



US General Services  
Administration

Public Buildings Service  
1800 F Street NW  
Washington DC 20405

tel: 202.501.1881  
fax: 202.208.2996

## GSA CENTER FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT

### GSA FEDERAL BUILDINGS: TOOLS FOR COMMUNITY INVESTMENT FORUM

May 12, 2000

8:25 a.m.

The Brookings Institution  
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

TAPE TRANSCRIPTION

## C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
GOALS FOR STRATEGY SESSION, NEW APPROACH FOR GSA	3
PRINCIPLES FOR LIVABLE COMMUNITIES	83
CASE EXAMPLES: HOW GSA BUSINESS PRACTICES FIT INTO THE PRINCIPLES FOR LIVABLE COMMUNITIES	135
BREAKOUT SESSIONS	158
WRAP-UP	188



## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MS. ALTMAN: Good morning, everyone. I am Hillary  
3 Altman. I have met most of you, and have even worked with  
4 some of you before. Hopefully, we will get to be working  
5 together, all of us, in the coming months. And I just want  
6 to welcome everyone today. I want to thank Brookings  
7 essentially. And Amy Lu, who is sitting right here, is  
8 deputy director of the Center on Urban and Metropolitan  
9 Policy. Bruce Katz is going to be joining us shortly.

10 I also want to thank some folks who are on my  
11 staff, who have been working really hard. Stephanie Henley  
12 is in the back of the room, our legislative advisor, and I  
13 guess note taker for the afternoon, a copious job. Ed Yiefer  
14 here is our policy director, and we will be hearing from him  
15 a little bit later. Frank Giblin is our deputy director. He  
16 works a lot all over the country coordinating our field  
17 projects and our efforts. We have many of our field officers  
18 here. Do you guys want to raise your hands. There are a  
19 couple more coming.

20 Regina Nally is from Chicago. I was about to say  
21 Region 5, but that probably does not mean anything to most of  
22 you. Janet Preisser from Denver. And Harold Abert from Fort



1 Worth. And Nancy Czapek from here in Washington is going to  
2 be joining us soon. But we are going to go around the table,  
3 and everybody is going to get to know each other. Laurie  
4 Stormer, who is a presidential management intern, is just  
5 about to finish up and come and join Frank. And also, Bruce,  
6 who is in the back of the room, you will not hear but you  
7 will see him all day long, because he is really behind the  
8 scenes making everything work today.

9 Most of you know who we are, I think. And what you  
10 may not know is that we have been the government's landlord  
11 in one form or another for I think over a hundred years. We  
12 began to build custom houses. And even though at the time,  
13 we did it sort of unknowingly, we did use our buildings for  
14 strategic purposes.

15 One of the oldest buildings in our inventory, I do  
16 not know how many of you have been out to Portland, Oregon,  
17 is the Pioneer Courthouse. And when it was built at the turn  
18 of the last century, it was built so far out of town, that  
19 the newspaper of the day said that it would take a pony  
20 express to get out there. And it sort of berated it for  
21 being so far outside of town. So little did we know it, but  
22 today it is at the center of the one of the most vital civic



1 squares, Pioneer Square, I think in the country.

2 So you want say that we attracted development by  
3 building there, or you might say that it just happened. But  
4 we like to think that we helped to direct it, in our sleep of  
5 course.

6 In Cleveland also, at the turn of the last century,  
7 our federal building like many federal buildings around the  
8 country, was a vital place of government and commerce,  
9 serving as a central meeting place and a place where there  
10 can be a farmers market, really anchoring and being a vital  
11 source and vital center, and representing government to the  
12 community.

13 And our in Cheyenne, Wyoming, at the same time, we  
14 built the first building of stone in that community, which at  
15 the time was just a little town built of wooden buildings.  
16 So it really said that the federal government is an anchor  
17 and a figure of permanence.

18 So basically, we have been urban developers for a  
19 very long time. Most of you are familiar with what followed.

20 As cities grew, we began to separate government from  
21 commerce and built office buildings, sometimes not very  
22 memorable ones. Some of you even came up to me this morning



1 and said I know of this really awful 1970s building. And we  
2 will talk about that at length today probably. But really,  
3 we just built buildings for awhile expecting that something  
4 would happen because we did that, and we found that was not  
5 always true.

6           So today, you probably know that we are building  
7 great courthouses again. We are actively putting our  
8 buildings where they can do something, and returning also to  
9 some traditions. And a couple of folks here today are going  
10 to talk about some of the projects that we have been working  
11 on, providing retail and restaurants whenever we can. And,  
12 of course, we are dealing a lot with security issues too, but  
13 we are really trying to balance that.

14           So today, we are the largest public real estate  
15 organization in the country. We house a million federal  
16 workers, and several agencies. And we have a \$5.5 billion  
17 dollar budget, and \$3 billion of that is lease payments. And  
18 our agency's mission, for those of you who do not know, is to  
19 provide great work environments for federal workers. So that  
20 is really our primary goal.

21           But in terms of authorities, it is important to  
22 understand that is different from lots of others. We collect



1 rents that fund our operations. So we do not give our  
2 grants, like our lucky friends at HUD and DOT do. People  
3 mistake that, of course. They come to us anyway.

4           We also have what I think is a unique challenge.  
5 As a government, we sort of have to practice our ABCs. We  
6 have A to serve of our customer agencies, B to manage our  
7 business on behalf of the taxpayers, and C to be good  
8 neighbors to communities. So we are always balancing these,  
9 and it is a balancing act, but it is something that we try  
10 very hard in every decision we make to make sure that we  
11 consider.

12           And also, certain authorities apply as we do that.

13 We do new construction, and leasing, and dispose of  
14 property. Lot of these authorities make good sense, but we  
15 actually have not revisited this in light of current trends  
16 and principles that guide our ability to have positive  
17 development impacts in communities in over 25 years, in fact  
18 since Bob Peck, our commissioner, drafted the Public  
19 Buildings Cooperative Use Act, which encouraged the federal  
20 government to open up its buildings and make them lively, and  
21 inviting, and promote mixed uses wherever we could.

22           So we know that today like any other developer that



1 it makes sense to invest in infill and urban locations, and  
2 particularly to create mixed use and live-work-play, and 24  
3 hour and walkable communities, all of these things that we  
4 are trying to do. We know that transportation alternatives  
5 are important. And that suburbs are alive, and in many ways  
6 viable choices too. And I think that we are going to talk a  
7 lot about that today.

8 Inner suburbs in particular are becoming more urban  
9 and mixed use pedestrian environments, and the aging ones in  
10 particular are facing some of the issues that inner cities  
11 are.

12 People are also starting to examine the effect that  
13 technology is having on space needs and growth patterns, and  
14 I hope that we at least address that a little bit today. I  
15 do not know how deeply we can get into that discussion, but  
16 it is a very important one.

17 So we want to reexamine ourselves in light of all  
18 of this, and also in light of our presence. We control over  
19 350 million square feet of space in 8000 buildings in more  
20 than 1600 cities around the country. And over 90 percent of  
21 our inventory is in urban areas, most of that, almost all of  
22 it in fact, is within urban centers. And we make about 3000



1 lease and location decisions affecting where and how we  
2 locate every year. And again, that is going to be a real  
3 point of discussion for us today.

4           In 60 cities around the country, we have over a  
5 million square feet of space each. To give you an example,  
6 here in the National Capital Region, I think that we are  
7 about 30 percent of the office market. And we are obviously  
8 unusually large here, but that is a tremendous presence.

9           So really, we cannot help but have a significant  
10 impact on urban vitality. And our presence is changing too,  
11 and I think that is very important, and it is another issue  
12 that we want to begin to get at today. For example, when  
13 Brookings put out a report, I do not know if you outside of  
14 this region have seen it, but it was on this region, and the  
15 state of growth in this region, I think Amy did a lot of that  
16 report, they mentioned that the federal government is really  
17 no longer the largest employer like we used to be in this  
18 region. In fact, we are now the largest customer.

19           And what has happened is while employment is down,  
20 we are now contracting, and I think it is an exponential  
21 number that is increasing, and the contracts are going to the  
22 suburbs. So I think that is a very interesting trend. You



1 know, it is not just about our buildings and our location  
2 decisions. It is also about our services, and how that is  
3 shifting things as well.

4           And one year ago, we established our GSA Center for  
5 Urban Development. And I think that I have been talking to  
6 all of you about that, and some of you have had the chance to  
7 work with us before. But really, to help change the way that  
8 the federal government does business. We look for  
9 opportunities to really take advantage of ways we can  
10 leverage our federal real estate options, in ways that will  
11 bolster community efforts, to encourage smart growth and  
12 community vitality and cultural vibrancy.

13           And the center helps GSA direct its real estate  
14 activities to spur local development efforts. We are really  
15 trying to be strategic about that. We offer a one stop shop  
16 for communities and federal agencies, and identify  
17 opportunities tied to federal projects where we can  
18 corroborate with communities, and really make the most of  
19 that investment, and also our ABCs.

20           So we are doing projects all over the country, and  
21 we really want to look critically at what is making sense and  
22 what is not, and what we really need to be doing, and also



1 how to build communities and not just buildings. And I think  
2 that is really important.

3 I also want to emphasize a dramatic new approach  
4 for us. And I will also be frank with all of you about the  
5 challenge that we face. And it is really exciting that we  
6 are all here today to really begin to look at that.

7 For a couple of minutes, I want to ask Paul  
8 Chistolini, who is our deputy commissioner, to say a few  
9 opening remarks, and help us set the stage a little bit this  
10 morning. Bob Peck, who is our commissioner, is going to be  
11 joining us in about ten minutes. And I believe that Bruce  
12 Katz is also on his way. And then I would like to go around  
13 the room and have us sort of introduce ourselves, so we know  
14 sort of what we are bringing to the table and who is here.  
15 We have a good mix of our GSA leadership with all of you,  
16 with particular expertise from around the country. So let's  
17 turn it over for a couple of minutes to Paul Chistolini.

18 MR. CHISTOLINI: Thank you, Hillary. Hillary asked  
19 me to say a few words, mostly because I have been with the  
20 agency for a long time, and I have seen a lot of trends. And  
21 I think I have a sense of where things are going as it  
22 pertains to the federal government, because I have a lot of



1 interaction with other agencies. I think that the future is  
2 just filled with opportunities for us to do more and better  
3 work with the communities.

4           Every morning I get up and look in the mirror, and  
5 I think well I am still part of that group called the Baby  
6 Boomers. And we have had and we will probably continue to  
7 have a big influence on the way that the federal government  
8 reacts in the future. And let me give you an example. Most  
9 Baby Boomers live in the suburbs. As people tend to retire,  
10 the agencies that serve them have to think about locational  
11 issues. Now that is impacted a great deal by technology, and  
12 public transportation issues, and what have you.

13           One of the real challenges that our people find is  
14 that in meeting those agencies that deal with the public,  
15 particularly the Social Security Administration, and the  
16 Internal Revenue Service, they have to think about where is  
17 that population located and where can we best locate  
18 ourselves to meet their challenges.

19           So you get into a natural conflict of putting  
20 offices in real downtown locations compared to where the  
21 people live. And that is where I think technology is going  
22 to play a role in the future, which hopefully will allow



1 people access through kiosks, malls, and shopping centers, or  
2 different public locations where people can provide the kind  
3 of information and get the kind of information that will  
4 allow them to get the services that they need.

5           And in that regard, GSA is serving more and more as  
6 the conduit for the information between the agencies that we  
7 serve and the communities. I think that if you talk to our  
8 regional coordinators and our regional staffs, they are  
9 probably having more conversations with communities than they  
10 have ever had. And it is just not about locational issues,  
11 but it is about a wide range of issues of how the federal  
12 government can be more interfaced with what the local  
13 community is planning to do both in the short term and in the  
14 long term.

15           Hillary mentioned that one of the big programs that  
16 we have going on is the construction of new courthouses.  
17 Well, new courthouses present two wonderful opportunities.  
18 One, where do you site them in order to help communities meet  
19 some goals. And secondly, what do you do with the old  
20 facilities. And I will give you a couple of examples.

21           A couple of years ago, I was down in Albuquerque,  
22 and we were putting in a new courthouse. And I was talking



1 to the mayor. And he said, "Well, you guys worked on this  
2 wonderfully, you put the courthouse right where we wanted it,  
3 about five blocks from where the fringe of the city was and  
4 in the direction that we were expanding. Little did we know  
5 that in the two and a half years that it took you to build  
6 that building, the rest of the community would fill in those  
7 five blocks." So that really worked well.

8 On the other side, what do you do with some of the  
9 older buildings that you move out of. We have got a couple  
10 of wonderful successes, and I hope that some sub-group of  
11 this larger group here can talk about how to make more  
12 successes in the future.

13 In Fort Myers, Florida, we moved out of an old  
14 courthouse, and the old courthouse became a community  
15 educational center. In St. Louis in the old courthouse  
16 there, it became a courthouse for the local community,  
17 thereby saving them millions of dollars being located right  
18 downtown, not changing any patterns for attorneys. We know  
19 how hard it is to retrain attorneys. Another one is  
20 Lafayette, Louisiana. Another group example of how our  
21 ability to dispose of a building to the community saved them  
22 a great deal of money.



1           So as we do more of these projects in the future, I  
2 see more opportunities. But it is not just limited to  
3 buildings. Other agencies are disposing of properties, many  
4 of whom are in the suburbs. We now have about ten projects  
5 across the country where the Department of Defense is working  
6 with us to dispose of industrial operations. Some of them  
7 were World War II ammunition plants, and some were plants  
8 where specialized equipment was manufactured.

9           These locations are at a minimum 5000 acres and at  
10 a maximum 10,000 acres. And the community sees these as  
11 wonderful opportunities for park lands and other types of  
12 development. And so we expect more of those in the future.  
13 So an opportunity to have communities understand better how  
14 they can work with us earlier and do better planning, and  
15 address all of the potential environmental issues at an  
16 earlier stage, and brings these things to a much more quicker  
17 and successful resolution.

18           In fact, today we have a team of people down in  
19 Chattanooga, Tennessee that are working on how to use a 8000  
20 acre facility just outside of the city as a future park land.

21

22           We have also done a number of joint projects and I



1 guess we are doing more about how to fix up internal spaces  
2 or external spaces in plazas around our buildings. My  
3 friends in Philadelphia were very instrumental in creating  
4 the first contract where a city and the federal government  
5 were able to jointly contract for common services such as  
6 street cleaning, security, and landscaping services. And  
7 since that was done in about 1992, we have several dozen of  
8 those contracts around the country.

9           So it is a good way to share an opportunity and to  
10 leverage the buying power of two public entities to get more,  
11 and present different types of opportunities for people who  
12 provide those services in the local community.

13           Philadelphia has become very successful. And other  
14 communities, we have partnered with them. Even here in the  
15 District of Columbia, we encouraged the concept of having  
16 people in uniform cleaning up certain parts of the city  
17 giving a very positive image. I know that when I first went  
18 to Philadelphia, I looked at these people with these little  
19 uniforms cleaning up, and came to appreciate the fact that  
20 every corner was clean. And every block, someone was  
21 responsible for it. It brought back some of the stories that  
22 I read about Mayor Daley and how he assigned responsibility



1 block by block. And if trash was not picked up in one block,  
2 they knew exactly what happened. So that part of  
3 responsibility and accountability works for both of us.

4 To sort of wrap this up, I see a couple of  
5 wonderful opportunities, of properties that we are going to  
6 build, the siting, and how that can help communities. And  
7 the properties that we are going to be disposing of, and how  
8 that can also help communities. And the challenges of siting  
9 agencies closer to their customers in the future, those  
10 issues have to do with access to public transportation,  
11 parking issues, and just the general impact on the community.

12  
13 So I expect that we will be having much larger and  
14 longer dialogues with all of the communities. And I hope  
15 that Hillary's group, and I am sure they will, will serve as  
16 a good forum for the exchange of those ideas and the  
17 resolution of those problems. Thank you.

18 MS. ALTMAN: Perfect timing. Thank you, Paul.

19 Bob Peck, our commissioner, has just joined us. I  
20 am sure he is ready to sit down and make a few remarks.

21 MR. PECK: I am.

22 MS. ALTMAN: Great.



1 MR. PECK: Shall I start?

2 MS. ALTMAN: Sure.

3 MR. PECK: First of all, I want to congratulate  
4 Harriet, because I did not have a chance to do it in any  
5 other way. I would like to reflect a little bit, and I go  
6 back a ways, on GSA buildings. I got interested in  
7 architecture when I was in law school in New Haven,  
8 Connecticut, which as many of you recall, was one of the  
9 places that was without disparaging anyone's intent most  
10 victimized by urban renewal. So it was a good place to get  
11 interested in urban issues. And the deal that I had to cut  
12 with the law school to study architectural history was to  
13 write something that had to do with government. So I wound  
14 up writing about government buildings.

15 And unfortunately, at about the same time that I  
16 was doing this or a couple of years afterwards when I was  
17 teaching a course at Yale, the government built a new federal  
18 office building, still one of the most inhospitable buildings  
19 in our inventory. So it said a lot unfortunately in a  
20 negative way about how federal buildings could be.

21 But here is the good news. Across the New Haven  
22 green was one of the really wonderful federal courthouses in



1 the GSA inventory, and a place that people in New Haven still  
2 refer to with a great deal of respect.

3           Even in legal terms. I will quickly take this to  
4 the urban context. Even in legal terms. If you went to the  
5 local courthouse in New Haven, you did not gain much respect  
6 for our rule or law or system of justice. In fact, when I  
7 worked for Legal Aid, we had a witness who was conked on the  
8 head by a piece of falling plaster in the courtroom. And  
9 everyone assured me when I was a law student that if you went  
10 across the green to the federal courthouse, you would once  
11 again regain some respect for the legal system. And indeed,  
12 it was true.

13           So in the sense of what does it mean to people  
14 about their government to have a building that is sort of  
15 mean and foreboding as opposed to one that is sort of  
16 welcoming, as the historical courthouse in New Haven has with  
17 grand steps and a columnade, and all of that. Not that you  
18 need that style to do it, but it said something about the way  
19 that we used to site our federal buildings and the role that  
20 they used to play in a city.

