he thanks them every way possible. I've heard from foundations that they have never gotten a thank you letter from a mayor before. They call me and ask me when will I please submit another proposal, because that means something to people. But there's a way that you can really connect the value and the prestige of the public sector with a private partner that works on a multitude of levels to create a campaign that addresses specific concerns. The bottom line is, you tell us what you need to do and we just get it done.

The last thing I would touch on is the political nature of what we do. It is so important for our funders to know that we are not a political organization, but it's so important for us to understand the political environment we work in. We have to be politically savvy. It's terrifically helpful to me that I worked for the city previously. I spend all kinds of time working with the city council to show these are projects for your neighborhood. We on our own have created relationships with this county and with the state and with federal departments. Because we know that we have to have the capacity to survive in the long term.

The reality for a partner is, you cannot be a political organization but you have to understand how to thrive in a political environment and be flexible and be savvy about who you're working with and how you're working with them.

Mayor Johnson: I'm a little confused why people in Cleveland believe that schools or the city should not be the primary providers of playgrounds.

Ann Zoller: When the mayor asked us to do this, he had just been given the authority to run the schools by the state legislature. The capital needs of the schools are so incredible that, books and roofs have to come first. While playgrounds are important, when you have roofs that are leaking, they can't be at the top of the list. I think we've been able to clearly articulate to private funders that this is important to the school district and the school district backs that up through their support. I work with members of city council so that approximately \$40,000 to \$50,000 of every \$230,000 project is provided by a member of city council through any number of funding sources they have available to them. The district takes on the responsibility for maintenance, provides additional in-kind services that have value. We're able to demonstrate that the district and the city are at the table, but we're also able to demonstrate that neither has the capacity to take on the significant capital initiative now.

The other issue is people in Cleveland are concerned about the schools and they want to help. This provides them a mechanism to do that. They can write a check to me and a project is up in six months and they can feel it and they can touch it and they can think: "I did something." Maybe because of where our school district is and people understand the very significant challenges that

we've had we have not really had too many people say to us, "This is the district's responsibility. We won't provide support."

Mayor Norquist: I think that school design for the last 50 years has basically been a disaster. Most of the schools look like truck warehouses, and then beyond that, on the playgrounds, the asphaltting of the playgrounds over the last 40, 50 years. It just seems there's a complete disconnect between the design of schools, playgrounds, and facilities around kids and what parents and kids would want. I just wondered—is it getting better?

Ann Zoller: They are. When we get to a school we engage in a community-based design process where we work with a team that includes the principal, the maintenance staff, students, teachers, a variety of teachers, parents, neighborhood groups. We can't change the look of the school facility, but we talk to them about what they want to see at their school. We encourage them to think about what they need at their school after school and on weekends. Every design that we do for a school is different. The learning gardens that we have are wonderful and our botanical garden is a great institution. We have these interactive places where kids design the gardens. There are raised beds, they change the plantings regularly. It varies based on the school. If we're at a school where it's all asphalt, we dig out a sea of the asphalt and we plant grass.

Mayor Norquist: We do the capital financing for all the playgrounds. The guys who do the playgrounds said, "Okay. We'll take some of the asphalt out." So they took some of the asphalt out and then they put in raised beds or berms that looked a corporate executive park. Don't go in and build berms. Just get rid of the asphalt and put some grass in and if the grass ends up having dandelions in it, that's good. Dandelions mean that the grass isn't poisoned. It seems like there's just some sort of overlay of bureaucracy and intransigence that just makes it really hard to change this whole thing.

Ann Zoller: That's where we are helpful because the city parks department, and I mean no offense to my friends in the parks department, would not do the community process the way we're doing it. I go to parent meetings till I'm blue in the face with three people in the room. We have incentives to do this because, on the other end of things I'm only going to be able to build as many projects as I can maintain. I sell future projects by taking them here.

We're working in neighborhoods that have 88 percent poverty. Our first school, there are 465 kids. Fewer than 20 percent came from two-parent homes. These are kids that are living in some pretty tough situations. We have not had one incident of vandalism, because this is something, it's a point of pride for this community, and these kids know that this is theirs. They would not feel that way if we had not worked with them from the beginning. I mean you see Bernie Kosar, the Browns quarterback, on these. We have these wonderful events that engage the community and it's the work that we could do that it would be almost impossible for a school district or a parks department to put that kind of time into it.

Mayor Johnson: Are most of your contributors from the city or are they not, and is this a guilt thing?

Ann Zoller: Most are not. It's interesting. When we started this we had a board of about 37 people. Probably three of them were city residents. It was a suburban board. Cleveland is a suburban city. One of the things the mayor said to us when we took on this strategic plan and changed the organization was he said, "I want one-third of your board membership to be from the city," and we said, "Okay." That we ought to do that.

So we restructured our board. And when we started this discussion some of my suburban, very well-intentioned corporate executives are saying things to me like, "Do the city parks need help?" And I said, "Let's get on a trolley." And we took them on a trolley and we showed them. And then they got it in a very personal way. When you take them to these schools and you showcase these kids and they meet these kids, what they see is what these kids do have and what they are. And that gets you more money than what they don't have.

We've been able to create such relationships with so many schools. I drag these kids to my board meetings. I have a member of my board retire; I've got three kids from a school giving them a speech and a watch. I mean, they understand that these kids are not to be pitied. That they are worthy of the investment. Then it goes from being guilt to this is a moral obligation that, you know, this is something our community must do.

Mayor Johnson: I've started to believe that people who are the recipients of service ought to be encouraged to support it. But there are people who believe that people who are poor don't have the means to support things. I think that is not true. I spent a quarter of my life working with the Urban League and I found out that when I began to almost require people to take some ownership, you know, not to take it as a gift, but to return to something, that they got more out of it, and they put more value on it. My question would be, when you're doing your marketing, do you accept a \$10 check or \$25 check from somebody?

Ann Zoller: Absolutely. I got an anonymous \$10,000 check last year and I get checks for \$5. At every school is we say, "You've got to raise some money." And I don't care if it's a pancake breakfast and you raise \$250. But you've got to raise some money. And there's a component where you have to help. And we always create a volunteer component. Whether it's the installation of the learning garden or painting a fence or creating a mural, there's always an activity that allows the neighborhood, the school, and the kids to be part of it. So that there's financial equity, and I don't care how much it is, and there's sweat equity.

We try to put an onus on the neighborhood so it's not a gift. We have these kids sign a playground pledge that they're going to take care of this. We think that it's a basic right that these kids ought to have the opportunity to grow up in these types of environments. But we put the responsibility on the school community and the neighborhood community to partner with us. We give small grants to development corporations to provide programming at these parks in the summertime so that there is institutional capacity in the immediate neighborhood to ensure the long-term success of these projects.

Paul Rookwood: Is all your work focused on children?

Ann Zoller: No. A lot of the work that we do is contract based. For example, we have a contract with the city. Those 20,000 vacant lots, we have a contract where we take 1,000 of those lots, we hire residents, they maintain that lot three times over the course of the summer, we pay them, it's a good thing. The CMHA Training Program is definitely not about kids. The participants are from 18 to their 50s. The CMHA Program is primarily funded through HUD. If I have a contract paying for something I don't have to market it as much. So I sell the playgrounds. That's the biggest thing that we're selling. That's what we're on the street with. That's really the focus of our materials.

KNOXVILLE – WORLD'S FAIR PARK

Mary Eysenbach: Mayor Ashe is going to talk to us about the World's Fair Park, which the City of Knoxville is developing in conjunction with their convention center project.

Mayor Ashe: Thank you. Good morning to everyone. Let me just say this project, where we're building our new convention center, is on the World's Fair Park, held 18 years ago in Knoxville. It was successful, with 11 million visitors. The World's Fair Park was a lasting legacy and a subject of debate ever since as to what the residual use should be. The Sunsphere has become an icon. What the Eiffel Tower is to Paris or Big Ben is to London. We had a contest for our bicentennial celebration nine years ago. Of the 600 drawings the school kids submitted, I'd say two-thirds of them had the Sunsphere in it. So it's clearly part of the landscape of Knoxville.

The World's Fair Park is located between the main campus of the University of Tennessee and downtown Knoxville. When we had the World's Fair, everybody thought they'd get rich and all sorts of new things open up downtown. The result was, people went to the World's Fair and didn't leave. They stayed on campus, on site. People were not going to the park and then leaving an hour early to wander around.

So part of the challenge to us with the convention center being located next to the icon of Knoxville, how do we then build around it activities that will generate additional business activities? We're spending \$160 million to build this. If nobody does anything except go to the meeting rooms, troop over to the hotel, spend the night, and go back to wherever they came from, then a lot of the rationale for having invested all this money, frankly, is lost.

Dick Bigler here is the project manager and is in charge of keeping it on schedule, under budget, and on time. Ron Watkins is one of the two partners in proposing a public/private development plan that would be involved in the downtown Knoxville area.

One of the challenges we had in building this was the park has become very popular as a park—outdoor concerts, a lot of community events. The challenge was, would all the green space be gone or would the park remain? So for the design of what we anticipate the park will look like after the convention center is built, there will be ample green space.

The World's Fair Park actually went into a gulch or a valley between downtown over here and the University of Tennessee. This would be a linkage down to the river. The river has quite a bit of

waterfront development. There's the women's boathouse, which just opened up with a restaurant on the top floor. There's a greenway and walkway all the way down. And it's a fairly attractive and popular area right now.

Twenty years ago when this was first conceived as a site for the World's Fair, it was just a dilapidated area with a creek running through it. It was a major urban renewal and renovation of that area.

One of our challenges is, what peripheral items do we need around the park?

The railroad track has about three trains a day.

The state amphitheater was one of the state's contributions to the World's Fair. They built an outdoor amphitheater with this cover. It's 18 years later and the cover is about to collapse on us, so it's not working as a roof's supposed to work.

Some of the issues that we're talking about—how do we take the convention center and integrate it into the pedestrian park atmosphere? What elements of the original fair 18 years ago need to be saved? And once people come to the convention center, what activities nearby do we have that, once they're through the meeting, lure them outdoors and into the broader community?

Dick Bigler: One of the things we did as a part of this also was to move an old substation that was here and put it over in a new place that's below grade. One of the issues it would be interesting to have comments on, is we have a proposal for a new tented structure that's somewhat akin to that, with seating for about 4,000 or 5,000 people under seating with a hillside here. The question we pondered a bit is whether we should take this icon down or not, if we're replacing it with a new structure, and use this space better for maybe reshaping this lake, which is pretty.