21           The Jimo Building, as it is called in New Haven, is  
22 even in the wrong location. It helped cut off a street. It



1 is on a back street with an entrance that is so hard to find,  
2 that when I visited it last spring that I watched a poor guy  
3 who had broken his leg on crutches try to find the front door  
4 of the building, and he could not find it. It was not good.

5 So what can we do. Fortunately, I got to work at  
6 the National Endowment for the Arts at some point in the  
7 1970s. And our task, impossible as it might have seemed at  
8 the time, was to try to bring some style and good design to  
9 the federal government. One of the things that we realized  
10 quickly on this little project was it was not so much about  
11 architectural design. It really was about opening federal  
12 buildings up to their communities. So we helped promote  
13 legislation which passed called the Public Buildings  
14 Cooperative Use Act, and it is still on the books.

15 So here is my plea. When I got the job of being  
16 commissioner of the public building service four and a half  
17 years ago, I had a dream that we would actually bring the  
18 Cooperative Use Act out of mothballs so to speak and really  
19 put it to use. It encourages the federal government to take  
20 the ground floor pedestrian access levels, and rooftops, and  
21 balconies of federal buildings, and turn them over to civic  
22 uses, commercial uses, cultural uses, anything that would



1 sort of bring our buildings into the life of the cities, in  
2 which almost all of them sit.

3           And we have had some success. The reason that we  
4 have a Center for Urban Development and Livability in fact is  
5 to use the Cooperative Use Act authorities and other things  
6 like that that we have to work with cities to make our  
7 buildings catalysts, to make them not just being built, but  
8 actually participating in the life of the city.

9           I want to tell you why I have been a little  
10 frustrated. Unfortunately, I am just going to throw in  
11 another intractable issue on the table. And that is that a  
12 tremendous amount of the energy that we have spent designing  
13 and managing our buildings in the last several years has  
14 dealt with an understandable, legitimate, but overwhelming  
15 concern about security.

16           So just at the point when at least all of us in  
17 this room, I hear that this meeting will once again be one of  
18 those meetings where we have the entire choir in one room  
19 preaching at each other, one of things that worries me is  
20 that this prerogative is overwhelming almost everything else  
21 we do.

22           I have talked about it. Senator Moynihan and



1 Justice Breyer have both talked about the need not to let  
2 this so overtake us that our public buildings become  
3 fortresses, that we create a little fortress America in every  
4 city. And so that is something that we are also going to  
5 need to deal with realistically. There is a fear about.  
6 Just ironically as I think the fear about crime is subsiding  
7 or will subside as soon as public perceptions catch up to the  
8 crime statistics, just as the cities start to come back, I do  
9 worry that we will have this other reason for our public  
10 buildings not to participate in the lives of the cities.

11 In any event, I throw that out to you. I am trying  
12 quite honestly everywhere I go to build a constituency for a  
13 counterbalancing force. Because you quite honestly can do  
14 security, building Jersey barriers in places where nobody  
15 goes, as all of you know, is actually not a very good way to  
16 build security. It simply is paint a target on your  
17 building, and we really do not need to do that. So I am  
18 hoping that you will be able to talk about that.

19 We obviously have some great examples of things  
20 going on. A lot of the projects that our Center for Urban  
21 Development have started to do with public buildings start to  
22 show what you can do to bring cities and the government



1 together.

2 One other story that I will just tell you, which I  
3 hope you will think about a lot, and help us think about.

4 From way back when I started thinking about this and when I  
5 had the job overseeing the public building service, I have  
6 had the occasion to be approached by city officials and  
7 members of Congress who wanted a federal building in their  
8 midst, which is great. And it creates construction jobs and  
9 helps keep jobs downtown, and that is great.

10 And as we will talk about, there is a history going  
11 back all the way to the founding of the District of Columbia  
12 of federal site locations being political decisions and done  
13 for certain reasons. The location of this city to help  
14 balance off an agreement that the southern states would help  
15 pay off the northern states' debts, so the capital had to  
16 move south.

17 Buildings in cities, we can show it going back to  
18 the early nineteenth century, being locations in places where  
19 the city leaders wanted us to build, so they would stimulate  
20 development. That turns out not to be such a new thing.

21 But what I have always worried about is you can  
22 plunk a federal building down. And if it does not really



1 open itself up to the city, it may in the long run not be a  
2 net benefit. You only have to go here to the Federal  
3 Triangle, which was touted in the 1920s as a great way to  
4 clean up this tawdry area of Washington, which everyone will  
5 tell you if you read the conventional books about it was the  
6 red light district and all. What they do not tell you is  
7 that there was a general farmers market in China Town, a very  
8 vibrant area of the city, which got blown away and replaced  
9 by buildings that close up at 5:00 for most employees and  
10 certainly do not open at all on the weekends.

11 So not always. Sometimes I have said to people be  
12 careful what you wish. We will build you a building, and we  
13 will take it off the tax rolls. Our people will show up in  
14 the morning, and leave at night just like anybody else.

15 So we need to make sure that when we invest all of  
16 these public dollars that we do in a new courthouse and a  
17 federal office building, that it actually helps do what we  
18 are hoping it will do, which is to be an economic boom to the  
19 city and a boost to life in the city.

20 So I am interested to hear what you all have to  
21 say. We have these discussions interminably inside GSA, and  
22 we have them intermittently with people who only see us one



1 at a time. I think that is one of the important things to  
2 note. Just as every time we do a courthouse, we are a little  
3 frustrated because each judge who works on a courthouse  
4 usually does it once in his or her lifetime. And we have to  
5 teach them the construction business and the architectural  
6 design business all over again. They are wonderful clients  
7 in lots of ways.

8 But the same with cities. You usually only get a  
9 new federal buildings once in a generation. So we see a lot  
10 of trends across cities. And I think that this is a great  
11 opportunity for us to sort of show what we have, which is  
12 beginning to be something that looks like a database of  
13 experiences. But also to hear from people in cities across  
14 the country and people from other federal agencies, who have  
15 a different perspective and see other kinds of construction,  
16 and other types of economic development, you know, insights  
17 that you can bring to us. Thank you.

18 MS. ALTMAN: Thanks, Bob. And thanks, Paul.

19 I usually go around the country and say we are the  
20 federal government and we are here to help you, and I get  
21 some laughs. But really, we are hoping that all of you today  
22 can help us. And I just want to say thanks again for being



1 here and participating with us. And even if we are the  
2 choir, at least we all get to sing together.

3 This strategy session today is our first chance to  
4 really have an out of the box dialogue about what is possible  
5 with our new approach to doing business with cities through  
6 the work that our center has been doing. So what we want to  
7 do today is gather enough ideas to develop a framework. And  
8 we are going to put a report out at the end of the year on  
9 this, that will help us to identify some of the changes we  
10 can make as we review our policies and practices, in order to  
11 better support livable communities.

12 I am also hoping that we can candidly share and  
13 discuss our activities using some of the GSA project  
14 examples. And you all got the notebooks ahead of time, and  
15 we gave them to you again when you got in the door, so you  
16 would have something to do when we were all talking. But  
17 there is some good background in there, and we can talk about  
18 some of those cases.

19 I think that we also all bring to the table both  
20 inside and outside government personal experiences and  
21 projects that we know about. And I hope that is all part of  
22 the discussion today as we walk through the day. But really



1 to look handily and talk about this, so we can identify which  
2 activities support, and also those that hinder our ability to  
3 create livable communities.

4           Some of the examples that Paul and Bob gave, I  
5 think, really hit home, and really get us thinking about the  
6 kinds of things that can have a positive impact, and the  
7 kinds of things that have a negative impact.

8           Let me just quickly run through the day. There are  
9 a couple of changes to the agenda. We are going to have the  
10 introductions go until 9:30, so we can go around the room.  
11 We have so many terrific people here, that I want to make  
12 sure that everybody gets a chance to say hello and have a  
13 sound bite this morning.

14           From about 9:30 to 10:30, we are going to review  
15 the principles for livable communities, and we did send  
16 those out to you earlier this week, and introduce and discuss  
17 some of our business practices, those mysterious things that  
18 we never sort of share comprehensively. And then really  
19 begin to identify in that discussion how they can fit into  
20 the livable communities principle, so how does that match.

21           We are going to take a break at 10:30 for fifteen  
22 minutes. And then from 10:45 to 12:15, we are going to talk



1 about and relate some of the GSA cases to the livable  
2 communities principles in order to get a sense of how our  
3 activities really support or impede our ability to achieve  
4 them. And particularly, at that time, to draw out some key  
5 issues. And we are going to be putting those up on the  
6 screen, so we can really begin to get a sense of what is  
7 coming out of some of the most important things. I think  
8 that we probably all have the same kind of list in our minds  
9 already that we have brought to the table.

10 At about 11:30, we are going to telelink to  
11 California, where the Congress for the New Urbanisms, some of  
12 them members, are going to join us. They actually have been  
13 partners with us for the past six or seven months, along with  
14 some other groups that we are going to talk about today. But  
15 they have really been helping us with some project  
16 assistance, and also to begin to review our authorities in  
17 light of some of the current trends. So Shelly Poticha,  
18 their executive director, will be on line with us with some  
19 other folks.

20 Also, we have an economist joining us from a firm  
21 called Strategic Economics, a Ms. Dena Belzer, out at  
22 Berkeley. And she is going to talk about a project that the



1 City of Oakland, California had asked her to do an analysis  
2 of, and that was our Oakland Federal Building. And she has  
3 got this great sort of GIS presentation, which looks at sort  
4 of all of the market issues and where and how we made the  
5 decision we did to put the building there, and the city's  
6 involvement in that, and the actual development that  
7 resulted. So that would be a way to kick that off.

8 We will also be talking about some specific  
9 projects. We have Fernando Costa, who is the planning  
10 director from Fort Worth, with us today. And we are going to  
11 be talking about that project. Susan Barnes-Gelt is a Denver  
12 City councilwoman, and she is going to be talking about our  
13 project there a little bit, to help generate the dialogue.  
14 We have lots of other projects that we are going to want to  
15 talk about too.

16 I will sum up the key issues from the group, and we  
17 will break at 12:15. The lunch downstairs is from 12:30 to  
18 2:00 with Phil Angelides, who is the California state  
19 treasurer. So that promises to be a very interesting and  
20 really coincidental opportunity for all of us.

21 We are going to come back this afternoon from 2:00  
22 to 3:00. And Ed Jiefer is going to lead our breakout



1 discussions. The breakouts will reports back to the group  
2 about 2:30, and then we will regroup again from 3:00 to 4:00  
3 to do a wrap-up, hear comments from the group, and some  
4 closing remarks from folks, and talk about our next step.

5           As Bruce has not joined us yet, I am going to begin  
6 to go around the room. I would like to sort of hear from all  
7 of you, just have you introduce yourselves, and take about a  
8 minute. If you need thirty seconds, take thirty seconds. If  
9 you need two minutes, take two minutes. I do want to try to  
10 keep it moving.

11           Just a couple of things before I do that. I think  
12 you all have the notebooks, and should have looked through  
13 them. So you are either very confused, or you completely  
14 understand everything we do. I know people are coming and  
15 going throughout the morning and afternoon, and feel free to  
16 do that, just get up and go. I am sorry we could not get  
17 everyone around the table here, but there is water on the  
18 table. I have told that these mikes are all wired. So if  
19 you put papers on them or if you tap them with your pen, we  
20 are all going to hear you do that.

21           We are also trying to record this, because we are  
22 going to do a transcript from today to help us with our



1 report. So if you could speak up. And if you are not along  
2 the tables, I will try to repeat your comments, so we can  
3 capture all of that.

4 So I think that is it on the logistics. But why  
5 don't we just sort of start going around the room. Amy, why  
6 don't we start with you.

7 MS. LIU: My name is Amy Liu, and I am the  
8 assistant director for the Center of Urban and Metropolitan  
9 Policy here at the Brookings Institution. We are definitely  
10 very happy to host this meeting today.

11 We are a center that was started just about over  
12 three years ago to really take the best of research and the  
13 best of practical experience to come up with a new policy  
14 agenda for cities in metropolitan areas. So the things that  
15 we are focusing on range from regional growth and  
16 metropolitanism to central city competitiveness to dealing  
17 with neighborhood poverty and the growing numbers of working  
18 poor in this country plus welfare reform.

19 So we really care about places. I think that the  
20 only thing that I want to leave in terms of the purpose of  
21 this gathering here today is that we have really taken a look  
22 at a lot of the trends that are taking place in metropolitan



1 areas around the country, and I really want to stress the  
2 fact that cities are diverse.

3           The 1990s may have been a really strong economy,  
4 but cities have experienced growth in very, very different  
5 ways. In terms of population growth between 1980 and 1998,  
6 even though some cities have really experienced a surge in  
7 their central city and downtown areas, that population growth  
8 really continues to out pace the growth of central cities.

9           That also applies to job growth and private sector  
10 job growth. We took a look at job growth in almost a hundred  
11 metropolitan areas around the country between 1993 and 1996,  
12 which is when the economy was really steady and strong, and  
13 found that for the most part that cities basically broke down  
14 into three categories.

15           There were cities that had lost jobs while their  
16 suburbs gained. These are places like Pittsburgh,  
17 Cincinnati, Salt Lake. And Dayton, Ohio. And Providence,  
18 Rhode Island. There were cities that actually gained jobs,  
19 but their suburbs gained them faster. And these were places,  
20 a lot of them on the West Coast. Austin. Boise, Idaho.  
21 Atlanta, and so forth. There were very few cities where the  
22 central cities actually out paced the suburbs in growth.



1           So again, I think that cities are very diverse.  
2   And as GSA and others think about the role as real estate  
3   agents and anchors for redevelopment, they really need to  
4   understand the diversity in the market dynamics of these  
5   places. So I would just leave that thought with you.

6           MS. WACHTER: I am Susan Wachter, assistant  
7   secretary of policy and development and research at HUD. And  
8   the data that Amy just spoke to you about is correct, I can  
9   tell you, since it is our data. And unfortunately, I will  
10   not be able to be with you all day, because we are now in the  
11   midst of doing our next state of the cities, my second state  
12   of the cities. And it is due out in two weeks, and the  
13   president will be delivering it in three weeks. It would  
14   have been wonderful if we had done all of this a year ago.  
15   But it is the current state of the cities, and there is  
16   actually a lot of data that is coming out as of today.

17           It is on the Web, so it is available to all of you.  
18   This data will be updated in a few weeks with current data.  
19   And that will be on the Web as well, as well as hard copies.

20           But let me step back and let me tell you HUD's  
21   interest in this overall issue and my perspective. We are  
22   the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In some



1 ways, we are on the crux of both issues. We are a department  
2 of concern. And part of our department is housing  
3 affordability. Our concerns are also urban development. And  
4 sometimes often, those two goals conflict. But we believe  
5 that good planning, good design, and good partnerships can  
6 actually achieve both affordable housing and urban  
7 redevelopment. But it involves partnerships, and it involves  
8 private sector and public partnerships as well as alliances  
9 across the board.

10 We also believe and I personally believe that we  
11 are at the very beginnings of these issues of how to  
12 redevelop our center in ways that will provide affordable  
13 housing, but also that will revitalize the center, and offer  
14 alternatives to living in this country to what seems to be  
15 the inevitable sprawl.

16 I want to stop a moment and tell you that one of  
17 our programs, which is both very exciting to us and also very  
18 limited to give you a sense of how far we have had to go, one  
19 of our programs is called One Million Homes. It was  
20 initiated by Vice President Gore. And it is a cooperative  
21 program between the National Association of Homebuilders, the  
22 Conference of Mayors, HUD, and we have also brought in the



1 ULI, the Urban Land Institute, to work with us on this as  
2 well. And we thank Bill for his efforts in working on this.

3           This effort is to increase our production of homes,  
4 multi-family and single family, in the centers of cities by  
5 100,000 a year over the next ten years, 100,000 a year for  
6 ten years is a million homes additional to what we are  
7 already planning. That is an extraordinary number. It would  
8 increase by 50 percent the number of revitalized homes. By  
9 new homes, we do not mean new building. We mean  
10 rehabilitation, as well as new.

11           If we succeed at this, and it will be extraordinary  
12 if we do succeed, we will have one million new homes in ten  
13 years. That will be terrific. That will be one million our  
14 of fifteen million new homes that we need over the next ten  
15 years, one out of fifteen.

16           If we turn to what is happening in Europe, in the  
17 UK. In the UK, there has just been a nationwide agreement to  
18 build over the next years 60 percent of the needed new  
19 additional homes in cities. That is to revitalize and  
20 rehabilitate as opposed to sprawl out, 60 percent. So we are  
21 far from where we ought to be I believe in this country. But  
22 it requires cooperation, and it requires local transformation



1 in terms of leveling the playing field, building in versus  
2 building out. It requires the federal government to get its  
3 act together with regions as well as cities.

4 I believe that we have the transformation  
5 possibility here due to the work, the tremendous work of the  
6 people around the table. We are cheering at HUD. We are  
7 hoping that this all will succeed, and that we can get this  
8 happening. We think that the win-win solution to sprawl is  
9 revitalization essentially.

10 MR. FULLER: My name is Steve Fuller, and I am a  
11 professor of public policy at George Mason University. When  
12 I received an invitation to participate in this session, I  
13 was excited that when you live long enough that things kind  
14 of cycle back. And it reminded me that in 1971 that I was  
15 retained by GSA, by the then commissioner of public building  
16 services, Arthur Sampson.

17 What was interesting at this time, I was just a  
18 young professor, at George Washington University in the urban  
19 planning department, is Art said to me, "You know, I think in  
20 public buildings that we can achieve social and economic  
21 benefits for communities, and many communities are struggling  
22 to revitalize their central areas. And GSA in their location



1 practices always wants to be in the hundred percent location  
2 competing with the private sector. Why can we not be on the  
3 other side of the tracks to help balance off the tug of war  
4 within urban areas. And we have a building out in Fresno,  
5 California, the IRS payment center, where this battle is  
6 taking place. And we have looked at who knows how many sites  
7 all over town, and it has really been a struggle to put this  
8 building in a place where it might do some good."

9           And we have this new executive order, 11512, which  
10 just a few people around the table may remember. I suggest  
11 that it makes good reading, not really, but its principles  
12 are wonderful. And it says that public buildings should be  
13 located in locations to support urban renewal, a term that we  
14 do not see very often anymore, and the achievement of local  
15 economic development and social objectives. Now I am  
16 paraphrasing it, of course.