The water features here—in the original design of the park there was a lake down here. We pushed in on the old lake because of the structure we had built. We have in this design what we call a source fountain. The idea was it would flow down through here in through waterfalls. That's a future phase if we do this piece of it.

UT's building a 1,500-car garage, we're planning a 1,000-car garage, and then we are planning to take down a building, a Holiday Inn, and there's a 419-space garage there. So we're surrounded by parking.

We're widening this bridge by one lane to make a three lane. Across the bridge we have two seven-foot-wide sidewalks with an elevator and stairs down into the park, because it is in a valley. So that connects all of that up and provide access through.

Ron Watkins: We had 11 million people attend the World's Fair, but we couldn't get them into the downtown area. So, instead of trying to develop amenities that would support the convention center, adjacent and on top of the World's Fair Park, we worked to develop a way to get the

visitors to the convention center and to the World's Fair Park across a six-lane thoroughfare adjacent to the convention center, and bring them into the downtown area.

The only way we really could do that was to move the headquarters hotel on the opposite side of the street from the convention center. We took an old exhibition center and we developed a destination entertainment center plan there with Scripps Television, to offer studio participating programs for HGTV, the Food Network and Fine Living and Do It Yourself and others, which was designed to attract about 500,000 people per year.

And as Dick pointed out, the new amphitheater that we asked SMG to look into developing in conjunction with their management of the convention center on the south of the World's Fair Park, would also bring a number of people to the park. There's 5,500 covered seats and 3,000 festival seats. So with 100 events per year there, you can see that those two pieces begin to bring about a million people to the park combined with the conventioners.

On the north end of the park is a new conservatory. That is what we call at the moment the winter garden. We've done some work with Dale Trahouly on that in regards to getting him to work with us on the design of it, because of the glass elements. And we have our new art museum, about 12 years old, adjacent to the World's Fair Park. So it helped us develop a little mini-cultural district.

We selected the only route across this six-lane thoroughfare that didn't involve tearing down federal buildings or historical buildings that we simply could not destroy to get to the downtown area. The bridge across the six lane is designed as a 200-foot-wide building with a 35-foot walkway through the center, 80-foot retail on each side, so it'll seem like you're inside a retail mall or retail store.

At the north end of the Scripps Television is an area called the Cascades. That houses a series of different type of restaurants like Cheesecake Factory and some other supper club-type restaurants. A cineplex and Imax complex is designed to attract 750,000 trips to the downtown area. It's on top of a parking garage -- 724 cars. Adjacent to that is a new 36-story office tower and a 415-room Marriott Headquarters Hotel, and an upscale retail block.

Adjacent to that is 157 units of teletch housing. It's old, historical buildings, very small with a very large plaza, open space where you can dine outside. We'd like to fill that with bakeries and bagelries and coffee shops and jazz clubs and blues clubs and wine shops and etc.

Our real hook is to count on Scripps and the value of Scripps to be our national promotional vehicle for exposing us to the Scripps's 65 million households that HGTV reaches and the 48 million that the Food Network reaches. The strategy really is to get more people downtown, more people walking around and moving around downtown and hopefully spending their dollars, and giving the attendees at the convention center some alternate activities and things to do so that they can have a much more fun and a much more satisfying experience while they're visiting our city.

We also worked hard to establish some linkages with the University of Tennessee by reopening

this bridge that bisects the World's Fair Park, which has been closed since 1982. We created seven new walking linkages with the University of Tennessee. Our hope is that we can add some other elements such as a waterfront element down the road on the south end of this project and a teen and children's park to the north end of it.

On the SunSphere, we've proposed a \$2.5 million creation of a laser show that would occur about 160 evenings per year. That's designed to bring somewhere between 1,700 and 2,000 additional trips to the park in the evenings.

The overall objective was to make sure that we didn't take away any of the green space. There's still the question of how do we get the people from the convention center to the hotel. It's about a three and a half block walk. We're offering them a conditioned walk space along the HGTV studios with glass into the studios, so they can see into the studios as they walk across, that comes across a block and a half leading to the hotel. We have to have the other amenities such as the festival retail area downtown and the jazz and blues things in order to make it interesting enough for people to make that three block walk.

Mayor Ashe: Recognizing we're going to phase it in over a number of years, then which elements ought to come first? And the last one—what role does the river play? We already have a fair amount of waterfront development.

Dick Bigler: A decision was made a long time ago, before the World's Fair, to bury this creek that flows through the park, so actually there is Second Creek, which flows through the park in a boxed culvert that's 30 feet below grade. So this piece is actually the creek right here reemerging.

Grover Mouton: What I want to do here, I just want to give you a larger framework. The city is ringed with these sets of expressways and moving people out of town at a fierce rate. The riverfront has been reclaimed, and there is the interpretive center, which interprets the Smoky Mountains. The World's Fair Park is in a gully. These creeks are very important historically—particularly this creek—this is where the Trail of Tears began. There's a lot of historic connotation.

The urban design position here was to maintain this absolutely unbelievably beautiful view of the hills, the beginning of the Smokies.

The two issues here—the park floor plays a really big role. The perception of the park floor is very, very important to the citizens. I think you're being asked, because of constraints on the budget, to evaluate their plan and help them move forward as quickly as possible with the financial constraints and the design that they put together.

The critical piece here is how do you engage the rest of the town and this new development into this park here? There is an aggressive move to connect this into the downtown. They've chosen this northern point of connection, because the accessibility of open land and the development of land on this piece of the city.

Ron Watkins: I'm most interested personally in your feedback relative to your thoughts on how the winter garden or the conservatory will work at the north end of the park, how we can attract the people into the downtown district from the park; and also how the convention center and the destination entertainment center, the parking garage and so on, how you see that working through the park, because it brings a lot of traffic to the park.

Mary Eysenbach: Grover, we know about the adjacent development as an adjacent item to the park, but what are some of the other peripheral items for the downtown area that are going to help make that park successful? We know that linking to the existing riverfront is pretty critical in order to complete a loop. But are there some other probably more critical pieces that Knoxville needs to have in place in order to help make the park a success?

Grover Mouton: The perception is that this park is a people's park. This is a residue of the World's Fair, and this belongs to the people. The truth of the matter is, there are very few people that ever go in this park. So that's a very, very serious issue here. I've found that to be the most important sort of perception issue in terms of the entire project, that it's perceived as their park; however, no one uses it.

Then you ask why doesn't anyone use it? You have to remember that this is in this huge swale. It's surrounded by some very, very tough roadways, which they have had a terrible time connecting to the downtown. It really is a very isolated situation to the city. It's not as isolated to the university. Although the university does not engage in this facility at all, for a variety of reasons that I don't really quite understand. The topography of the university is much higher. They're very self-contained. And there's really nothing to bring the community into this area.

So the item that is really needed to make this work is to integrate the park into the city. In terms of the real connections to the river, you're cutting down a pathway that is so complicated in bridge connections and railroads and underground connection, and parking structures.

Mayor Johnson: I want to raise a point, Mayor. It goes back to something that Victor said. He raised the question about spending \$160 million and what would it achieve. Maybe we need to ask another level of questions. Where can we get the best bang for our buck in investing money in certain of our assets? What you're doing, people are trying to do in every city across the country, and will it really achieve the impact that we hope for?

Mayor Norquist: If you're trying to do a master planned development, big picture project, it probably won't be as successful unless it's coupled with smaller, fine-grained stuff. And if there's a place where smaller developers can build housing, the little, fine-grained stuff a lot of times that works faster than when we all get involved.

We're always going to want a convention center, but it's the other stuff that's more interesting and more fun. Like New Orleans—I don't think the Super Dome or the big convention center they have in New Orleans is the reason people go to New Orleans for the most part. They go there because of the beautiful city that was spontaneously created by its own people.

If you go to New York City, it's much more fun to walk on Lexington Avenue or Greenwich Village—there's all kinds of little interesting stuff that's unique to New York. And Knoxville isn't as big as New York, but there's got to be some stuff that's for the little places of the heart.

Mary Eysenbach: I'd like to go back to Mayor Johnson's question, how do we get the biggest bang for our buck? Since you do have limited financial resources, I think it would be helpful for us to look at the idea of prioritizing and phasing the project so that when you do go in and start building the park, what are the most important elements that you need in place?

Lee Springgate: I have observations about parks and convention centers. I haven't seen great examples of really good urban parks next to convention centers.

Linda Cox: In Seattle you can walk out the convention center and get great relief from the convention immediately from the open space.

Lee Springgate: It's fine to have the space. It's really nice for people attending the convention. My observation is that the vast majority of community members aren't going to come to experience that same thing the conventioners are looking for. So you've got an interesting issue here, where you're trying to bring the community into downtown Knoxville right to the north. You're trying to use this convention center as some sort of a magnet to do that.

And I'm wondering if you don't have two parallel issues at play here. You're trying to make your convention center work and trying to make the space around it work for the convention center. You've got this lake which isn't too far from a major river. And you've got the space to the left, which is an open space where you're talking about having outdoor performances. So it strikes me that the lake and the performance space seems to be designed to meet the needs of the conventioners. That's the one place that tends to be pretty popular. It strikes me that that should be one of your priorities for phasing.

I think the other priority for me would be to do something to that area to the north where you show that gathering space. I would hope that you do something that would be appealing and kind of a magnet for families and children in the Knoxville area to come down there. I don't know whether that's some kind of really creative interactive water play area or what it happens to be; but it needs to be something that tells the citizens of Knoxville this space is important for them. Maybe if they go there, they'll walk through that linkage you're talking about and get down to these other things by the convention center and vice-versa.

About phasing—virtually every park that we did over my career was phased. There was virtually nothing we did that wasn't phased. But about half of them worked. About half the time the ultimate master plan was achieved, and the other half it wasn't achieved. I was always trying to understand what it was that got us to the ultimate success. I think there is a shelf life. I definitely think when you go beyond about five years. If you don't get those next phases moving within five years of the first phase, it loses political steam and political support.

I think it's really compelling to find a way to do a first phase that can stand on its own, but at the

same time compels people to do the next phase. It's really tricky to achieve that. In our downtown park we wound up getting the private sector to build one half of our circle, one half of our lawn area, and theoretically it can stand on its own, but it told the whole world if you didn't get moving pretty quickly, you weren't going to and you had to complete this next phase. I would move quickly from one phase to the next. I wouldn't make it more than about three phases at the most. I wouldn't let any moss grow under your feet. Try and find something that stands alone but is simultaneously compelling. And I'd find some way in that first phase for this community to get involved in this project, not feel as though it's strictly a convention center park.