17           And Art Sampson said to me, "Can you help us devise  
18 a methodology for finding these places." And for the next  
19 couple of years, I was probably involved in at least ten  
20 different building locations. Every once in awhile, I would  
21 have a chance to see these. And sometimes I am happy, and  
22 sometimes I am not.



1           But I was in Fresno last weekend on a California  
2 state building location assignment, and I went to visit the  
3 IRS center. It is a long story. But I think that there are  
4 just wonderful lessons that can be learned from these  
5 efforts. And all of this led up to the Cooperative Space Use  
6 Act that Bob Peck mentioned.

7           And I call to your attention what is now the  
8 Resolution Trust Building over on 17th and G, which I think  
9 was the first building built under that legislation, which  
10 has retail and has public spaces. And if there was not a  
11 sign on the building, you would not know that it was not just  
12 another mixed use project within the urban fabric. You would  
13 not know that it was a federal building, because it also has  
14 historic preservation tied to it too. It was a very  
15 controversial project when it was done, because it was done  
16 on a Sunday. They had to tear down a historic building to  
17 get it done.

18           MR. PECK: In violation of a court order.

19           MR. FULLER: Times change and then they do not.

20 But I am glad to be part of this, and I applaud GSA for what  
21 they are doing.

22           MS. BARNES-GELT: I am Susan Barnes-Gelt, and I am



1 an at large city council member from Denver, Colorado, known  
2 sometimes affectionately and sometimes with great contempt as  
3 the official right brain of the Denver city council. I chair  
4 the city's land use committee, and we just completed a new  
5 every decade comprehensive plan. And we are about to embark  
6 on a transportation and land use study, which actually is  
7 revolutionary. Because the City of Denver, even though many  
8 of you think of us as innovative, really has not yet made the  
9 connection between land use and building.

10           There are two really interesting federal projects  
11 going on in Denver within a half a mile of one other. One is  
12 a new federal courthouse, and the other is Hope 6 in Curtis  
13 Park. And because of my interest in planning and urban  
14 development, I have been a little bit engaged in both  
15 projects, a little more in Hope 6 because our local housing  
16 authority unfortunately is kind of leading that parade.

17           But I have been surprised from the outset at the  
18 absence of connection between these two projects even though  
19 the federal courthouse is kind of at the north edge of our  
20 central business district in a pretty well contained federal  
21 district that is completed to some degree by this new federal  
22 courthouse. And the Hope 6 project is less than a half a



1 mile away in kind of a mixed but quickly gentrifying older  
2 neighborhood of central Denver.

3           And I think probably part of this frustration of  
4 barriers is one thing, but I think that the other thing we  
5 might think about is how we connect federal projects. I  
6 think that Denver is sort of serendipity in the way that  
7 these two things are happening almost coincidentally.

8           So I hope again that these discussions that I once  
9 again applaud Hillary for convening will be good. I guess  
10 that some of the challenges that I think facing all of us is  
11 how we can dialogue with the individual communities, so we  
12 can create advocates. I think that this is sort of  
13 accidental because of maybe my involvement with the Congress  
14 for the New Urbanism. And I am disappointed that both Dena  
15 and Shelley will be teleconferencing instead of in the flesh.

16           MS. ALTMAN: Well, they are coming here next week  
17 for our waterfront workshop in the Southeast. They could not  
18 do two trips.

19           MS. BARNES-GELT: Anyway, I look very forward to  
20 spending the day with all of you. And I value being here  
21 today.

22           MS. ALTMAN: Thank you.



1           MR. CHEN: My name is Don Chen with the Surface  
2   Transportation Policy Project where I direct the land use and  
3   smart growth programs. The STPP, as we are called, we are a  
4   coalition of about 200 organizations from around the country.

5   We are probably best known for helping develop the Inter-  
6   Modal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, which  
7   was reauthorized a couple of years later in the form of the  
8   Transportation Act of the 21st Century.

9           Those two laws represent a shift in U.S.  
10   transportation policy from one that emphasized highways and  
11   automobiles to one that attempts to try to get us a more  
12   balanced transportation system. That includes walking, and  
13   bicycling, and transit access, and better programs to address  
14   land use.

15           The reason why we have gotten more involved in land  
16   use as the years have passed is exactly the reason that Susan  
17   raises. That a lot of people all over the country still do  
18   not find the connection between transportation, land use, and  
19   community reinvestment to be important to solving the entire  
20   puzzle. We think that you cannot solve any one of those  
21   things without addressing them altogether in a coordinated  
22   fashion.



1           So we have started to address those issues in such  
2 a way. One of the things that we are trying to do is to get  
3 organizations to coordinate nationally on smart growth on  
4 something called the National Smart Growth Coalition.

5           I will just mention one thing that I would like to  
6 try to address today, and that is the notion that federal  
7 buildings and other federal facilities are important not only  
8 in their design but also in the management of the personnel  
9 and the use. And I think that it is very important for us to  
10 try to figure out how to get employees to those buildings,  
11 and how they travel, and all of those issues.

12           I am particularly interested in how to get transit  
13 benefits into the hands of all federal employees as an  
14 equivalent benefit to parking benefits. And I know that GSA  
15 could play a certain role in that, and I would like to figure  
16 out what exactly that might be.

17           MR. LAUGHLIN: I am Keith Laughlin, the executive  
18 director of the White House Task Force on Livable  
19 Communities. I could speak at length. But in the interest  
20 of brevity, I would just indicate that I am very glad to be  
21 here today. GSA's work is central to the work of our task  
22 force with eighteen agents who participate. But the whole



1 notion of being a good neighbor is a central theme of the  
2 work that we do in trying to define the role of the federal  
3 government in helping smart growth in urban communities.

4 MR. SORENSON: I am John Sorenson with the Postal  
5 Service. I am the federal preservation officer for the  
6 facilities department for the Postal Service. We have a \$3  
7 million budget for new construction, so we can do a lot of  
8 damage or a lot of good, depending on who you talk to.

9 We are very sensitive or we are getting very  
10 sensitive to the needs of the communities. In the past, it  
11 was building our post office. Today, it is building their  
12 post office. I have to say that I recently wrote the new  
13 community relations regulations that were published in now  
14 official postal law if you will or policy, and it involves  
15 the community a lot more than we did five years or ten years  
16 ago. And the biggest fight that I had in selling this, if  
17 you will, is number one, writing it and selling it to my  
18 senior management, and then selling it to our field units to  
19 understand it, and get them trained in the process.

20 And I have to say that it is working quite well.  
21 There is always the one, two, or three. We do 8000 real  
22 estate transactions a year overall, and 30,000 if you include



1 renewing leases, 30,000 every single year with a misstep here  
2 and there. We have some right now where we are trying to  
3 expand the building, and we have a development group that  
4 does not want the building expanded. So they write to their  
5 congressional office demanding that we be placed where senior  
6 citizens are in the development, so people can drive to the  
7 post office.

8           And if we try to build outside of the downtown area  
9 because the present building is not as large, pardon the  
10 expression, as a postage stamp, and it is just impossible to  
11 expand it, so we have to build new, and the only place we can  
12 build new is in the development area, we have complaints from  
13 the downtown.

14           So no matter what we do, in many cases we are going  
15 to get criticized for it. We are in a unique situation today  
16 of having to work with the community local officials, and  
17 provide retail services of the Postal Service and get the  
18 mail out.

19           Communities do not realize, let's take Annapolis,  
20 what we did is we split operation. We still have a beautiful  
21 post office on Governor's Circle downtown, and we moved the  
22 industrial operation out in the industrial part, and we call



1 that a split operation. It works well, but we cannot do that  
2 in every community.

3 So there is a lot of opportunity. It is an  
4 opportunity to get closer to the community and working with  
5 them. So I am here basically to study and listen. I could  
6 talk for an hour, but i am going to stop now. And Bob, Rudy  
7 Abshad, my vice president, says to make sure I say hello.

8 MS. ALTMAN: I am glad that you could be here. Can  
9 you guys all pull the mikes toward you on the table. I just  
10 want to make sure that we can hear everyone, if you would  
11 move them toward you. Thanks.

12 MS. NALLY: Hi. My name is Regina Nally, and I am  
13 with GSA. And like John, I serve as GSA's preservation  
14 officer for the Great Lakes Region, which is based out of  
15 Chicago. My other hat is as the field officer for the Great  
16 Lakes Region as well. And I am very excited to listen to  
17 hear what all of you have to say today, and perhaps hear some  
18 pointers on how we can be more effective on a local basis.

19 MR. MARTIN: My name is John Martin. I am here  
20 representing Public Building Services, Office of Property  
21 Disposal. I am an operations director in that group. My  
22 primary responsibilities, some of them I should say,



1 depending on which hat you wear for the day, for this forum,  
2 I would probably label them as GSA's brown fields program,  
3 and responsibility for the property disposal information  
4 technology.

5 I feel like the comments that Paul, Bob, and  
6 Hillary have made at the beginning of the day have set me up  
7 for success. When Hillary talked about us not having grant  
8 authority at GSA like HUD and some other people, I go into  
9 city meetings often and talk about that. I do not have grant  
10 authority, I cannot write you a check. But we do have real  
11 property assets. We cannot give them away, but we can  
12 discount them up to a hundred percent. That takes on a  
13 different context sometimes.

14 Bob's comment about be careful what you ask for, we  
15 will build you a building, and take it off the tax rolls, and  
16 our people will come and go from 9:00 to 5:00. I am in the  
17 fortunate position of being able to give that building back.

18 I should not say give it back, but possibly discount it. We  
19 will put it back into the community's tax base. Again, let  
20 them decide what a former federal asset can do for their  
21 community. And the last comment. Paul talked about  
22 a small facility that we have disposal authority for in



1 Chattanooga, a several thousand acre former Army ammunition  
2 plant. I was there yesterday with a group of GSA disposal  
3 people. We had some representatives from the community that  
4 came in. And for your information, it was a very positive  
5 meeting. Hopefully, I have covered the reporting  
6 responsibility here too.

7           They were very pleased with developments to date.  
8 They did talk about because we deal with such significant  
9 assets that this gives them the ability to be at a different  
10 level outside of their community. They formerly dealt with  
11 ten, twenty, thirty acre parcels. They now have the ability  
12 to offer 200 plus acre parcels to industrial developers. And  
13 I had the opportunity when I was making a presentation to say  
14 that has created great value for the community, and they  
15 acknowledged that. This one is not going to be a give away.

16 I think he felt that maybe he was being set up for a problem  
17 with negotiation after we established value.

18           I guess the key to what I am saying is what we have  
19 seen as our success is grounded in our community involvement.

20 What we have done with the community in advance of our  
21 disposals and what we continue to do with them as we are  
22 disposing of the property. On that note, I will turn it



1 over.

2 MS. LAWSON: I am Linda Lawson with the U.S.  
3 Department of Transportation. I am the director of the  
4 office of transportation policy development. I apologize. I  
5 have lost my voice completely a couple of days, and I have  
6 just barely gotten it back.

7 I am very excited to be here today. I think that  
8 with GSA that we have a number of activities and interests in  
9 this area. First of all, we care very much about our  
10 transportation facilities in the communities that they are  
11 in. Unlike GSA which actually builds the building, we do not  
12 have control over local communities and transit authorities.

13 But we encourage very much the focus on livability. In  
14 fact, next Tuesday, we are having an awards ceremony where we  
15 are trying to hold up some of the examples of transportation  
16 facilities that have contributed to the livability of their  
17 community.

18 In addition to that, we will be partners with GSA,  
19 and EPA, and other federal agencies in implementing their  
20 executive order on transit benefits. And I notice that one  
21 of your questions was the new executive order enough, and I  
22 would like to say no, no, that car pooling and van pooling



1 are successful. We know that there are areas where transit  
2 will not do it all. We know that biking, and walking, and  
3 telecommuting, alternative work schedules, and things like a  
4 guaranteed ride home. If we want people to think about other  
5 kinds of transportation alternatives, they need to have a way  
6 to get home, a guaranteed ride home from work, to provide an  
7 incentive for those programs.

8           So I would say that we need to go far beyond that  
9 executive order, that we need to work diligently to make sure  
10 that the executive order is implemented.

11           And lastly, I really want to commend GSA for  
12 focusing on transportation as part as a livable community  
13 element. And I do encourage all of our federal agencies to  
14 also focus on that as their implementing program across the  
15 country. Thank you for hosting this today.

16           MR. VAUGHN: Good morning. I am Michael Vaughn  
17 from PBS' office of portfolio management. The role of the  
18 office of portfolio management within PBS is to identify the  
19 right strategies for investment and utilization of our  
20 federal and leased assets, and meeting the needs of our  
21 customer agencies.

22           This mission is very consistent with urban



1 revitalization and livability. And we are in a position of  
2 somewhat being able to do well by doing good. In that most  
3 of our federal assets and customer needs are in downtowns, it  
4 enhances our ability to perform our portfolio management role  
5 of backfilling unutilized space that one agency might have or  
6 another one can expand into.

7           We very much recognize the positive cycle that can  
8 be created by enhancing urban environments, and enhancing the  
9 value of our assets. The more the assets contribute to a  
10 livable and vibrant urban environment, the more valuable they  
11 too will be, and the more useful they will be to our customer  
12 agencies.

13           So I am very excited about being here and listening  
14 to the best ideas that everybody has, and I hope I can  
15 contribute. Thank you.

16           MS. ZIMMERMAN: Hi. I am Maria Zimmerman. And I  
17 work for Congressman Earl Blumenauer from Portland, Oregon.  
18 Cameron may argue with me, but I think I have the best job on  
19 Capitol Hill. I get to work as senior policy advisor on  
20 livable communities for my boss, who has really made the  
21 issue of livability as the key uniting theme in all of the  
22 work that he is doing in Congress both in legislative and



1 working with other members. So it is most important to him  
2 to try to have the government lead by example, and be the  
3 best partner that it can be for state and communities trying  
4 to support livable communities. So that is a great job.

5 I am delighted to be here. Both myself and my boss  
6 really commend Bob Peck for creating the Center for Urban  
7 Development and Livability, and that we are all together  
8 today. It is really important I think to have us all here at  
9 the table, and to make the connections. Because what we see  
10 working with constituents and with Congress is that really  
11 the public does not see a distinction between different  
12 agencies, between GSA and DOD or the post office. So your  
13 ability to bring people together and develop these principles  
14 I think is a great message.

15 I would love to see the extension of smart growth  
16 principles and little community principles throughout the  
17 government. We have seen several governors who have embraced  
18 that idea. And I do not think that there is any reason to  
19 think why cannot DOD as it looks at base closure and reuse  
20 think about little communities and principles for guiding  
21 that.

22 The post office, I am glad to hear that there is



1 some progress being made. But my boss would like to see more  
2 community involvement. And I think doing as much of that as  
3 we can is really useful. So I look forward to the  
4 discussion. And thank you for inviting some congressional  
5 types.

6 MS. PREISSER: I am Janet Preisser, and I am the  
7 field officer for Denver and the Rocky Mountain Region. And  
8 I am really happy to be here. I just want to be here to  
9 learn, and take in what everybody here has to say and absorb  
10 it, so I can take it back to the region and start actually  
11 applying it.

12 MS. TAYLOR: My name is Cameron Taylor. I have the  
13 second best job on Capitol Hill. I coordinate the Senate's  
14 Smart Growth Task Force, which is co-chaired by Senator Jim  
15 Jeffords from Vermont and Carl Levin from Michigan. We have  
16 24 senators, and it is bipartisan. It is a little more  
17 heavily Democratically weighted. But we do have a couple,  
18 Senator Bennett and Senator Stevens are both on the task  
19 force. I am very proud of that. And it is multi-regional  
20 obviously. We have Alaska. And we have members from the  
21 South and the Southwest as well as the Northeast, and  
22 Midwest, and Northwest.



1           The major goal of the Senate Smart Growth Task  
2 Force is to investigate and assist in making sure that the  
3 federal government assists at the local level with local  
4 growth management plans. We are not interested in proposing  
5 a national zoning board or any of the scary things that  
6 frequently are the concerns expressed to me by national  
7 homebuilders, although they have come around greatly.

8           So we really are here to look for ways that the  
9 federal government can lead by example. And I think that  
10 Maria really said it the best way. So I really commend GSA  
11 for today, and thanks for inviting me.

12           MS. MORRIS: My name is Marya Morris, and I am with  
13 the American Planning Association. I am in our Chicago  
14 office. We do have an office right across the street, but I  
15 work in our research department. I also want to commend GSA.

16       In looking through the case studies, I saw the example from  
17 Chicago about Congress Boulevard, which I find very  
18 encouraging. I was just hoping, as I was reading it, that  
19 they also owned the Subway sandwich shop across the street,  
20 which is probably a worse blight than the parking garage. If  
21 there is anything you can do.

22           My particular area of responsibility at APA is



1 working on our growing Smart program, which some of you may  
2 know is our project to develop model planning legislation for  
3 the states, for the 35 or 38 states depending on how you  
4 count that have not done anything with their planning laws  
5 since the 1920s. The project is funded largely by HUD, but  
6 also by a consortium of federal agencies and foundations.

7 Right now, we are working with a number of states  
8 that are using our model laws. And the area of interest that  
9 I have here is in the relationship of GSA's policies and  
10 programs and your principles to what the states are doing  
11 with their growth management programs, and also with what the  
12 local governments are doing both to implement the state  
13 growth management laws, but also very specifically dealing  
14 with local plans, local architectural review boards,  
15 architectural guidelines, and things like that.

16 I did not know honestly the extent to which GSA was  
17 already involved in this sort of stuff, and I find it very,  
18 very encouraging. Thanks.

19 MR. GIBLIN: Hi. I am Frank Giblin. I am the  
20 Center for Urban Development's deputy director. As Hillary  
21 said earlier, I am primarily involved with helping our  
22 regional offices on specific projects out in the field.



1           I was in a meeting yesterday in Youngstown, Ohio on  
2 a new courthouse. It was a meeting on sustainability. They  
3 are going for the lead rating system in the U.S., the Green  
4 Buildings Council rating system. One of the presenters said,  
5 when he was talking about innovation and how to get points  
6 under sustainability for innovation, he said anytime that you  
7 can get more than one return for something you are doing,  
8 that is something that is innovative, the sustainability  
9 criteria. And that in a nutshell I think is what we are  
10 trying to do.

11           GSA's business is to meet the needs of its customer  
12 agencies, whether it is a courthouse or a GSA lease. When we  
13 can do that in a way that also supports what a community is  
14 trying to do, then we have got something much better and much  
15 bigger.

16           And in every case, I guess we have worked on maybe  
17 twelve to fifteen projects so far in the last seven months,  
18 every case is slightly different. But what is really  
19 exciting is that in every case that the conversation is  
20 starting about GSA buildings sometimes existing and sometimes  
21 planned. And we are talking with local partners and  
22 neighboring property owners, but also use groups. And what



1 comes out of the conversation is a conversation that  
2 discusses much more than just that building. It discusses a  
3 neighborhood. And that is the only way that I  
4 think federal buildings or federal activities are going to  
5 really give the community a boost or help a community to  
6 achieve its goals. It is when they are not just a federal  
7 property, but when they are very specifically linked into  
8 what a community is doing with the partners there.

9 I would say too that my regional office has done  
10 fantastic work with some of the field officers who have  
11 already introduced themselves. Regina, and Janet, and Harold  
12 are working really closely with our people in the field,  
13 sometimes project managers and sometimes building managers.  
14 And one thing that is also unique about GSA probably at this  
15 table especially is that we wear a couple of different hats.

16 In some cases, an organization can be an advocate  
17 for a certain way of thinking or a certain issue. In GSA, we  
18 feel very strongly and especially the commissioner feels very  
19 strongly in supporting communities. We also have difficult  
20 business practice issues in how to meet client needs, how do  
21 you work a 100 foot setback into a retail district or  
22 maintain a street front. Things like that, where we have to



1 meet our client needs on one side, and we want to do that in  
2 a way that supports communities. And we also want to have an  
3 open dialogue with communities about what we can do together.

4 MS. SMITH: I am Kennedy Smith, and I am the  
5 director of the National Main Street Center at the National  
6 Trust for Historic Preservation next door over there. I am  
7 also happy to be here. We do a lot of different things. We  
8 work with about 2000 communities to help revitalize their  
9 downtowns and neighborhood commercial districts, and produce  
10 training materials, blah, blah, blah.

11 One of the things that we also do is look at what  
12 makes downtowns work economically. And one of the things  
13 that we are doing now is working with the GSA Center for  
14 Urban Development to adapt some of our market analysis tools  
15 that we have been using for years to help communities figure  
16 out what is happening economically for the needs of GSA and  
17 federal agencies to estimate the economic impact of a federal  
18 facility on a downtown or neighborhood commercial district,  
19 which will be a fantastic tool for showing the community what  
20 the benefits are of having a federal facility there, and  
21 beginning to look at some of the synergy that could exist  
22 between a federal facility and other activities in the



1 downtown. And I promise John that we will not use this  
2 against the post office. We will help you use this tool for  
3 good purposes.

4 MR. HEBERT: I am Harold Hebert, and I am an asset  
5 manager from Fort Worth, Texas. I am also a field office  
6 representative for the Center for Urban Development and  
7 Livability. I am completing my thirtieth year with GSA PBS.

8 In those three decades, I have been able to participate in  
9 some interesting things, among them part of the site  
10 acquisition team for the federal building in Oklahoma, which  
11 later became the Murr Federal Building in Oklahoma. So there  
12 are some memories associated with that.

13 In the mid-1980s, I led a project which ended up  
14 being featured on the cover of our annual report for GSA,  
15 which was our opportunity building purchase program in which  
16 we actually bought existing high quality office buildings,  
17 three of them in Texas. And by that process, we actually  
18 committed to a downtown presence in Houston. We bought the  
19 building for about 25 cents on the dollar, and it was a good  
20 time to do that with the market in Houston at the bottom. We  
21 killed a few birds with one stone.

22 In the 1990s, I have been very happy to have be



1 part of this Center for Urban Development and Livability,  
2 working with the City of Fort Worth, and beginning to work  
3 with the City of Little Rock on the Capital Avenue  
4 redevelopment project. In Austin, Texas was another good  
5 opportunity to take a paved federal ugly lot and make it  
6 something much more friendly to the community and to the  
7 citizens.

8           We completed a project that I am very proud of in  
9 Galveston, Texas, where we took an existing gorgeous historic  
10 custom house finished right at the beginning of the Civil  
11 War, no longer viable really as a federal building. We made  
12 a very long term out lease to the Galveston Historical  
13 Foundation. They raised over a million dollars in about a  
14 month to restore and renovate that building. They are  
15 thrilled to death to be the caretaker for probably the next  
16 sixty years. That helped the community, and it helped the  
17 historic district of Galveston.

18           And one thing that the Galveston project did like  
19 Fort Worth and like some of the others, it is very low cost  
20 or almost a no cost item to the federal government. It is  
21 not that we necessarily have to spend a lot or invest a lot.  
22 It is more like thinking through what we do.



1           I have also seen a change in GSA to conclude. Most  
2 of the years of acquiring space for the government maybe  
3 particularly in Region 7 and particularly in Fort Worth, you  
4 look to acquire space which has one parking place per  
5 employee, you know, per Chevrolet Suburban, which is really  
6 what you want to end up with.

7           I think that there is a lot of evangelism that  
8 still needs to be done within GSA and to our customer  
9 agencies particularly. Thank you.

10          MR. BARNETT: My name is Jonathan Barnett. I am a  
11 professor of city and regional planning at the University of  
12 Pennsylvania. I do not think we have ever met. I am  
13 relatively new there, and you have been busy down here for  
14 quite awhile. I also write about public policy and the  
15 issues as they affect urban design, and urban design as they  
16 affect public policy issues.

17          But I think that the reason I am here is because I  
18 also practice as an urban designer. And because I am a  
19 professor, I practice as an individual. And a lot of my  
20 practice is working with local governments around the country  
21 on downtown redevelopment issues. Because I am an  
22 individual, I have a long term relationship with a lot of



1 these cities. I have been working with the City of Cleveland  
2 since the early 1980s and the City of Norfolk.

3 For example, I have been through the siting of the  
4 public building in Cleveland. I have been through  
5 negotiation with GSA over the redesign and refacing of the  
6 Norfolk federal buildings and so forth.

7 And one of the things that I find from this  
8 practice is that everything happens for a reason, and it is  
9 usually a pretty good reason. The result may not be so good,  
10 but everything that goes into the result is actually done for  
11 a good reason, and it is usually done by very good serious  
12 people. And one of the things that I have noticed is all the  
13 world is a stage.

14 Susan, if you become the head of the housing  
15 authority in Denver in a couple of years, I am not sure what  
16 you think of the city council after that and so on. So I  
17 think that this is a very important effort, because what you  
18 are doing is you are redefining the jobs of the people in the  
19 department. And it seems to me that it is a role that these  
20 people play in how it is defined for them. It defines a lot  
21 of how they are going to react.

22 I was listening to your description of the disposal



1 offices. And I was thinking here is a place where maybe you  
2 should chase a name than chase a job description.

3 MR. F. COSTA: Good morning. I am Fernando Costa  
4 with the City of Fort Worth. And I think later today you  
5 will hear me say a little more about the project that we have  
6 under way there. But we are working with GSA and most  
7 directly with Mr. Aver on a project to develop a transit  
8 oriented civic square in downtown Fort Worth.

9 For now, let me say that we are greatly impressed  
10 with the leadership that Hillary, and Frank, and others have  
11 provided to us on this project. Thank you.

12 MR. T. COSTA: Good morning. My name is Tony  
13 Costa. I am the head of public buildings for GSA here in the  
14 National Capital Region. I think that John has been talking  
15 about redefining the job. And I think that for us in the  
16 National Capital Region, that is really where it leads. I am  
17 not sure what the cliché is, something about butterflies  
18 causing a tidal wave, is that it.

19 But for us in the National Capital Region, that is  
20 what it is like to some extent. We manage 85 million square  
21 feet in the metro area. And depending on how you count that,  
22 that is between 20 and 30 percent of the real estate market.



1 That is kind of daunting and scary sometimes, because  
2 everything we do has such an impact on land use and  
3 transportation patterns that I am not sure that we have  
4 thought through what that means. And I am not sure that we  
5 can spend lots of years figuring it out either. And I am not  
6 sure that we tell 1600 employees this is how you should look  
7 at that, because I am not sure we know.

8 But we do know enough that we know that we have to  
9 change the jobs and how people look at the jobs. And it is  
10 actually pretty interesting. My closest partner in local  
11 government life, Andy Altman, deals with it every day. And  
12 it is a really interesting dynamic. I tell him that we are  
13 like a corporate citizen. He tells me you are a public  
14 agency. And the dynamic is interesting, because we are both.

15  
16 I talk to my customers, and I try to convince them  
17 that they should be good corporate citizens too. Sometimes  
18 they do not care and sometimes they do. And I think we are  
19 making some progress on that end. And again, 1600 folks work  
20 in the National Capital Region. What we are trying to do,  
21 and it is not very difficult, you see a lot of GSA folks  
22 here, just to get a better feel for how much of an impact we



1 can have on a micro and a macro scale, how we manage property  
2 every day to looking at 800 leasing actions every year, and  
3 the impact that we can have. It is daunting, and I look  
4 forward to the discussion this morning.

5 MR. HUDNUT: My name is Bill Hudnut, and I am from  
6 the Bureau of Land Institute. I am the senior fellow. Our  
7 organization is very interested in smart growth. We have  
8 partnered with EPA and HUD, as Susan mentioned, and are  
9 partnering with them on various different issues relating to  
10 smart growth.

11 I am here because I am particularly interested in  
12 the applicability of what we are talking about not to the  
13 central cities so much as to the inner ring suburbs and the  
14 deteriorating neighborhoods out on the fringe of the city  
15 boundary, which I think is the soft under belly of urban  
16 America. There has been a lot of revitalization in the  
17 downtowns, but I am concerned about some of these suburbs  
18 that are not the suburbs further out but are the older ones,  
19 the deteriorating ones, and what can we do there with regard  
20 to livability and community investments by government  
21 agencies and so forth to assist them in their revival, if you  
22 want to put it that way, or at least their turn-around.



1 MS. TREGONING: I am Harriet Tregoning, and I am  
2 the director of the urban economic development division at  
3 the Environmental Protection Agency where we coordinate  
4 something called the Smart Growth Network. ULI and many  
5 other organizations around the table are a partner in that  
6 network. The mission is to educate and inform in order to  
7 try to encourage a different pattern of growth development.

8 We do a few things at EPA. We make grants to  
9 communities and nonprofit organizations to help encourage  
10 smart growth. We try to change policies at the Environmental  
11 Protection Agency to better line them up to incentivize and  
12 reward smart growth decisions. And we also provide  
13 information and analytical tools to help form development  
14 decisions.

15 Our thesis is that a small change in the  
16 development patterns and practices could have enormous  
17 environmental benefits. One of the analytical tools that we  
18 work with, we are talking about working on it with the  
19 General Service Administration, is something called the Smart  
20 Growth Index. It is a modeling tool designed to work on a  
21 regional scale and a neighborhood scale down to a site  
22 specific scale that would help people better look at



1 development alternatives, transportation alternatives, land  
2 use alternatives, and their impact on transportation,  
3 congestion, air quality, water quality, and infrastructure  
4 costs. And I am also very happy to be here.

5 MR. GIEFER: I am Ed Giefer, the policy director of  
6 GSA's Center for Urban Development. I am also happy to be  
7 here. My sound bite I guess would be that we are here to  
8 make better cities and towns. And that is a real simple  
9 thing to say, but I think it is also really lofty. There are  
10 a lot of steps in between a meeting here and to see  
11 measurable results in cities and towns. And I am really  
12 looking forward to working on that outcome and that output  
13 which is going to be better policies, better practices,  
14 better programs, and better principles. And I thank you all  
15 for being here.

16 MS. ALTMAN: Thanks. I just want to interrupt this  
17 for a second, because Bruce Katz has joined us. And I would  
18 like to ask him to talk a few minutes about some current  
19 trends, and anything else you see as relevant this morning.  
20 Thanks, Bruce.

21 MR. KATZ: Sure. I am Bruce Katz, and I am the  
22 director of the Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy at



1 Brookings. And welcome to Brookings. Actually, my mission  
2 in life today is to make livable airports. Because I just  
3 finished another one of these trips to California where no  
4 connections were made, and I am just in a fundamental stage  
5 of dazed and confused.

6 I think that what is going on here today is  
7 absolutely so critical. Because what the Urban Center and  
8 what so many of our colleagues around the room have focused  
9 on in the past number of years are not only the sort of key  
10 decentralization trends, which are happening in the economy,  
11 the spreading out of metropolitan areas, sprawl to use the  
12 sort of catch word, but the role in government policies and  
13 facilitating these decentralization trends, spending on tax,  
14 on regulatory, and on administrative.

15 And I think that the role that GSA is playing  
16 really as a federal agency subjecting many of its policies  
17 and practices to a very sort of stringent test, a really  
18 harsh self-examination, I think really is a model for many of  
19 the agencies in this town, and perhaps many of the  
20 congressional committees to really undergo. I am not too  
21 encouraged by the congressional committees as of yet.

22 I think that the location of federal facilities.



1 When you think about the potential role that the location of  
2 these facilities or the leasing of the facilities has, not  
3 just in generating economic activity particularly in areas  
4 that are distressed but under-served, but in really being a  
5 pioneer with the private sector in testing new kinds of mixed  
6 use facilities and transit oriented development. In many  
7 respects, the federal government, particularly as Tony was  
8 saying in this region, should be the best kind of corporate  
9 actor, the best kind of lessor and so forth.

10 I think that as you go forward today that what I  
11 would urge you to think about is to really go back to some  
12 first principles. You know, when I was on the Hill on the  
13 Banking Committee, it really a tenet of faith that federal  
14 facilities should be located in central business districts,  
15 and you should tightly define that. And that was sort of  
16 really something that we did not need to discuss any further.

17 But I sort of agree with Bill. I think that we  
18 need to sort of examine fairly clearly what kind of trends  
19 are occurring, not just generally in metropolitan America but  
20 in specific metropolitan communities around the country. I  
21 find the cities in the metropolitan areas of this country  
22 extremely diverse. And there are still many cities like



1 Baltimore, or St. Louis, or Philadelphia, or even the smaller  
2 ones like Camden, and Flint, and so forth, where we really  
3 have not seen the kind of prosperity that we have seen in so  
4 many parts of this country.

5           So therefore, in those places, the role of the  
6 federal government as pioneer and generator of economic  
7 activity and leverager or private sector investor I think  
8 remains fundamentally clear. But there are other places in  
9 the country, both in older cities like Boston and Chicago,  
10 and obviously in cities like Phoenix and Dallas, where the  
11 downtown markets are fairly robust. And we are even seeing  
12 sort of a beginning of a living downtown in many of these  
13 places, which I think will be a movement with changing  
14 demographics that will really take hold and take root over  
15 time.

16           So in those places, I think that we really do have  
17 some fundamental questions to ask about where is the best  
18 place for the federal government to invest its resources and  
19 locate its facilities. Some of these places remain highly  
20 dense with mature transit systems running out into the older  
21 suburbs, with the older suburbs being the soft underbelly of  
22 urban America very weak commercially with very little of the



1 new economy activity occurring, and with fundamentally  
2 changing demographics with rising numbers of the working  
3 poor.

4           So I think that as we go forward and think about  
5 the role of GSA and the role of the federal investment  
6 generally, I think that we really need to keep an eye on this  
7 fundamental diversity among and between markets, and not  
8 treat the country really as a cookie cutter, but really as  
9 disparate topologies and different categories of cities and  
10 older suburbs.

11           And I think secondarily that this connection to the  
12 private sector, this connection to sort of mixed use, how do  
13 we leverage what has traditionally been seen that this is  
14 federal only. Obviously, in the aftermath of Oklahoma City  
15 and the aftermath of some of these other things. And these  
16 become very, very complicated questions because of safety  
17 issues and security issues. But I think that there is still  
18 a role to play to think about how the government pioneers,  
19 how the government sort of sets the template.

20           I think that at lunch today that we are going to  
21 hear from the California state treasurer. When you think  
22 about the level of experimentation and innovation, which is



1 occurring at the state, regional, and local level, it really  
2 is sort of breathtaking. I do not think that we could have  
3 imagined two or three years ago that the kind of smart growth  
4 efforts going on in Maryland, the kind of metropolitan  
5 government experiments going on in Georgia now, or these new  
6 sort of California efforts would be here and be taking place.

7 I think that really is a challenge to the federal  
8 level to basically step up and sort of again take the lead on  
9 experimentation and innovation. I think that is really the  
10 model at this stage where the agency really is critically  
11 examining its role and its place in the market.

12 And I applaud you guys for doing this, and I hope  
13 it is a productive day. I probably will remain dazed and  
14 confused as the day goes on, but such is life in the 21st  
15 century.

16 MS. ALTMAN: It sounds like you have got some  
17 pretty clear points. Thank you, Bruce.

18 Let's just real quickly. You guys are all so  
19 interesting. I want to give everyone a chance. We should  
20 probably move as quickly as we can to just finish  
21 introductions.

22 A PARTICIPANT: Hi, I am Eric from the Booz-Allen



1 team. And we provide a wide range of programmatic and  
2 analytical support for the office of property disposal. I  
3 think that one of the tasks that should be of interest to the  
4 group here is actually a series of socio-economic case  
5 studies just under way, which we are throwing out to the  
6 communities and helping them understand direct and indirect  
7 indications of disposal activities. For instance, in Boston,  
8 we are looking at the equity and economic implications of  
9 housing.

10 MS. COGAN: I am Jessica Cogan. I serve as the  
11 director of the Center for Livable Communities, the American  
12 Institute of Architects.

13 MS. ALTMAN: We are just a little bit over, but I  
14 promise that we are going to end on time. So we are going to  
15 make adjustment throughout the day depending on how the  
16 conversation goes. I am just really excited to hear -- yes,  
17 we are the choir -- but I am excited to hear from all of you.