One more thing I don't see done enough on these sort of phasing projects is we don't develop a comprehensive financing plan concurrently with the physical phasing plan. Often you have opportunities to get money from various sources that are fairly clearly going to get you one part of that project done before another part. If you can pass on that opportunity, it may not be there for you again, or maybe some donors are ready to give you some money making certain public grants and private foundation money. We don't think comprehensively and strategically enough about matching funding sources up with the phasing sequence. That could very well be that you need to take in consideration the financing aspects along with those strategic political discussion and you'll get your answer in phasing.

Paul Rookwood: I was thinking about a similar story that I witnessed in San Diego. Prior to the convention center going in, in 1986 they built something called Horton Plaza, a retail destination. It had two or three anchor malls. It had a multiplex cinema. It had a 300-room hotel. The idea was that it would revitalize downtown.

When this project went in, it killed downtown, sucked all the energy out of downtown. Because all the retail energy that that city could support right now went inward and wasn't on the street.

What happened afterwards was really interesting. The Gaslamp Quarter, about 1988 or 1989, was dead. It was derelict streets, prostitution on the streets, there was drug dealing. It was really not an area that was particularly appealing.

Because it had terrific character, it had great streets, it had a real grid, this started to take off. This has now become the hot sort of tourist destination. It's a place where locals go as well as where tourists go. You've got about 50 or 60 individual retail businesses lining the streets and you've got loft living or apartment living above the shops. I think that Gaslamp partly took off because in putting the convention center here and putting this big retail mall in here, was sort of starting steps in what ultimately became a synergy of relationships between all of these.

The reason for telling this story is that when I look at this scheme, a lot of the energy in this it seems to me is kind of like Horton Plaza—it's sucking inward to make the development package work. If you really want to build downtown, the smaller businesses, the things that bring energy and life to the street and bring people to come there and visit, where is your Gaslamp quarter or something like that? And then part of the question that you seem to be asking is, can the park be part of that solution?

Mayor Norquist: What happens at the noon hour for lunch?

Mayor Ashe: They're not walking to the World's Fair Park. At noontime, no. It's not near an office building where people would—they'd have to walk four blocks or five to get there. And there's something else between there to stop at and that's where they stop.

Paul Rookwood: What I hoped you'd tell us is that this area was available for redevelopment. I'd get the university to bridge the park and sort of link it to downtown.

You asked how can we make the park more energetic? How can we make it alive? How can we bring people there? At the simplest level there are two answers to that. One is, is that the park in and of itself is sufficiently appealing and attractive and accessible that people go there. The other is that it has adjunct attractions—cafes, galleries, retail, you know, stuff going on, cinemas that bring people to it.

What this sort of made me think is that what you're doing is you're pulling most of that energy right now into this big development to make the development work. So you're not bringing that kind of adjunct activity right now into the park to make the park energetic. So maybe there's enough energy as a sort of second phase after this development takes off and hopefully is successful, is there enough energy for there to be a second wave of development that's more focused on a different kind of business. And if so, what do you do to plan for that and make that happen? How do you set up a structure where you can have smaller businesses coming in as a second phase and where do they go and how do they relate to the park? And then the second thing is, is there a way of making the park itself intrinsically an attractive destination?

One final thought, I wondered if there was a way that you could start thinking about this being the spine that gets, you know, a whole series of smaller businesses and cafes and retail and stuff that are more oriented to the street and related to the park, so that somehow they become part of the draw that brings people in and then fan out into the park from there.

Ron Watkins: At one time we considered this being sort of an interactive fountain, a Bellagio type of fountain. What would you think about something like that in the park assuming we could come up with the money to fund it?

Paul Rookwood: I think that having that sort of attractive features in the park can be part of what makes people go there. One fountain on its own might do it, might not.

Mayor Ashe: I guess my question is should we keep the amphitheater? I agree architecturally and aesthetically it's kind of an interesting little thing. If it is removed, then in the summertime if you have rain or something, then you no longer have a place in an outdoor arena. Now, presumably you can do it inside the convention center, but you lose the ambience of being "outside."

Grover Mouton: It takes up a tremendous amount of space. I mean, it modulates the ground floor. It defines the vocabulary of the park. It's right on top of the edge. It shrinks the water to such an extent, that I think it's questionable if the water will have the impact. Paul, is that what

you're talking about?

Paul Rookwood: I think that this space is too chopped up and too small to carry the program you have in it with conviction. It won't add strength to the space. I think this structure is very attractive, but I think it's probably in the wrong place for you to make what you're trying to make out of this. The other thing I was thinking about this spine here, I would think it would be nice if somehow you can step this down so it kind of engages the park. And you won't do that with that structure there either.

Is there a way you could bring a series of platforms down from this so you get the platform sort of viewing out to the hills beyond, and that's part of what happens that you tie this spine into the park better?

Mayor Ashe: The general consensus seems to be to remove this. Does anyone think this ought to stay? Well, we'll think about it.

Lee Springgate: If your objectives are to try and do something here for the larger community, you might want to consider having the water to the north and having it be a tremendous attraction for the community at large. You could have something a little bit more modest; more water features to look at, a very pleasant layout outside the convention center windows, and have the others to be real park element.

Paul Rookwood: There are lots of examples of really tiny parks, and I think that's a very good point that gets back to what we were talking about yesterday, the idea of coming up with sort of numbers or something like that that's going to tell you what your parks should be or how big your parks should be or, you know, I think is really wrong. You've got to look at the fabric of the city and see how the parks become part of the fabric of the city and work with that. The tiny, little quarter-block park may have a much bigger impact in some situations.

Mayor Norquist: But so much of it has to do with the surroundings of the, I mean, Rittenhouse Square [in Philadelphia], you've got, what, are there four or five parks that William Penn designed? The only one that really works to complete satisfaction is Rittenhouse Square, and it does not so much because of the park but there's an uninterrupted building line with windows all the way around the park. That's why you needed to line that park with windows.

Dick Bigler: Of course, we'd like input on that and about the phasing, but we're locked into a budget and a large project with many different features in it. Unfortunately, the last thing that gets built is the landscaping. Oftentimes you're robbing from Peter to pay Paul, and so you're forced into a phasing situation. I would like more discussion on how to accomplish everything you'd like to do. We've stayed on track as far as our budget. It's just that we have a lot of pieces, and so the question is how do you see us best able to accomplish the phasing of parks, which we're forced to consider?

Linda Cox: I'd like to offer one more suggestion on this phasing question. Some of the park groups that we've watched on this stuff do an awful lot of programming of activity ahead of being

able to make the physical improvements that they want. They were forced to that circumstance. They didn't have the money yet to do the improvements that they intended, so in order to get something going, they started by doing activities that would draw people into the space.

It turned out to have some unexpected benefits. It did start to create that feeling from people that this is a real park. It's okay they didn't necessarily have the land acquired and worked out. This is a real park. People really use it. There's more happening here than we thought. Let's come back. They got that which ultimately is what you want for a park.

It's more important to have people feeling that it's their park and they want to be there than really what it looks like. That helped them with the fund-raising and that certainly was a part of their strategy. This question of how can you be sure that people are going to carry this out over time helps a lot with that. Because if the public really is using and expecting it to be, ultimately folks will find the money to support what's needed for it.

The other sort of unexpected benefit is sometimes it steers you towards what kind of facilities you actually need. It could be relevant to things like the amphitheater because if you get using a space for concerts before you've got it fully developed as an ideal for concerts, you may change your ideas about what that physical concert structure really needs to be like.

For example, in Houston folks did it with environmental education. They had all these pavilions they wanted for environmental education and stuff like that, didn't have the money yet, brought in a trailer so they could just have the supplies they needed for environmental education stuff, dug a few holes to fill with water to fill with crawfish and insects that kids could start studying. They started doing the environmental education, and they had a huge program going before they ever just in this last year got the education pavilion built.

By the time they went to build that pavilion, their plans and ideas about what they really needed had been improved and formed by running it in the ground. That could have a lot of validity for this park where you have the entities that could start sponsoring activities there. I love hearing that maybe this could be a space for really considering food tastings from all the restaurants in Knoxville, or kite flying festivals, or art festivals, or things of that kind that you get people into them and it might help with that kind of phasing issue.

Christine Saum: It also develops public support for investing in these things when you get ready to build them.

Mayor Ashe: We don't have that many downtown residents, but what few we have they'll walk through the park in the early morning.

Mayor Norquist: What are you looking for in the future for downtown residents?

Mayor Ashe: We're attempting to build that up. Basically the downtown market are people without kids.

Mayor Norquist: Actually, kids like downtowns.

Paul Rookwood: What you described unfortunately is something that happens in project after project after project. The budget gets overrun and expands somewhat on the buildings and the landscape gets left behind when you say chop it out of the landscape.

The cost of the landscape is really a very small fraction of the building cost. It's usually a much smaller piece. And has a huge impact. If you think about the cities you go to, and the places that stick in your mind as being the quality that creates the experience for you, it's often as much about the quality of the street, the plaza, the park, the pocket park, as it is the individual buildings. It's a tremendous mistake that we make to go on sacrificing the exterior public spaces, which create civic amenity. Our civic spaces are not created by the buildings around them but by the quality of the spaces you're in.

Now the building creates part of that, obviously. But to chop it out—I think it's a shortsighted mistake that we go on making time after time. If you look at the great European cities that people love to go and visit, what's great about them is the quality of the public spaces. The buildings are there too. They're good buildings, but the quality of the public spaces makes them remarkable.

The other thing, know what you want to achieve in terms of quality and don't sacrifice it because you haven't got the budget right now. I'd find a way to phase it rather than sacrifice the quality. Don't cut out the quality paving and put in asphalt. Phase it or put in something temporarily, but put the quality in at the end of the day. It's absolutely vital.

In landscaping, putting the trees in early is a key thing, because when we plant trees, we tend to plant them small, and it takes them five or 10 years to get going.

Dick Bigler: What we planned for this park, the quality is very definitely there. The size of trees for instance are six-inch caliper. We knew going in that there were some pieces we would have to phase because we didn't own the property. We've budgeted anywhere to 20 to 30 percent of the value of the building, which is remarkable, we just don't have all that money.