18 It sounds like we are a group with a lot of mutual  
19 interests, who have really raised some key issues, some of  
20 which I will just sort of run through.

21 I thought that it was very interesting that you  
22 talked about sort of a disconnect between federal projects,



1 the Hope 6 project and with the federal courthouse in Denver  
2 right down the street. We have not made those connections  
3 yet. It is something that we very much need to do.  
4 Connecting between transportation and land use and community  
5 reinvestment, that is another nexus that I think is very  
6 important.

7 I thought it was interesting to hear that John  
8 Martin sort of measured our success as really being whether  
9 we are grounded in community involvement or not. I think  
10 that is very important. How transportation facilities  
11 actually fit into communities is another one.

12 It was interesting to hear from some of the  
13 congressional folks about guiding principles which go across  
14 the agencies and across governments. We are all sort of I  
15 think getting the idea now. Nobody is trying to reinvent new  
16 principles. But the fact that we are starting to take those  
17 on, I think is something that could take momentum.

18 The model laws that EPA is developing are  
19 incredibly exciting, particularly as they relate to state and  
20 local planning. And I hope that from our federal perspective  
21 that we are able to look for connections there.

22 Actually, Tony Costa said something that I was



1 really struck by, that we are a corporate citizen and the  
2 local planning office thinks no, you are a public agency. I  
3 think that there is a really interesting disparity in  
4 perspectives there. And that is again a balancing act.  
5 Also, the inner ring suburbs, Bill, you called them the soft  
6 underbelly of urban America. And I think that is pretty  
7 poignant.

8           And then Bruce was talking about the potential role  
9 in locating federal facilities, and the fundamental diversity  
10 of cities. The opportunities to provide mixed use, and to  
11 really look at some new types, I think is very interesting.  
12 Innovation in particulars is a thought that I want to leave  
13 us with as we move on into the next discussion.

14           What I would like to do now is before we break,  
15 because I think we are going to need a break soon, we have  
16 gone around the table, but I would like to at least introduce  
17 some of the principles that we talked about. They were in  
18 your briefing books. I do not want to spend too much time on  
19 them, because we could spend the whole day debating them.  
20 But we did do some careful research of it. I think that they  
21 capture the issues. I would like a few comments, but I would  
22 like to sort of move on from there, and begin to talk about



1 what our business practices are and their effect particularly  
2 on these principles.

3 So I would like to just review the principles  
4 before we break. Stephanie, maybe you can start to write  
5 them up on the screen. Oh, there is a technical difficulty.

6 Well, I think that we have all got them in our notebooks.  
7 And then I would like to break for a couple of minutes. And  
8 then we will come back and introduce and sort of discuss some  
9 of our business practices with you. That is the sausage  
10 basically. You are going to get to see how that is made.  
11 And then I would like to wrap that discussion up just  
12 beginning to identify how these practices can mesh and fit  
13 into the principles.

14 But I would like to introduce six principles. The  
15 first is to make strategic regional location decisions. And  
16 I think that we have all talked about locating federal  
17 facilities. And we have also raised the issue of considering  
18 aging in the suburbs, not just the central city. And how do  
19 those executive orders that are out there that require  
20 federal agencies to go into central business districts  
21 measure up against that, those current trends. So I want to  
22 put that on the table.



1           The second, which I think I heard around the table  
2 is offer transportation alternatives. There is the new EO  
3 out, the new executive order on transit benefits. But folks  
4 seem to agree that it is a good start, but it is not enough.  
5       Certainly, federal agencies can be doing more. Ellen, it  
6 was really interesting to hear a couple of your anecdotes.  
7 Smoking lounges in particular really strike me.

8           In addition to that, the goal is really to create  
9 walkable neighborhoods. I think that one of the things that  
10 GSA can look at is developing near transit. How we do that  
11 is sort of at the policy level, because we generally do it  
12 but it is not a policy. And I think that we need to look at  
13 that a little bit. Biking, walking, offering those kinds of  
14 alternatives is really important.

15           Investing in infill and urban locations. This is  
16 critical. And I think that it does not just mean the central  
17 city, but it can also mean an aging inner ring suburb.  
18 Examples include locating in central business areas and  
19 historic districts. Also, aging inner ring suburbs. Reusing  
20 historic buildings, and also participating in downtown  
21 management districts, and other kinds of things that we can  
22 do. The workshop which we are going to be doing on the



1 Southeast waterfront I think looks at a key parcel of the  
2 city, and looks at how we can make the most out of that with  
3 mixed use development.

4 Seeking ways to leverage investment is the fourth  
5 principle. And I think that lots of folks have talked about  
6 how to make one decision count and have a much bigger impact.

7 In particular, I think that it is important to look at some  
8 of the issues that Bruce raised about innovation, and also  
9 about forming partnerships. And not just partnerships with  
10 other federal agencies but also importantly with communities  
11 with diversity and different types of cities that are out  
12 there that have different needs.

13 And also importantly with private business. I  
14 think that we really do want to let a lot of you around the  
15 table know that that is something that we think is very  
16 important, and it is not something that everyone has  
17 supported or are thinking is important. So I want to talk  
18 about that a little bit.

19 The fifth principle is to promote mixed use, live-  
20 work-play, 24 hour cities. You have heard the anecdote a  
21 couple of times around the table this morning about how  
22 federal workers get into their cars, drive to work, park in



1 subsidized parking, eat their lunch that they bring from home  
2 or in the government cafeteria, and go home by 5:00. What  
3 kinds of things can we do to help change that.

4           Is it leasing mixed use buildings, is it really  
5 promoting and providing restaurants and shops on the ground  
6 floor of our federal building. Is it more than that, is it  
7 to begin to look at live/work incentives, and other types of  
8 opportunities, and some new ideas that can help us think  
9 differently about that, new authorities.

10           And the sixth is to consider the effect of  
11 technology on space needs. I am excited to hear a couple of  
12 folks bring that up this morning. I think that it is very  
13 important. Our space needs are changing as technology  
14 changes. We are not sure how. Certainly, agency needs are  
15 changing. And I think that we can talk a little bit about  
16 what some of the specific agencies needs are. Some are  
17 consolidating. Some become more technically oriented, and  
18 are changing the way that they need to locate, where they  
19 need to be located.

20           And also, examples could include providing some  
21 live/work alternatives. Again, is there something that we  
22 could go to encourage federal workers. Maybe it is that



1 federal workers will live downtown, and they will commute out  
2 to the inner ring suburbs to work, a reversal of that. I do  
3 not know. Anything is possible. But I want to put that on  
4 the table as the sixth principle.

5 Do we have any comments on that, do we want to talk  
6 for a couple of minutes on those, or take a break, what do  
7 folks feel like doing?

8 MR. PECK: If I could just make one comment.  
9 Because I am going to have to leave for a little bit, and I  
10 will be back. But I want to make it clear. These principles  
11 for livable communities are principles that I believe in, and  
12 that our administrator, Dave Behr, believes in. I want to  
13 make it clear that not everyone thinks that GSA in particular  
14 should do this at all.

15 I just had a hearing in the House of  
16 Representatives about three weeks ago, which I got a very  
17 pointed and clearly antagonistic question about why we set up  
18 this Center for Urban Development, why we were doing it, what  
19 authority we thought we had to do this kind of activity, and  
20 why it was part of our mission when the Public Buildings Act  
21 says that we are supposed to provide space for federal  
22 agencies.



1           The Office of Management and Budget, which was the  
2 first place I worked here, has been, still is, and always  
3 will be controlled by bean counters. Just last night, it  
4 shot down for the umpteenth time a proposal which we made,  
5 which we think we can do under existing authorities, to do  
6 something sort of innovative in urban development activities.

7  
8           We have lots of tenants who think that putting  
9 federal agencies where we can help spark development or be  
10 where our transit station is going to happen is about the  
11 worse thing that we can do to them. And we are measuring our  
12 success I think rightly in part by reinventing government  
13 initiatives by how much our customers like us.

14           Just like in the Postal Service, they need to  
15 remind people that their job is to move the mail. And if you  
16 cannot get huge semis into the center or town, which you  
17 cannot do, we will be all bitching at them like crazy about  
18 why we do not get our mail delivered, and the hell with the  
19 downtown historic post office.

20           In any event, we cannot do joint ventures. I am  
21 just telling you that I want to be clear. That is why I am  
22 talk about talking to the choir. We have to understand what



1 the limitations are. If we want to widen the kinds of things  
2 that the federal government can do, you need to understand  
3 that. Particularly for those of you who are in or come out  
4 of state and local government, where it is fairly common for  
5 the government to have these kind of financing vehicles, to  
6 be able to go to borrow particularly on bonding authority for  
7 particular projects, and have joint public/private ventures.

8 You will be surprised what the federal government, the 800  
9 pound guerilla in town, cannot do.

10 So I am just putting it on the table. This is  
11 obviously my particular frustration. And it does not in any  
12 way absolve GSA from doing whatever we can within whatever  
13 authorities we have for doing the right thing.

14 But I do know that the fact for me that I am so  
15 proud to be a GSA in era where we do not think our job is  
16 just to provide desks to put federal butts into and buy paper  
17 clips, and it is great. But there are people who long for  
18 those good days.

19 MS. ALTMAN: I guess that I would encourage all of  
20 us when we leave here today to go back to our organizations  
21 and build a constituency for these kinds of innovations, and  
22 things we are trying to do. I will not belittle how hard the



1 challenge is going to be in many ways. And I think that all  
2 of us here are very committed to it. So let's take a break  
3 for ten minutes.

4 (Recess.)

5 MS. ALTMAN: I put some principles up on the  
6 screen. They are the ones that you saw in your notebook. I  
7 reviewed them before we broke.

8 Do you all have any thoughts, did we hit the six  
9 things, is there anything missing, is this a good place for  
10 us to start to talk about some of our practices and some  
11 things that can fit within these principles as ideas? Keith.

12 MR. LAUGHLIN: I reviewed these before, and I had  
13 two comments after hearing this morning's discussion. One is  
14 the community involvement issue is raised over and over  
15 again. It seems like it would be nice to have that somehow  
16 reflected, particularly if these were to be picked up by  
17 other folks.

18 MS. ALTMAN: Okay.

19 MR. LAUGHLIN: And the second, the issue of  
20 security I think is also a really important one. And I think  
21 that there should be something that emphasizes the importance  
22 of trying in the design process to achieve the goals of



1 security, when at the same time you are trying to do these  
2 other things. I think that would be useful.

3 MS. SMITH: I agree. I think that it would gain a  
4 lot of sort of political support within the federal agencies,  
5 if you say something about safety being a livable criteria  
6 and building that into your dialogue.

7 MS. ALTMAN: Okay.

8 MS. SMITH: That it is achievable. It sounds good.

9 MS. ALTMAN: Right, exactly. Do you see that  
10 fitting into the six things, or do you think that those are  
11 additional things, or do we need to rework some of these?

12 MS. SMITH: I think that it could fit into the  
13 first one frankly, talking about making strategic regional  
14 location decisions. I think that you could say something  
15 about making sure that the locations that you are choosing  
16 meet several needs.

17 MS. ALTMAN: Okay.

18 MR. LAUGHLIN: Even in No. 5, mixed use, live-  
19 work-play, 24 hour cities, we want them to be safe also.

20 MS. ALTMAN: Okay.

21 MR. LAUGHLIN: It can be part of No. 5.

22 MS. ALTMAN: Okay. Then the community involvement,



1 do you see that as helping us sort of leveraging investment  
2 or should that stand on its own?

3 MR. LAUGHLIN: Well, I think in some ways that is  
4 stands on its own. It is a process point that is necessary  
5 for the rest of this to work right.

6 MS. ALTMAN: Okay. So why don't we add community  
7 involvement as one of the principles.

8 A PARTICIPANT: Hillary, the point that Bob Peck  
9 made which is that there is a difference between safety from  
10 terrorists and safety from sort of random street crime and so  
11 on. And I think that this is a very deep problem that you  
12 have, which is that if you want to have a plaza which is safe  
13 for ordinary people, you want a lot of activity on it. And  
14 if you want a plaza that is safe from people with truck  
15 bombs, you have an entirely different problem. I guess  
16 people are saying that you need to show that you are aware of  
17 this issue, but I do not know how you resolve it.

18 MS. ALTMAN: I think they are very different  
19 issues.

20 A PARTICIPANT: Two comments. One on your  
21 community involvement. I also think that you should  
22 emphasize involvement and partnerships. Because I think that



1 some of the challenges you face can be mitigated by actual  
2 hand in hand relationships, particularly as it relates to  
3 locating facilities downtown, the issue that Susan and I were  
4 talking about earlier of making sure that you have got some  
5 dollars going right over here and other dollars going right  
6 over here, and there is that connection being made.

7           And I think that those connections happen because  
8 of a sort of almost informal anecdotal relationship. So I  
9 think that should be a real point then.

10           MS. ALTMAN: Okay. I think under the leveraging  
11 investment, partnerships are also a key part of that.

12           A PARTICIPANT: This is less a comment on the  
13 principles themselves which I think are good, but more kind  
14 of a comment on Bob Peck's statement about congressional  
15 response, and how well these principles relate to GSA's  
16 mission. And I actually think that there are probably lots  
17 of really wonderful good government ties that somewhere maybe  
18 need to be better articulated.

19           There are a series of articles in the Washington  
20 Post this week about the federal work force and competition  
21 with the private sector, and how hard it is to attract and  
22 retain certain categories of workers. I think that one of



1 the things that we are talking about here is high performance  
2 buildings. And high performance, at least in the private  
3 sector, high performance buildings have begun to translate  
4 into high performance employees, which means higher  
5 productivity, which means greater efficiency.

6           If anyone is in a position to really analyze the  
7 performance, and you could do that in partnership with  
8 unions, with the companies that provide the health care  
9 benefits to agency employees. There are all kinds of really  
10 wonderful ties that might help embed these more in your  
11 mission. I do not think that it necessarily pertains to the  
12 principles themselves.

13           MS. ALTMAN: Let me run through something real  
14 quick, which is beginning to introduce some of our practices  
15 and the things that we consider, because I think it will help  
16 us make that connection a little bit. But one of the things  
17 that we do. Basically, we talked about how we do new  
18 construction, how we do leasing, that we do repair and  
19 alterations to existing buildings, and we dispose of federal  
20 property.

21           As we do all of those things, there are some issues  
22 that are most often raised. And there are four things, and



1 there may be many more, but these just seem like the key  
2 things that came out. The first is deciding where and how to  
3 locate. And that can be siting or site selection. It can be  
4 sites that are accessible. It can involve the issue of the  
5 telework. The second is maintaining control over  
6 design. And I think that we are forever trying to do that in  
7 projects where we are actually in control of federal  
8 construction, and others where we have lease construction.  
9 Where we are trying to implement security design measures.  
10 Those kinds of things come into play. But that is one of our  
11 major considerations.

12 The third is achieving the highest and best value  
13 for federal assets, and balancing that effectively with what  
14 we call a legacy value. So it is basically balancing sort of  
15 what is the value of the property or sort of business  
16 decision with the community value. For example, in a  
17 disposal. And that is something that John alluded to a  
18 little bit earlier.

19 So it is highest and best value, and balancing that with sort  
20 of the legacy issue.

21 And the fourth is really determining and providing  
22 mixed uses in federal facilities. And we always have the



1 discussion about if this is an opportunity for us to provide  
2 mixed uses, how do the security concerns come into play here,  
3 is this going to happen in this building or not.

4           So for each of these four issues, deciding where  
5 and how to locate, maintaining control over design, achieving  
6 the highest and best value for federal assets, and balancing  
7 that with sort of the legacy value, and determining and  
8 providing mixed uses in federal facilities, each of those  
9 affects the ABCs, the needs of agencies, the need to manage  
10 our business, and the needs of communities.

11           So I just want to introduce that. And I think that  
12 Harriet, that is what you were sort of opening up a little  
13 bit, which is how do we relate our business and our mission  
14 to what these principles are. And where are there examples  
15 of how we can begin to talk about that.

16           I think that maybe one way to talk about that is to  
17 open up this sort of community planning and participation.  
18 How does that fit in, how does that fit in the way that we  
19 actually do our business, and the way that we sort of  
20 structure these principles.

21           I do not know if any GSA folks have any examples.  
22 Or Maria, do you have a comment?



1 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Well, I was just going to say that  
2 with community participation that first I would move that and  
3 make that the second principle, so it is given an emphasis.  
4 But I would also think that maybe community participation is  
5 not quite the right word. Maybe it is full participation of  
6 active partners or something, and listing those out as  
7 federal agencies, community, and business representatives.  
8 Somehow to make that a little more inclusive, so that it is  
9 not just community in a generic sense.

10 MS. ALTMAN: Okay.

11 MR. MARTIN: I would agree with that. I think one  
12 of the things and maybe it is inherent is that you get  
13 benefit to the community, and it does not have to be the  
14 community individual whose relationship brings that private  
15 sector business piece in our dealings. One thing that I do  
16 not think that I mentioned along the way is I think that what  
17 we are talking about is for GSA institutionalizing this  
18 community involvement piece. I do not want it to be so rote  
19 that oh, boy, it is another process that we have to deal  
20 with, and everybody hates it.

21 But again, what do we do in the course of doing our  
22 business. Is there a piece that we can make this part of how



1 we do our business, and not just add it on as another  
2 Christmas ball to something else we have to do. And I  
3 mentioned the success that we had. It is really a lesson  
4 learned. I hate the cliché. But just keep doing it.

5 A PARTICIPANT: Just going back to No. 1. Mr.  
6 Hudnut's example about the inner ring suburbs, it is probably  
7 the next area that we are going to have to concentrate on.  
8 But I still think that there are a lot of medium sized and  
9 smaller cities that are still struggling. So maybe we can  
10 put the word maybe preference for the central city. Some  
11 agencies are better than others in terms of implementing some  
12 of the executive orders. And also, just a lot of central  
13 cities and downtowns are still kind of struggling to  
14 revitalize.

15 And so I think that what I have seen is some of the  
16 agencies that still kind of cope out. And right here in the  
17 National Capital Region, the National Capital Planning  
18 Commission tries to promote 40 percent employment as their  
19 goal for employees in D.C. And I know that they have been  
20 struggling to kind of maintain the lead, as more and more go  
21 into the suburbs. I still think that we should, if we can,  
22 give preference.