Mayor Ashe: We want to build access into the park. I think the university's going to work with us on this.

Paul Rookwood: Somehow getting the university to be part of the life of this park or create the activity that, you know, makes it lively and vibrant and other people want to go there.

Mayor Norquist: How can it be world-class university on the scale of the Sorbonne, Oxford? Oxford wouldn't have a downtown that was all hollowed out. If Tennessee wants to be a world-class university, they need a world-class downtown right next to them that they're connected into.

GROVER MOUTON – PARK DESIGN

Grover Mouton: They've asked me to speak on urban design and park systems. I'm going to be

rather brief, but will give a kind of philosophical approach to the way urban designers tend to look at parks. The best way to do that is to take New Orleans and go through the system that we have and talk about some of the elements and sort of the fine incremental pieces that have arrived in this wonderful system. Not being an individual that has anything to do with parks other than an advocate, and a strong advocate, in that I am the founding member of our botanical garden.

I took it on because when I went to the botanical garden, there was an automobile in the pool, and I said, this is absurd, this is ridiculous, what's wrong with this place? The problem was is that our city park, no one could decide did the state own it or the city owned it. We did a master plan and I hired all the local people, and this process is going good.

I also chaired the National Trust [for Historic Preservation] garden restoration for Shadows-on-the-Teche, which is a fantastic facility in southwestern Louisiana where I grew up.

The city of New Orleans, our 19th century city, was at the time the capital city of America to a certain degree. All of the raw materials, which were allowing England to really create the industrial position, were really coming out of here. The city was really made up of agents making money on all the people working really hard up the river.

The town itself is surrounded by water. When the first people came, they thought the place was an island. The river swings around the city, which gives us this fantastic grid system. We have these integrating colliding grids, which even people from New Orleans—you can't find your way anywhere around this place, which I think is an amazing, wonderful way to live. It creates these wonderful historic neighborhoods that have these tremendous identities.

The park system that we have—and we're very fortunate to have—begins with our great, historic plan, which is just a traditional military plan. It was primarily a place for a show of military power. Today it is called Jackson Park, our great front door. It's a kind of urban park that everyone would like to have. It was in terrible jeopardy in the late 1960s. Everyone with any kind of money, power in town, wanted to put an expressway right here. It was called the second battle of New Orleans. It was stopped by a Republican judge.

The reason this works in its urban condition is it has all these extremely well-defined images. What I really love about this square is that these fantastic buildings were designed by a woman in Paris, the Baroness de Pontalba. The baroness was thinking of the Place Vendôme.

She put this facade on the cathedral so that she could get her development. She put this mansard roof on both these buildings. She was a clear, fantastic developer.

The two major parks are Audubon Park and City Park, where my botanical garden is, right there. Audubon Park, as many parks in this country, began with a different realm. This was a great exposition that New Orleans put on, which was a terrible disaster. It was in the days of the Victorian era, when the economy was beginning to boom. It was all about cotton and exporting.

The fairgrounds itself was a wonderful group of fantastic buildings; none of them exist today. All

the buildings that were on the site were meant to be temporary. They took all the materials and built Tulane. I mean, it's an amazing story.

Today it's a neighborhood park. It increases the value of the uptown region in a tremendous way. It was an old plantation. It's an adaptation of an Olmsted English park.

The reason I'm talking about this is to talk about the spirit of the American plan, and the way that these parks that relate very specifically to the context remain within the image. Many of the parks in the New Orleans park system were old plantations. Unfortunately, most of the parks in the cities that I've worked in, they are sort of afterthoughts. They were on the edges of the city.

Now I'm going to go into the cemeteries. We had this great cult of death. These were really unbelievable places of power and grandeur and still have a position in the community. There were architects that only designed tombs. They cost an absolute fortune and your fame and your reputation was embodied in your tomb. You can see the power in these places, which are really wonderful. We've got a cultural position. We don't keep people out [of the cemeteries].

I want to talk about one park, one urban park, that really works and stands out for—I think it's a model that everyone should look at—Bryant Park in New York. The reason it really works is that they had one of the best urban designers/landscape architects in this country work on this park. They let this individual really do what he needed to do. It is an amazing piece of design, and an amazing piece of urban design.

Mayor Norquist: Are you talking about William Whyte or somebody else?

Grover Mouton: No, I'm talking about Laurie Olin and a lot of his people. The point being, if you do have a very good designer, you really need to let him go ahead and design it and stick to it and support their ideas and make it work. This was something that everyone thought would never work, the public library and this park in the middle of Times Square. One of the reasons it really works is that they have put these kiosks in that actually bring all the people into the park. I like the park because it's a very formal design. It's very beautiful, very elegant. You can walk in it. You understand it immediately. There is none of the commotion or any of these sort of natural environments floating around you. You know exactly what's going on.

As a country, we're so young but we're very powerful. But we don't have a great deal here, we really don't.

What we do have, these remnants in the landscape, are clearly so important as to clues to parks and to urban design. One of the reasons that New Orleans works, the president of the bank, Morgan Whitney, wouldn't lend anybody any money. So we didn't have urban renewal. So I say Morgan Whitney saved the town, and the remnants of our wonderful historic past are unusually engaged in the landscape.