1 MS. ALTMAN: Actually, Stepanie Bothwell just  
2 joined us from the AIA Center for Livable Communities.

3 MS. BOTHWELL: In the effects of the GSA business  
4 practices, you talk about maintaining control of design. But  
5 in the principles, that is not clear as to its objective. So  
6 I might suggest some language that looks like strive to  
7 create the highest quality of place and civic inspiration  
8 through excellence of design.

9 MR. MCILWAIN: If you could add to that within the  
10 context of the neighborhood. Because so frequently people  
11 come in and design a building that could be anywhere but  
12 where it is actually located, and it actually destroys the  
13 fabric.

14 MS. BOTHWELL: I second that.

15 MR. MCILWAIN: Thank you.

16 MS. ALTMAN: I am sorry, could you give me your  
17 wording again.

18 MS. BOTHWELL: Strive to create the highest quality  
19 of place and civic inspiration through excellence in design  
20 within the context of the neighborhood.

21 A PARTICIPANT: Also, on the effects of GSA  
22 business practices in No. 3 when you talk about the legacy



1 value, if you could also insert something about reducing  
2 community costs as a factor or perhaps even a principle of  
3 livable communities. Because I think that we all know what  
4 we are up against. We are up against the practice or desire  
5 to locate facilities on inexpensive land and shifting the  
6 transportation costs of people who have to drive to those  
7 facilities.

8           And I think on the one hand that you would be  
9 saving taxpayer dollars by getting a cheap plot of land and  
10 putting a facility there. But on the other hand, those  
11 people who you are shifting costs onto are also taxpayers,  
12 and they are the people who have to deal with the facility.

13           So anyway, maybe we can add just a couple of words  
14 about reducing community costs in the process of siting  
15 facilities.

16           MR. MCILWAIN: I would like to again piggyback on  
17 that to say that the siting should be located with public  
18 transportation in mind. Particularly, if you have got rail  
19 transit, there should be rail transit hubs or at the very  
20 least at major bus lines.

21           MS. ALTMAN: Kennedy.

22           MS. SMITH: This is sort of tying all of these



1 things from Harriet and Don, and building on that. I think  
2 that when I tried to turn on my universal translator and read  
3 this through conservative eyes and think what would be  
4 appealing to me, I think that if we could say something about  
5 reducing federal costs, about there being cost efficiency in  
6 developing facilities that make best use of transportation  
7 dollars, and make best use of other federal programs, HUD  
8 dollars through shared infrastructure and things like that.  
9 That is what we are trying to achieve in making livable  
10 communities, but it may also appeal to fiscal budget  
11 watchers.

12 MR. MCILWAIN: Well, there is an excellent example  
13 of that in what is going on with ATF and New York Avenue  
14 siting. That is being tied in with a new Metro stop to be  
15 put into the Metro Center, a large portion of the cost of  
16 which is being paid by the private building owners in the  
17 neighborhood. So you have got a whole bunch of things coming  
18 together, partnerships, private dollars going to support  
19 transportation dollars, to being supported by GSA dollars, to  
20 totally transform part of the city.

21 MS. SMITH: I think that there are good examples of  
22 that. And if there could actually be at some point a report



1 or some case studies that demonstrate that because of this  
2 type of development and planning that the federal government  
3 needs to allocate X amount less. I could imagine that  
4 getting a very different response on Capitol Hill than other  
5 things that we might be likely to produce.

6 MS. ALTMAN: Keith.

7 MR. LAUGHLIN: I would just follow that up with a  
8 comment. And that is that I think it is important to keep in  
9 mind who the audience is for the principles. I think that  
10 you have got multiple audiences. And I think you really make  
11 that point well. I think you have got inside GSA, and you  
12 have got other federal agencies, and you have got multiple  
13 partners, and you have got the Hill.

14 So what you are trying I think to do is to put  
15 together a set of principles that will appeal to those  
16 multiple audiences both in terms of helping to understand  
17 what this is about. But also, I think bringing those  
18 arguments that way, so Bob does not get those kinds of  
19 questions when he goes up to testify.

20 MS. ALTMAN: Right. Jessica.

21 MS. COGAN: There is nothing that I see here that  
22 really talks about consistency or trying to seek or strive



1 for consistency with local government. We talk about  
2 communities, and we have added a new bullet or a new No. 2 on  
3 here, the involvement, but that is different than local  
4 government. So I think that somewhere in these principles  
5 that there needs to be some reflection on local government.

6 MS. ALTMAN: That goes into No. 1?

7 MS. COGAN: Yes, I think that could.

8 A PARTICIPANT: I hate to disagree. But I think  
9 that if you define community in terms of stakeholders, local  
10 government and downtown associations, I mean those local  
11 stakeholders. I think that we agree, but I think that it is  
12 a matter of having to define it. Maybe you can come up with  
13 a definition that speaks to the various stakeholders that  
14 would include local government, the business community, and  
15 downtown associations where that is relevant.

16 MS. COGAN: As long as it is clear that when we are  
17 talking about community that we are not only talking about  
18 the citizens, but we are talking about the local government.

19

20 A PARTICIPANT: Exactly.

21 MS. COGAN: That is fine.

22 MS. ALTMAN: Are there any more thoughts on these



1 from anyone?

2 MS. SMITH: The word culture, has anyone brought up  
3 the word culture of the area or the style of the place?

4 MR. MCILWAIN: That is really what I was trying to  
5 get at with the context.

6 MS. SMITH: I added to that little line that I  
7 wrote the context of the neighborhood and district within the  
8 larger environment, and maybe we should also add culture.

9 A PARTICIPANT: I am curious, back to security just  
10 for a second, about other public agencies. We have got  
11 Denver, Fort Worth, and the Postal Service here. I wonder  
12 how you have dealt with security issues.

13 MS. BARNES-GELT: Do you mean at the local level?

14 A PARTICIPANT: Right, in Denver or the Denver city  
15 government, or in Fort Worth, or at the Postal Service.

16 MS. BARNES-GELT: Well, actually, thank heavens, we  
17 are still pretty lax about it. There was a shooting in a  
18 courthouse in Raport County, which is a first rate suburb.  
19 And the response to that was to put these kind of, I think  
20 that we probably got them when we decommissioned Stapleton  
21 Airport, we got these really old nasty metal detectors that  
22 you have to go through only when you go into the city and



1 county buildings.

2 But that is balanced by the fact that the parking  
3 lot where most of the city council and many of the cabinet  
4 folks park is exactly the same place where the blue school  
5 buses that drop off high security prisoners load and unload.

6

7 And in Denver where the city center is, there are a  
8 number of city buildings, the city and county buildings which  
9 houses the courts. And that maybe is the significant thing.

10 That is the only reason why we have these Stapleton  
11 decommissioned metal detectors there. But all of our city  
12 buildings that are in the kind of civic center area, you can  
13 walk in and out of. I think that there are security people  
14 that are there or sometimes there. So I guess the bottom  
15 line is we are extremely relaxed about it.

16 MR. F. COSTA: I do not know if Harold wants to  
17 comment on it. Obviously, security is a concern for all of  
18 us in today's world. But from a design standpoint, it tends  
19 to be the tail that wags the dog. I think that in Fort Worth  
20 in regard to our federal buildings that the results have been  
21 less than ideal.

22 I think that a few years ago that GSA may have



1     tried to make it even worse. But fortunately, the city did  
2     not go along with it. But I think that we all have a lot of  
3     learn about how we can recognize the valid interest in secure  
4     buildings without allowing those interests to overwhelm.

5             MS. FREGONING: Will we have a chance to talk more  
6     about the security issue today?

7             MS. ALTMAN: Do you have a point that you want to  
8     make?

9             MS. FREGONING: I do not know that it is  
10    appropriate to talk about it now, but I have a couple of  
11    maybe radial questions.

12            MS. ALTMAN: Okay.

13            MS. FREGONING: The questions have to do with like  
14    why are federal buildings a target. Unfortunately, we have  
15    no terrorists in our group today to give us that perspective.

16    So we are going to have to speculate a little bit. But in  
17    some ways, the notion about moving toward mixed use  
18    buildings, and really kind of spreading federal workers kind  
19    of more broadly among a lot of different buildings, I think  
20    might be a really good security option. If you cannot make a  
21    statement that it is not a federal building, then maybe it is  
22    much less of a target.



1           There probably are buildings that have to be  
2 federal buildings, you know, courthouses for example. But I  
3 would argue that there are a heck of a lot of other buildings  
4 that really do not have to be federal buildings. For  
5 example, if you could figure out a way to put nonprofits and  
6 feds together, all of the people who are off the tax rolls,  
7 you know, in a single building, maybe that would be kind of a  
8 good strategy for a locality, and let the people who pay the  
9 taxes kind of be in some other buildings. Just sort of mix  
10 it up in general.

11           Could that start to be sort of a strategy that  
12 could be considered, as opposed to putting all of the feds  
13 together and making it a target, a security risk, and then  
14 doing all of these extraordinary things to mitigate that  
15 risk.

16           MR. MCILWAIN: I think that the idea that if you  
17 for example have a street scape of stores, and restaurants,  
18 and average citizens, the political statement is very  
19 different if you bomb something like. I hate to say that  
20 citizens should be screens, but that is what we are talking  
21 about in effect. And it changes the political dynamics very  
22 dramatically.



1           For example, in the tragic situation out in  
2 Oklahoma, if that day care center had been known to be right  
3 out front, the politics of that would have been dramatically  
4 different. It was after the fact, but there is a good chance  
5 that it could have been before the fact. So we are in fact  
6 maybe the best screens for our federal workers.

7           MS. BARNES-GELT: Could I add something to that.  
8 Harriet, in some regards, it is an answer to you. For  
9 example, in Denver, there are two challenges. One is, and I  
10 can only use Denver as an example, there is sort of a federal  
11 quadrant. So the new federal courthouse is going in as part  
12 of its quadrant. Where as Janet can confirm, we have already  
13 got a former post office that has been beautifully renovated  
14 to be another courthouse that is the Court of Appeals.

15           Your ideas are great, Harriet and John, about mixed  
16 use. But the worst enemy to making these buildings  
17 especially in downtowns accessible are judges. In Denver, we  
18 are hoping and praying on a regular basis for the retirement  
19 of the senior federal judge, because he has been the singular  
20 obstacle to accessibility to these buildings.

21           So you have two problems. One, when you collocate  
22 all of your federal buildings to create a community, that is



1 both good news and bad news. And secondly, in my parochial  
2 experience, the judges drive as much of these decisions about  
3 fortress America, as Bob puts it, as anyone else. So I think  
4 that is a huge hurdle.

5 A PARTICIPANT: I think that maybe the Smart Growth  
6 Coalition needs to get a new process for the confirmation of  
7 federal judges.

8 (Laughter.)

9 A PARTICIPANT: I think that we are always going to  
10 encounter obstacles like this in places. Denver may have a  
11 bad judge, but Atlanta may have a judge who is open minded.  
12 I think that what Harriet is suggesting is just another way  
13 to sell the benefits of mixed use development for federal  
14 buildings, and that we ought to regard it in that way, and  
15 maybe try to get the design guidelines to emphasize those  
16 benefits.

17 MS. ALTMAN: Marya.

18 MS. MORRIS: I would like to hear what some of the  
19 more forward thinking design solutions have been for the  
20 large facilities that have had to respond to Oklahoma City,  
21 and not do it in a way that uses just the Jersey barriers or  
22 the planters with the dead flowers.



1           In any of the case studies here, has anybody come  
2 with some ideas that look a little better than those things?

3           MS. ALTMAN: Tony, if you want to comment. The  
4 Reagan Building just by the nature of it being open. There  
5 is a food court there, and there is an international trade  
6 center, and restaurant.

7           MR. T. COSTA: The Reagan Building, we just refuse  
8 to close it basically. I get a letter every month from  
9 Congress telling me that it is an abomination, and that we  
10 are putting people at risk. And we respond with well,  
11 Congress told us many years back that it should be more than  
12 a federal building. So if you want to pass a law telling us  
13 to close it, we will do it.

14           But that has been the approach. And it is less  
15 design, although we do have some design stuff that is helping  
16 security. It is just a matter that in this case that it has  
17 been easy for us to say we are not going to close it. I  
18 think that it is harder for us in other places for that. But  
19 we can play off the pressure with the Reagan Building.

20           But as far as design solutions across the country,  
21 it has been very interesting. Because I have seen something  
22 that has been touted as design solutions that personally I am



1 sure they are solutions. So i do not know.

2 A PARTICIPANT: We had a design awards ceremony  
3 last March. And there were architects voicing opinions about  
4 potential design solutions. But it is the response that  
5 Harry brought up, too. We are always fighting the last war.

6 Hiring architects to come up with solutions, it may be very  
7 different in one area versus another. The key is to try to  
8 look at all of the available options, and not close the door  
9 on any. But to look at it in each individual case, not to  
10 say that mixed use is going to work across the board, or in  
11 plazas separate from the rest of the building or across the  
12 board.

13 MS. MORRIS: That is why I think that within GSA  
14 that you need some sort of compendium of techniques to share  
15 among regions. When you come across people or judges who are  
16 saying absolutely not, you can say it worked in Denver or it  
17 worked in Fort Worth or wherever.

18 MS. ALTMAN: Interestingly, one of the things that  
19 we have done a lot of is sort of landscaping, and sculpture,  
20 and art, which has been more creative, and sometimes more  
21 criticized. I mean we have examples. You folks who are in  
22 the HUD building, you know those sculptural elements are



1 barriers to cars driving up on the plaza. In Minneapolis, we  
2 have these sort of berms. In New York, we have similar ones.

3 We are building these sort of mounds of sculptural earth and  
4 things like that.

5 But for us, a lot of the answer has been use,  
6 trying to encourage people to really bring people into the  
7 space, invite the public in and keep it open, and keep it  
8 inviting. That has been part of our battle. I think  
9 Stephanie that you mentioned Boston. And that began as a  
10 challenge, but I think that there were some very strong  
11 advocates to keep the building open. There is a McDonald's  
12 in there now. We hope that those examples take heed.

13 MR. OCHOA: Is there any movement by GSA to develop  
14 design guidelines with security alternatives?

15 MS. ALTMAN: I think that we want to get there. We  
16 have our facility standards now, and we have folks studying  
17 security design. But I actually think that our security  
18 design guidelines right now are more responsive to the  
19 Department of Justice criteria as opposed to innovative with  
20 design solutions. I think that is something that we all  
21 recognize.

22 MR. T. COSTA: I think that what we are trying to



1 push are more guidelines based on performance standards.  
2 Right now, we put big things so it separate things from other  
3 things. And that is not going to get us where we need to go.  
4 We have been involved personally over the last two years to  
5 try to shift to performance standards, and we are not there  
6 yet. But that is really in my opinion the only solution.  
7 Because then you can simplify design solutions and other  
8 things that are not really related to design use.

9 MS. ALTMAN: And we also have an opportunity with  
10 the ATF project to codevelop design guidelines, urban design  
11 guidelines, with the city. And that is something that we are  
12 just embarking on. It is the first time that we are going to  
13 do that anywhere. There are very real security concerns that  
14 we are dealing with as ATF as a client, and a huge setback  
15 issue. So there is all of the opportunity there, but  
16 certainly we are going to ask all of the questions.

17 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Hillary did a joint briefing for  
18 the Senate Livable Communities Task Force a month ago. And I  
19 recall that you did have some slides showing examples from  
20 Sweden, I think it was.

21 MS. ALTMAN: Right.

22 MS. ZIMMERMAN: And I am just wondering. It seems



1 to me that Europe, the Middle East, and other places have  
2 been dealing with this issue for a long time. And I am  
3 wondering what examples they may have and how is GSA trying  
4 to look internationally at what places have done to do more  
5 with that linkage.

6 MS. ALTMAN: We have some folks heading out to our  
7 World Workplace Conference in San Francisco later this week.

8 I do not know if they are going to get into the design  
9 discussion. But I always try in the slide shows to use  
10 models, things like dollards. The folks in Sweden have been  
11 more creative with using them as sculptures or sculptural  
12 elements. You know, people are more relaxed. I mean cities  
13 are more crowded. And they are not looking to close things  
14 off.

15 I do remember one of my first experiences in  
16 Europe, and this is a personal experience. I was in Italy,  
17 and I walked up the steps of the wrong building. And there  
18 are four armed guards suddenly facing me, reminding me that I  
19 had walked up the wrong steps. But there was no way for me  
20 to know that. They looked monumental and inviting in public.

21 I think that these are all questions.

22 MR. T. COSTA: We actually did a couple of years



1 ago at that very conference talk to the British and Irish  
2 about that very issue. One of the interesting things is that  
3 the American culture and the perception of risk and what we  
4 can accept is much different. And in London, it was pretty  
5 amazing. The discussion related to the preservation of  
6 infrastructure not necessarily people.

7           At least from our standpoint now, and I am not a  
8 security expert, but a lot of what we do is to protect every  
9 person. And I think in Europe that they accept that there  
10 are risks in life more than we do. So that is part of the  
11 dynamic that we have to work through a little bit, and I do  
12 not think that we have.

13           MR. HUDNUT: I wanted to segway the conversation  
14 that we have been having, because several people have  
15 referenced the importance of people, and of the buildings  
16 generating vitality. And if you are talking about the  
17 revitalization of an inner suburb, if you are talking about  
18 vitality, that means people. And the design question that I  
19 would have is how can these buildings be inviting to people,  
20 how can they open onto the street, how can they encourage  
21 pedestrian involvement. And how can they feed life into the  
22 city rather than create a fortress, you know. There is a



1 bunker mentality that we want to keep bad people out.

2           It seems to me that if you are investing in infill  
3 and urban locations, you have got a tremendous opportunity to  
4 help revitalize urban areas if you do it right. I do not  
5 necessarily know what right is. I just feel as though if we  
6 get into a kind of mentality where we are so preoccupied with  
7 security, and we forget about what Jan Jacobs taught us about  
8 density, and diversity, and having people walking all around  
9 and everything, we are going to do ourselves a disservice.

10           MS. ALTMAN: I also want to talk about just a  
11 couple of questions that I think we need to raise. I think  
12 that we have a pretty good consensus on the principles. I  
13 think that we have talked a little bit about some of our  
14 different practices and some of the different things we do.  
15 I think you are getting a hint at what some of the issues are  
16 that come up as we are doing these things. Obviously, a big  
17 one is security. Design is another. Proving mixed uses is  
18 another. We talked about our investment a little bit.

19           I just want to raise some questions, and see if we  
20 can start to talk about some case examples. I would like to  
21 understand better the kinds of things that we can do in order  
22 to work more with communities, and I mean communities



1 including local government and sort of broad community. Are  
2 they things like developing design guidelines with the city.

3 Are they things like coordinating with other folks. Are  
4 they things like looking at site selection.

5 And also, we talked a little bit about where agency  
6 needs fit in. And I think that we should talk a little more  
7 about some of the specific agencies and some of their needs.

8 We know that FBI wants a hundred percent back. So where and  
9 how do agency needs fit in the balance.

10 Also, what are our business needs. I want to get  
11 back to that a little bit. You know, we have these things  
12 called local portfolio plans, and I think that Kay could talk  
13 a little bit about that. And Mike Vaughn about our portfolio  
14 and our asset management. And how all of this fits in, all  
15 of these principles, as we are making decisions about our  
16 business.

17 We talked a little bit about what the federal  
18 government role could be. I think that we should talk a lot  
19 about what the role of the private sector could be. I think  
20 that Bob put it on the table pretty clearly about how we want  
21 to work and do sort of public and private development, and we  
22 do not have that authority. But I think that there are lots



1 of ways that we need to talk about wanting to partner with  
2 private business.

3 And also, I want to consider some of our  
4 authorities. You have a list in your notebooks of sort of  
5 what our authorities are, and what we are required to do.  
6 But at some point, I want to get to the discussion about if  
7 that makes sense, and is that enough.

8 So I could just back up a little. Raising those  
9 questions about community planning and participation and  
10 about agency needs, about business needs, about sort of our  
11 role, and about the role of the private sector, and about our  
12 authorities. Let me go back to the first one, community  
13 planning and participation.

14 Do you guys have an example, maybe Fort Worth or  
15 Denver is a good one. We talked about them a little. I do  
16 not know if you all have a couple of other examples that you  
17 want to share.

18 MS. BARNES-GELT: I can talk a little bit about  
19 Denver. And I assume that it is true that when you build a  
20 facility in most communities that you hire local architects.

21 In the case of Denver, we hired a local architect and a  
22 local landscape architect. I do not know if it was



1 intentional or just lucky. But you got firms who were very  
2 sensitive to many of the issues that we are talking about  
3 today. Particularly the urban design and landscape firm  
4 fields on a regular basis with the design guidelines.

5 I actually have a stupid question. Is it fair for  
6 me to assume that you are or are not subject to local zoning  
7 and design regulations?

8 MS. ALTMAN: We are required to consider the local.

9 MS. BARNES-GELT: That is just as I suspected.

10 A PARTICIPANT: Andy Altman has joined us at a  
11 perfect time, my other half after work. But he is the  
12 planning director for the District of Columbia. Tony made  
13 the pointed comment earlier today about how we are a  
14 corporate citizen, and you believe we are in fact a public  
15 agency. So I think that is interesting and answers Susan's  
16 question a little bit.

17 MS. BARNES-GELT: So again, it is a challenge.  
18 Because particularly on communities where you have got really  
19 what I would interpret as being good and rigorous urban  
20 design guidelines, and zoning laws, and so forth. You know,  
21 that is of key importance.

22 Do you look through a competitive selection process



1 when you identify, I mean do you work with the local  
2 community when you set up the criteria?

3 MS. ALTMAN: Well, that is the right question.  
4 Actually, we are starting to do more of that and do that  
5 better, I think. Do you guys want to talk about that a  
6 little bit. I would love to hear from you.

7 A PARTICIPANT: Are you talking about site  
8 selection or are you talking about architect selection?

9 MS. BARNES-GELT: Yes.

10 A PARTICIPANT: Which?

11 MS. BARNES-GELT: Both.

12 A PARTICIPANT: Both, okay.

13 MR. T. COSTA: Are you talking to Andy and I?

14 MS. ALTMAN: Yes. I think that it would be  
15 interesting.

16 MR. T. COSTA: Andy and I are both relatively new  
17 in our jobs. And we spent a large chunk of last year having  
18 this kind of discussion. I can only speak for the National  
19 Capital Region. We talk to local government a lot, but I am  
20 not sure how we formally include local government into a lot  
21 of discussions about site selection. I think site selection,  
22 we probably did.



1           And Andy and I frankly have had lots of debates and  
2 negotiations about that, and I am sure that it will involve  
3 more. We are debating what it means for the city to  
4 participate fully in the development of evaluation criteria.  
5 We debate that almost every day.

6           MS. ALTMAN: What are the actual sticking points, I  
7 mean what are the intervention points or the points in the  
8 process where Andy, you think you need to be at the table;  
9 and Tony, where you think that we need to be in control?

10          MR. ALTMAN: Well, I think, you know, from the city  
11 perspective and municipal perspective that obviously we want  
12 to be in as much control as possible. Because the decisions  
13 that GSA makes has such a huge impact on areas of the city,  
14 not just in terms of the building itself but in terms of how  
15 it is going to spur development and be part of development,  
16 all of those kinds of things.

17           I think that there is this tension for GSA as to  
18 who is your client. Because on the one hand, you have all of  
19 the agencies that you have to serve, the different government  
20 agency facilities, and to be responsive to their needs. On  
21 the other hand from the city's perspective, you are also  
22 trying to be responsive to how do we fit into the city. And



1 I think that there is a tension that you get caught between.

2           For example, in the siting of a facility, from the  
3 city perspective, we want to say how do we use these public  
4 buildings as an investment and the people and everything that  
5 it brings to be part of our development program. The  
6 question then is does that conflict with where the client  
7 that you are trying to serve may want to go, and then how  
8 does that all play out, and this is where Tony and I get into  
9 a lot of discussion, with the rules that you are bound by,  
10 whether that is the procurement process or the selection  
11 process, how the criteria is set, how the evaluation is set,  
12 and how you come in.

13           Ideally, where do you want me to put a building,  
14 and I say put it here, and he would say great. But then how  
15 does that rank relative to the other factors that you have to  
16 take into consideration. But from a city perspective, we are  
17 doing this now. I am looking at all our public buildings.  
18 We have got a million square feet. And we are going to put  
19 them out in the neighborhoods right now. We are going to  
20 relocate them to neighborhoods and create civic centers and  
21 all of the things we want to do. And I have control over  
22 that, over the siting decision and everything else.



1           MS. ALTMAN: Kay or Michael, can you guys talk at  
2 all about the local portfolio plans or how that might fit in  
3 and the portfolio planning. You talked about the agency  
4 needs and the community needs, and I talked earlier about the  
5 ABCs. We have a business need there as well that we are  
6 trying to balance.

7           MS. STORMER: Sure. The local portfolio plans that  
8 GSA is trying to establish now is kind of a new thing. So we  
9 are learning and we are making a lot of changes to it. What  
10 I want to say is that it is not a replacement for the old  
11 community plan that used to be about this thick and nobody  
12 would ever read. This is a streamlined document. Right now,  
13 it is primarily for internal use. But it is to help our  
14 people who are out in the field to make the right decisions  
15 for the entire community.

16           From a financial point of view, it has a lot of a  
17 market statistics in it, and it has a lot of what are all of  
18 the federal buildings and our lease buildings, and what is  
19 the return on investment of those buildings, who are our  
20 tenants in those buildings, as well as what are some of the  
21 local community concerns that are in them as well. Michael,  
22 do you want to add anything?



1           MR. VAUGHN: I think it is primarily a business  
2 document for internally within GSA, but I think that it is an  
3 excellent entry point for a lot of the concerns. Because our  
4 business is really a community development to some extent as  
5 well. So I think that it should be ideally a summary of  
6 actions that need to be taken either in regard to our  
7 existing assets, new assets under construction, new leases or  
8 existing lease renewals, expirations, et cetera. It does  
9 seem to me to be a good entry point for the concerns of the  
10 community vis-a-vis the needs of our clients vis-a-vis our  
11 actual business situation.

12           I think that the one thing that we can say is that  
13 one of the things, since Pam Weslyn became assistant  
14 commissioner for portfolio management, is we have taken the  
15 national accounting program as part of portfolio management.

16       And we realized that there is this great big world of  
17 clients and customer agencies out there, which a good part of  
18 our mission is to serve them. We are not just conservators  
19 of building assets for the federal government and taxpayer.

20           They have very different mission needs. And to  
21 some extent, this can be painful as in the FBI, which is all  
22 too often kind of militated against what I would call



1 livability solutions. But it could also work in concert with  
2 these kind of concerns.

3 I do not know if it was Harold who was talking  
4 about IRS feeling the need to get closer to their customers  
5 who are in fact suburban. A lot of our agencies are thinking  
6 that really they are not just paper factories, and they are  
7 not just purely office locations. They have a different  
8 functionality needs within their agency mission. And those  
9 different functionality needs may well be suited in very  
10 urban vitality friendly atmospheres, or even inner ring  
11 suburbs, et cetera.

12 So I think that pulling the disparate threads  
13 together in this is not an easy trick. And it is what makes  
14 GSA so popular not only all around this town, but all around  
15 many towns. It is hard to keep everybody happy at the same  
16 time.

17 But I think that the local portfolio plan is meant  
18 to be a document to kind of pull the threads together. So I  
19 would certainly suggest to the GSA people here that they have  
20 a role in the preparation of these documents for the major  
21 markets.

22 MR. GIBLIN: One of the reason that the portfolio



1 plans are so important I think is that they are a plan for  
2 capital programs that might be five years down the road. But  
3 even though that it way far in advance of community input and  
4 that sort of thing, it is the time that customer expectations  
5 are starting to gel. And if the portfolio plans can think  
6 through what the issues are going to be down the road, if an  
7 agency five years ahead of the construction project is  
8 talking about a suburban development, start working through  
9 that issue then. That is the kind of thing that our people  
10 are really doing.

11 MS. ALTMAN: John Sorenson.

12 MR. SORENSON: The Postal Service, we will have our  
13 own space package, and it will involve the community and  
14 local officials up front. As soon as our facilities  
15 department gets it from operations, they will make an  
16 appointment with the highest ranking official. Of course,  
17 you are not going to see the mayor in New York City.

18 So we will meet with that person and explain what  
19 we are trying to do, and ask for their help. It is all  
20 partnering. And then we will ask to be placed on the next  
21 town council meeting within thirty days. We have certain  
22 time limits. It is mandatory that every project go before a



1 town council or public hearing process. It is absolutely  
2 mandatory. Our people dislike it, but too bad. Some do not  
3 like to get up and talk in front of the public, but they have  
4 got to get used to it.

5           Of course, the public meeting is to say we need to  
6 expand our operation. It does not say that we need a new  
7 building. That is what we used to say, we need a new  
8 building. Well, what is wrong with the old one. Well, I  
9 don't know. Today it is we need to expand our operation,  
10 either expand our buildings or another building or create a  
11 construction. And if we know at that time that we cannot  
12 expand the building, if it is landlocked, then we still wait  
13 a minimum of fifteen days before we say we need a new  
14 building.

15           At that point, we send a letter to the local  
16 official and post it in the post office. In other words, we  
17 keep them informed and involved all the way through our  
18 process. If we cannot expand, we are going to advertise for  
19 an existing building or new construction. There are thirty  
20 days for comments, if someone wants to object to that  
21 expansion.

22           We do not have a site selection meeting. We have a site



1 review committee meeting. There is a big difference. Site  
2 selection says you selected. Site review says you are  
3 reviewing sites. It is an internal meeting. We have had  
4 requests almost demands from the historical preservation  
5 groups and Chamber of Commerce groups. They want to be in on  
6 the meeting. We would have to rent a bus to take all of  
7 these people around, and it would take six months to decide.

8           It is an internal committee made up of postal  
9 operations, finance, transportation, and real estate, and the  
10 postmaster is also involved. And we vote and rank sites, Max  
11 3 sites, Sites 1 through 3. We will write to the local  
12 officials and let them know. We will post it for the  
13 community to object, or to offer the sites, and so on and so  
14 forth, and wait a time period. And then we notify the  
15 community and local officials we have selected. And we have  
16 to do that internally, because those sites are controlled at  
17 our site review committee, the sites are controlled.

18           So we cannot allow outsiders. Maybe we are  
19 paranoid. We really do not want the city official to get in  
20 on the site review committee. And we start talking about  
21 price. That this site may be contaminated. That is for the  
22 owner to decide and not us.



1 MS. BARNES-GELT: When you say that the site is  
2 under control, what do you mean?

3 MR. SORENSON: We control them legally with a  
4 contract.

5 MS. BARNES-GELT: I see.

6 MR. SORENSON: It is not an option.

7 MS. BARNES-GELT: I have had a little experience.  
8 In a couple of cases, the site selection of a post office  
9 facility in one case was highly political, and was  
10 essentially managed through what I would call a political  
11 process at the congressional level, which kind of flies in  
12 the face of what you have said.

13 MR. SORENSON: It never happens.

14 MS. BARNES-GELT: So I am curious how often that  
15 really happens. And secondly, and this is kind of a broader  
16 question, it seems to me that one thing that all of you in  
17 the public office building arena could think about,  
18 especially when you locate downtown, is taking a very hard  
19 look at your parking requirements.

20 For example, there is a post office facility that  
21 is adjacent to this federal area in Denver that I have been  
22 describing as a four block area. There is a postal facility



1 right on the kind of edge of this that sits in the middle of  
2 a parking lot, which is the world's worst use of downtown  
3 real estate.

4           And as a second piece of that, I am thrilled,  
5 although I think that the building people might not be as  
6 thrilled as I am, although I may have changed their mind last  
7 week, that the budget for the new federal courthouse could  
8 not include a structured parking. Well, that is great news.

9           And unfortunately, the structured parking was located right  
10 on the corner, really a bad place to put structured parking  
11 in a downtown. Particularly when you have got a post office  
12 or a federal facility located in a downtown, to have a  
13 suburban parking requirement is nuts.

14           MR. SORENSON: We work with the ideal situation.  
15 If you could have whatever you want, here is our space  
16 package that is given to us. Our space package may include  
17 60 parking spaces for downtown, and then they break it down.

18           MS. BARNES-GELT: That is like 42 too many.

19           MR. SORENSON: I totally agree. But we work from  
20 the ideal and then back off it.

21           MS. ALTMAN: I want to table the parking, because I  
22 think it is really important. We have some folks waiting to



1 join us from the West Coast. And I think it is perfect  
2 timing. Well, let's turn on the TV.

3 Good morning to everyone out there. Do you just  
4 want to just quickly introduce yourselves, and then I am  
5 going to let folks know what you are going to talk about.

6 MS. POTICHA: I am Shelley Poticha, and I am the  
7 director of the Congress for the New Urbanism.

8 MS. BELZER: I am Dena Belzer, and I am a  
9 consultant with Strategic Economics here in Berkeley,  
10 California.

11 MR. DOLFINE: I am Barry Dolfine, and I am with the  
12 property development division of GSA in San Francisco.

13 MR. DONES: I am George Dones, and I am with the  
14 portfolio management division with GSA in San Francisco,  
15 Region 9.

16 MS. ALTMAN: Great. Thank you all. I am really  
17 glad that our folks from the regions could join us too this  
18 morning. We have been having a really interesting  
19 discussion. We are just at a point where we are ready to  
20 talk about some strategic location decisions. So Dena, I  
21 know you have this great presentation on Oakland, California  
22 and the federal building that we would like to hear about.



1           Just before we do that, Shelley, I do not know if  
2 you want to talk for a couple of minutes about sort of our  
3 partnership and some of the work that we have been trying to  
4 do around the country, and even about the project coming up  
5 next week.

6           MS. POTICHA: Yes, sure. The Congress for the New  
7 Urbanism is a nonprofit organization. We are a membership  
8 group with members all over the country. And Jonathan  
9 Barnette, who is with you in D.C., is on our board of  
10 directors. And we are very concerned about the health and  
11 vitality of cities. And because of that, we set up a  
12 partnership with the GSA's Center for Urban Development to  
13 really help with a lot of the work that you are now starting  
14 today.

15           And some of that will be an ongoing involvement in  
16 this process of developing the principles and policies. But  
17 we are also working to help look at specific places where GSA  
18 is locating the buildings and looking at their property  
19 investments. And one of those specifics is a workshop that  
20 we are going to be cohosting next week for the Southeast  
21 neighborhood in Washington, D.C. And that will be a  
22 corroborative effort between the Center for Urban



1 Development, GSA's National Capital Region, the D.C. Office  
2 of Planning, and CNU, along with a multitude of additional  
3 people participating.

4           So we are hoping that that can really become a  
5 demonstration of how the principles that you are talking  
6 about can come to light on a real site. And we are thinking  
7 that this may become a model where we do this in many other  
8 places around the country. So if you have any questions  
9 about that.

10           MS. ALTMAN: Great. Thank you, Shelly. Well,  
11 let's get started, Dena, with you and your presentation. I  
12 do not know if you want to give a little background. We have  
13 your presentation up on the screen, so we can go through it.

14       If you say next, we will go to the next slide, and we can  
15 see what you are seeing.

16           MS. BELZER: Are you going to start at the  
17 beginning or are you going to start with the open case study?

18           MS. ALTMAN: We have federal partners, local  
19 results up on the screen.

20           MS. BELZER: Okay, great. I see it.

21           MS. ALTMAN: Great, okay.

22           MS. BELZER: Let me just say that I gave this



1 presentation, as you can see, in February to a session at the  
2 Council for Urban Economic Development Conference at their  
3 Economic Development Summit 2000. And Hillary and I were on  
4 a panel together talking about federal and local  
5 corroboration.

6           One of the points that I was trying to point out to  
7 these local economic development people were the advantages  
8 of partnering with the federal government. And you can see  
9 that we identified a number of bullet points. I am not going  
10 to go through all of these, because we do not have a lot of  
11 time. I want to focus mostly on the federal building case  
12 study, but I am sure that we can get anybody who wants a copy  
13 of this presentation.