They're much easier to see in the landscape than they are in architecture. Architecture is very complicated. It has to solve a lot of problems, keeping people warm and cold and alive. A garden

and a park can be a place that you go to where you bring your own perceptions to the garden. Architecture you don't do that. In a garden and a park, you bring your life to that place.

When we did the Civil Rights Park for Mayor Arrington, I said, the most important thing will be what people bring to this park, and how they understand and come to terms with what happened in the city. So the parks and the urban parks are incredible remnants and pieces, and they're about the strongest basis is urban design today I think.

Linda Cox: I want to pick a little fight with you, Grover, about something you said about Bryant Park. I have to completely agree it's a great park, and one that there's a lot to learn from it. But I really think that it's not just an argument for getting a good designer and letting his head go where it goes. Mayor Norquist asked you, were you referring to William Whyte. Because the thoughts of William Whyte were really embedded deep in that park. There are a lot of people that preceded the designer in thinking about what—how to make that park work.

It was a failed public park. It was closed down because of lack of use and a little too much drug dealing going on. There was a whole sort of philosophy that went into the ideas of bringing more activity into that park, bringing food into that park through the food kiosks, creating greater visibility for the park from the street and better entry into the park for people, and having activity, activity, activity in that park. That park has so much programmed activity going on, whether it's Monday night's movies outdoors in the summertime, or concerts, or there's just so much that's programmed into that park.

That landscape designer could never have been able to do the sort of design that really works there if there hadn't also been an assurance that that design could be maintained. There's a huge maintenance budget in that park and that was achieved by really building in the funding structure for the park through an awful lot of collection of money from the surrounding property owners in a business district.

So I could never say that park really represents: "Take a good designer and let him go." There was so much framework within that was set up philosophically and then to say and what you do you can count on it existing in the future because of the maintenance and programming that's going to continue to go on in the park.

Grover Mouton: I completely agree. What I meant was, first of all, they didn't hire a bad designer. But you're absolutely right. Bryant Park is amazing.

Paul Rookwood: I think there's one other thing that really works well at that location—people can move their chairs around. I think that's an absolutely key thing. It's something that you find in Paris and London in the urban parks. Because what people do is they make their own spaces. And the argument against it in every city park is, oh, gee, they'll all get stolen. But if you're creating real urban parks, put seats out that people can move around. It makes a huge difference.

Grover Mouton: I do advocate that one tries to hire or engage themselves in the best design. You're absolutely right about the engagement of the community and the client and the

maintenance value.

CONCLUSION: AWARDS CEREMONY

Mary Eysenbach: We understand that it is a lot to ask you mayors to leave town for a couple of days to devote your time and energy to one subject. We happen to believe that the subject is worth that kind of time and energy and very much believe in the kinds of things that we talk about and that we accomplish here. But we know that there's a lot of demands on your energy. And we appreciate your taking the time.

We want to recognize you as Fellows of The City Parks Forum. And in addition to the poster that you saw Mayor Murphy receive on Thursday night, we would like to award you a plaque so that like the poster, you can point to it and tell all your constituents that you do indeed support urban parks. If we could first have, Mayor Ashe?

The plaque reads, "In recognition of leadership in promoting parks as an essential part of the urban environment, the Honorable Victor H. Ashe, Mayor of Knoxville, Tennessee, is hereby named a Fellow of The City Parks Forum.

Mayor Ashe: I hope you all think about doing a program on the issue of federal and state DOT's dealing with local government in terms of urban planning and being futuristic.

Mary Eysenbach: The Honorable John O. Norquist, Mayor of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is hereby named a Fellow of The City Parks Forum.

Mary Eysenbach: The Honorable William A. Johnson, Jr., Mayor of Rochester, New York, is here by named a Fellow of The City Parks Forum. Mayor.

Mayor Johnson: I was given a second chance to come to this meeting. I was invited to the Minneapolis forum. Thanks to Mary for persisting. I wanted to say one other thing. I have this new avocation as mayor going to see success stories of other things in other cities so we see what we can learn. I took a trip in March to Birmingham because I heard about the Civil Rights Museum there. I was absolutely astounded at what I saw. To come here and meet the architect of that project was a tremendous bonus for my attending. We're certainly going to follow through, try to do a monument to Frederick Douglass in Rochester. You've helped us make a great connection to a fine person who has a sense of humor.

Also, Victor Ashe and I have been active members of the Congress of Mayors and I've known and appreciated working with him. John Norquist and I have never really met. I've read his work and heard about his work. Not only that he's a serious urban planner but also a man with a great sense of humor.

Christine Saum: All the mayors here have participated in the Mayor's Institute, but I think it's really wonderful that the American Planning Association and the Lila Wallace Funds have made it

possible for this continuation of the work. On behalf of the Mayor's Institute and the U. S. Conference of Mayors, I would really like to thank you all for making this possible.

Mayor Ashe: I think most of us are willing to send letters as you all decide where to go from here. I'd be happy to outline some of the issues that exist for us, particularly as it relates to DOT.

Mayor Norquist: I think that's a great idea. I think, if you can do it, have one that focuses on transportation issue as a design problem related to parks.

Mary Eysenbach: Again, thank you. We would appreciate if you mayors would spread the word to your peers, let them know about our program. Have people get a hold of us and find out how to participate. We are very interested in spreading the gospel about urban parks.