14           These are the advantages of federal partnerships  
15 for the federal government, and maybe we want to talk on this  
16 one for a minute. Mostly, these partnerships enhance the  
17 value of the federal government's financial investment. The  
18 federal government does not always think of themselves as an  
19 investor, but it probably should. We can use federal  
20 investments to leverage other kinds of federal programs and  
21 local investment. And we can create a better environment for  
22 employees, for federal employees. And this is a real issue



1 for every employer in the country at this point, work force  
2 retention. So we do not want to downplay that.

3 We see that we have criteria for selecting  
4 partnerships with the federal government. And again,  
5 remember that this is targeted towards local governments. So  
6 we are saying that you can look for opportunities to support  
7 your community goals. You can look for catalyst projects.  
8 You can look for projects that knit places together better,  
9 and for early pioneers in an area where the market is not  
10 there yet, but we can tell that it is coming.

11 There are a series of selection criteria. Again,  
12 for selecting good potential federal sites. Looking at the  
13 overall land use pattern, and looking at the existing  
14 services and amenities. And these are things that a  
15 developer would also look at, also trying to maximize the  
16 value of their investment. The quality and character of  
17 individual location of buildings, and existing concentrations  
18 of economic development. Undervalued real estate and the  
19 availability of services and amenities.

20 I have two open case studies here, but I am only  
21 going to present one I think. And then if you want to get  
22 into the other one, you can, but it is not a GSA project.



1           This just locates Oakland as a big black blob. You  
2 can see it, Oakland, California. The blue there is San  
3 Francisco Bay. And then you can see the San Francisco  
4 peninsula. So this just gives you a sense of Oakland.  
5 Oakland's population is about 390,000 people. It is  
6 currently about 42 percent African American, 34 percent  
7 white, and 16 percent Asian American. So it is a very  
8 diverse community. And it is a community that has been left  
9 out of a lot of the Bay area's economic activity over the  
10 last several decades. It has not had the same level of  
11 investment that other downtowns have had or other parts of  
12 the region.

13           So this case study, as I said, is the Oakland  
14 federal building. It is a million square feet of office  
15 space with 4000 employees. It cost approximately \$150  
16 million of direct federal investment. And the federal agency  
17 that is involved is GSA. We will go through a little bit  
18 more about this process.

19           So you can see that when we talk about selection  
20 criteria that I showed earlier in response to the first  
21 criteria about supporting community goals.

22           This is a map of downtown Oakland. And if I had my



1 laser pointer there, I would show you where. Let's just go  
2 on to the next slide, and it will illustrate better. Let me  
3 just make one point about Oakland in general. Oakland, like  
4 many other cities, had big urban renewal projects, and many  
5 schemes for what to do with their downtown. And in the  
6 1950s, Oakland began to really focus its high rise office  
7 building.

8           Let's go back to that one slide for one minute.  
9 You can see on the right-hand there, this is on the edge of a  
10 lake actually, Lake Merit. And this is not the historical  
11 core of Oakland's downtown, but it is where their office  
12 development began to concentrate in the late 1950s. And in  
13 the 1970s and 1980s, the city began to try to refocus their  
14 office development back into the more traditional core of  
15 their downtown, which is basically the point of this triangle  
16 that is created by two streets. Yes, right there. Thank  
17 you, good.

18           Those are the community goals. And then the  
19 selection criteria for why this particular site is viable and  
20 also from a regional perspective was to create a catalyst  
21 project to leverage other investment.

22           Now you can see where there are concentrations of



1 activity in Oakland, and where this one is outlined is where  
2 this office concentration was occurring starting in 1957 with  
3 the construction of the Kaiser Building, which is of course  
4 was Kaiser Aluminum and also became Kaiser Engineering, and  
5 then also became Kaiser Permanente, the first HMO in the  
6 country. So that was a tremendous catalyst for development  
7 again in the Lake Merit area.

8 Now the second area is where the historic core of  
9 downtown Oakland was, and where the city wanted to begin to  
10 focus its activity back, and where they began with urban  
11 renewal in the 1970s. This just fills in where the other  
12 areas where ultimately the city would like to see more  
13 development concentrated, and we will come back to that in a  
14 minute.

15 This shows the current location of the federal  
16 office building, just so you have a sense of the spatial  
17 relationship relative to the rest of the city.

18 Now we are zooming in on the blocks that are  
19 adjacent to the federal building. This is again where the  
20 historic core of downtown was. The Kaiser building was built  
21 in 1957. You remember where we saw that up on the left-hand  
22 corner of what is now the screen.



1           This is the first building that got built in the  
2 historic downtown core. And then in 1975, another building  
3 which is the Clorox building. You can see the sequence of  
4 buildings that fills in over about eighteen years. And in  
5 the early 1980s, Don Laier, who was a Toronto based developer  
6 acquired this whole city center area where the buildings are  
7 filling in now.

8           And they had Cesar Paley do a master plan for an  
9 urban business park. And again, you can see that we kept  
10 adding in buildings. But what happened was in 1989 that we  
11 had a very bad earthquake, and then followed immediately by a  
12 recession. And development in this area of Oakland stalled  
13 out.

14           In the early 1990s, we added one more increment of  
15 development. But the city was really concerned about what  
16 was going to be happening on these adjacent sites. And at  
17 that same time, the federal government was beginning to look  
18 for sites for a new definitely office building. They looked  
19 all over. I think that San Francisco also competed for this  
20 building. And Oakland said that they would give the federal  
21 government this land.

22           Here is where the GSA building fills in. I believe



1 it was completed in 1989. And you will see that it is really  
2 knitting together areas of the city that were more disparate.

3 And also, it was an early pioneer finishing out moving to  
4 the west from where the city center was going.

5 Now these sites that are marked in are all  
6 beginning to be proposed for development. And the largest  
7 site, which is adjacent, that one I believe was approved for  
8 development on Tuesday night by the Oakland City Council. I  
9 think that the primary tenant there is going to be Ask  
10 Jeeves, the Internet search engine. So suddenly, we are  
11 seeing a burst of high tech activity. Now again, this is ten  
12 years after this federal building was built.

13 We go back to this map of Oakland. And remember  
14 where the federal building is now. Again going back to where  
15 the Kaiser building was, the first node of really modern high  
16 rise activity.

17 Here is where the federal building is. And you can  
18 see how all of the blue buildings are the city center  
19 project, and that the federal building really finishes off  
20 that project. And where it says No. 2 just beyond that is an  
21 area called Preservation Park, which is a series of historic  
22 buildings or houses actually that were moved from a freeway



1 construction project and assembled into a very beautiful  
2 little historic area which houses all nonprofit  
3 organizations.

4 But there was really an issue of what would happen  
5 between city center and the freeway which is just west of  
6 there just to the left, and how to really get the rest of  
7 downtown going. The city center has really turned inward on  
8 itself. And it was a question of whether or not it would  
9 really help stimulate the rest of the area around it.

10 However now, you can see where the city government  
11 has rebuilt their city hall. It was really badly damaged in  
12 the earthquake. And where the red arrow to the left is part  
13 of that complex. And just beyond that is the new state  
14 office building.

15 So you see that we are beginning to get a real  
16 concentration of office development up to the north. But  
17 also then we have new investment moving to the south. And a  
18 lot of that, I believe, is because the federal building  
19 really filled in a very large gap there, and brought a lot of  
20 bodies into the downtown, and completed this whole segment  
21 which had been started but was unable to complete.

22 You will see that where the city is really trying



1 to move now is up towards this Area 4 which is called uptown.  
2 And in fact, in February just before I gave this talk in the  
3 same week, this was the headline in the San Francisco  
4 Chronicle, Another Grand Plan, talking about 2000 housing  
5 units that are now planned in that uptown area. And without  
6 this development on both sides pushing into the middle of  
7 this very run down area of downtown Oakland, it is unlikely  
8 that this kind of investment would be happening.

9 So summarizing the project benefits. We see that  
10 we have closed a major hole in downtown Oakland. This  
11 project really stabilized the city center area. It supported  
12 a tremendous amount of street retail and a major pedestrian  
13 quarter.

14 And what we have next are some pictures of the  
15 building itself. This is facing from the city center  
16 project. I have a 180 degree photograph so you can see if  
17 you were standing in the city center pedestrian way, you  
18 could see how that looked, but it was too big to e-mail, so  
19 you all do not have it. But this gives you a sense of what  
20 the building looks like. If you have not seen it, it is very  
21 beautiful.

22 This is just a picture of the building at night,



1 and it creates quite a signature for downtown Oakland. You  
2 can see it from all over the East Bay. This is one more shot  
3 of the building at night, and that is it.

4 Create places and not projects. I think that this  
5 is one of the most important things about this federal  
6 building. Again, it closed a major gap physically but also  
7 economically in a time when there was no development going on  
8 in Oakland. And Oakland, as I said, was stalled out way  
9 behind the rest of the regional economy in terms of capturing  
10 on its development.

11 And this building really helped to create a  
12 signature office building for downtown Oakland. And now when  
13 the economy is very strong, I think that it really helps to  
14 direct development in places where the city really needs and  
15 wants it to go, because it really frame where development  
16 should be for the rest of the city.

17 MS. ALTMAN: Thank you, Dena.

18 Does anyone have any comments on that? We were  
19 talking about one of the principles earlier of sort of making  
20 strategic regional location decisions. And I think that this  
21 is an example of a decision that we made with a city that  
22 made perfect sense. It was the right decision, and it was



1 also very thoughtful.

2 Do you guys know how or why we made that decision?

3 I guess I am interested in getting at sort of the  
4 ingredients that helped us get there.

5 MS. BELZER: Being at the right time at the right  
6 place is what you are saying. The city was giving the land.

7 The city was very eager to have this building. The city  
8 really recognized that there is would be a tremendous asset  
9 for them, and that it would be a very good partnership.

10 MS. ALTMAN: It is a hundred percent federal  
11 tenants, right?

12 MS. BELZER: Yes.

13 MS. ALTMAN: What you could not see on the slide  
14 that was too large to e-mail was all of the retail along the  
15 corridor that links directly to the BART transit and from the  
16 building.

17 MS. ALTMAN: Janet Preisser has a question.

18 MS. PREISSER: I was just wondering when the  
19 community became involved and brought this site up. I was  
20 wondering how far along the project was before you found out  
21 about the site, or do you know?

22 MS. ALTMAN: I guess all of the mikes are not on.



1 But Janet was wondering -- I am sorry, repeat your question  
2 again.

3 MS. PREISSER: I was wondering when they brought  
4 the city in.

5 MS. ALTMAN: At what point did the city get  
6 involved in the decision, when they came to offer the site,  
7 when we were searching for sites?

8 MS. BELZER: My understanding is that there was  
9 essentially like a RFP process where the federal government  
10 was soliciting proposals from cities.

11 MS. ALTMAN: And it was throughout the Bay area?

12 MS. BELZER: That is correct. And I know that they  
13 were competing primarily with a site in San Francisco. There  
14 is not a lot of institutional memory about how this project  
15 came about. So I seem a little sketchy about the details,  
16 that is why.

17 MS. ALTMAN: We have a former city employee here.  
18 I do not know if you have any memory of how the project came  
19 about.

20 A PARTICIPANT: No, I do not. I have no  
21 institutional memory.

22 MR. GIBLIN: I have a question here. Do we have



1 any sense or even a guesstimate for how much of the  
2 development would have happened anyway as the economy  
3 improved or how much might be attributable to our capping  
4 that development?

5 MS. BELZER: It is very hard. It is a good  
6 question. And you who are familiar with development know, it  
7 is very hard to say what would or would not have happened if  
8 this federal building had not gone in. But I do think that  
9 it sets a certain tone in terms of the quality of the  
10 development. And as I said earlier, it really finishes off  
11 the location that needed to be finished off. And then the  
12 city can really concentrate on getting other sites done.

13 At this point, any real estate in the Bay area is  
14 extremely valuable. And if this good economy lasts much  
15 longer, there will not be any development sites left  
16 anywhere. So it is hard to say what would have happened if  
17 there is building had not gone in. But it does again set a  
18 very important tone for the quality and character of  
19 development.

20 It was also I think a big inducement to bring the  
21 state office building. And I also think that it created a  
22 large incentive for the city to go back and rehab their



1 historic city hall after the earthquake. And if this federal  
2 investment had not been there, the city might not have been  
3 as interested in investing as much money as they did in  
4 creating a very beautiful civic complex for downtown. So I  
5 do not think that it is just about private investment but it  
6 is also other kinds of public investment that have also  
7 really made a very strong statement about concentrated  
8 activity right in this poor area, the historic poor area of  
9 downtown Oakland.

10 MS. ALTMAN: One of the things that we have been  
11 talking about are these principles for livable communities,  
12 and making strategic location decisions. And I think we have  
13 talked a little bit about site selection here. And I think  
14 it is very interesting, Dena, that you raised the selection  
15 criteria, which are to support community goals, and to be a  
16 catalyst project, to sort of be a knitting together project.  
17 And also, to be an early pioneer, and also to build on some  
18 things that we discussed earlier this morning.

19 Bruce Katz had raised the point that cities are  
20 fundamentally diverse. And Oakland it seems is a city that  
21 came forward with a need and was very aggressive about  
22 wanting to make this project work. The other idea is sort of



1 this connection to the private sector and mixed use. That  
2 ingredient was there too. And the third is the idea of  
3 innovation, and ways that we can be innovators. And this  
4 clearly was a project that enabled us to do something new.

5           So I think that the ingredients are all there. But  
6 it also lends toward selection criteria, and some things that  
7 we should be looking for as we are make these kinds of  
8 decisions. Ones that we can actually support these four  
9 points, support what the community goals are. Is that  
10 something that we can work into a policy which says we need  
11 to sort of look carefully at what those are.

12           That we need to look at what the catalytic effect  
13 is going to be. And we need to look at what the outcome is  
14 going to be, and how it is going to knit together in existing  
15 communities. To have some understanding of the market and  
16 what the city is proposing. And also, is there not sort of  
17 pioneering ability.

18           I just want to put on the table that I think that  
19 those are some criteria that we really need to be looking at  
20 across the board as we make location decisions at a  
21 particular site.

22           Do you all have any comments on that?



1 MS. BELZER: I just want to say one more point  
2 about this regional decision making and looking at a  
3 particular site in the regional context. Oakland has clearly  
4 lacked behind the rest of the rest of the region in private  
5 real estate investment over the last several decades. And I  
6 think that to invest in Oakland as opposed to San Francisco,  
7 which will always capture the upside in an up market was also  
8 a very good and important decision.

9 And I think that we have to really emphasize that  
10 you cannot just look at a site necessarily relative to one  
11 particular city, but also relative to the overall region, the  
12 way that is developing, and how that can or cannot steer  
13 development into a particular area.

14 Because many of the downtowns, many communities are  
15 experiencing still severe divestment. And that is a regional  
16 issue. It is not a local issue for a city.

17 MS. ALTMAN: Does anyone have any other comments?

18 MS. BARNES-GELT: I just want to compliment Dena on  
19 the incredible velocity of her skill at running Power Point.

20 MS. ALTMAN: It is 3000 miles away. That is great.

21 Well, let me just begin to at least sum up what has  
22 been a pretty interesting morning in which we have only begun



1 to touch on so many of the issues that have been put on the  
2 table. And again, this strategy session is just day one of  
3 what is going to be a pretty long process. We will be  
4 meeting in smaller groups after this to really refine, and  
5 draw upon, and further discuss some of the ideas that we are  
6 coming up with today.

7           But we have talked about this. I think that  
8 Oakland is a very interesting example of not only how we can  
9 make a location decision and what criteria can be for that,  
10 but also it is very much about investing in an infill and  
11 urban location in a way that makes sense. It is a  
12 development near transit. I think that is another criteria  
13 that we really need to be proposing as a policy.

14           It is also a real way to leverage investment. I  
15 mean that is our fourth principle. Or it is our fifth now,  
16 because we added on in between. But really looking also at  
17 the sort of partnership issue with the city, and with the  
18 local government there, and with the private business who had  
19 sort of filled in the rest of that site. So it is a good  
20 example to help us begin to think about what some of the  
21 criteria can be for our policies, and things that we want to  
22 be reviewing.



1           I want to close, and we will come back at 2:00.  
2   The lunch is downstairs. It is Philip Angelides, the  
3   California state treasurer, who I hear is really, really  
4   interesting. We are going to assign breakout groups when we  
5   come back at 2:00. So if you could sort of be right here at  
6   2:00, that would be great. And we will add a group for the  
7   new principle of community development and partnerships as  
8   well.

9           (At 12:20 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

A F T E R N O O N   S E S S I O N

19

(3:20 p.m.)

20

21

22



1 want to hear from, maybe five minutes each or so. I hope you  
2 have a spokes person. We will start with Group 1 and 7. We  
3 did not really separate the subjects. Make strategic and  
4 regional location decisions. And the seventh principle,  
5 which I do not know exactly, but keep all people involved,  
6 make the right partnerships, et cetera, on the local and  
7 regional level. Ed Guillard for a second or two.

8 MR. GUILLARD: We talked about a lot about  
9 communication. How in the decision making process, how the  
10 city and the federal government, the GSA and the federal  
11 agencies, learn what each other is doing or interested in  
12 doing, and how they can learn about that earlier rather than  
13 later. The challenge for the cities in general is first of  
14 all what is the interest of the federal agency that they  
15 might be dealing with, and who represents the federal  
16 agencies. Because GSA represents some federal agencies but  
17 not all of them. So is it GSA or another federal agency with  
18 specific authority to do real estate deals.

19 And then second of all, for the client agencies  
20 that GSA represents, what are the particular interests of  
21 those clients. And for a city, it would be very beneficial  
22 to know as much as possible about GSA or other federal



1 agencies, just to know what their interests are, who to  
2 contact, what they are going to want, what their real estate  
3 interests are, and what their preferences are and are not.

4           Sometimes in the pre-planning stage, even if you  
5 know that a particular federal agency would not want to be in  
6 an urban area or would not want to be downtown, there may be  
7 a way to work with their expectations and accommodate their  
8 real concerns about being in an urban area. If you know  
9 beforehand what the issues are, you can better be able to  
10 address ultimately what they decide to do.

11           As another agency as an example, we talked about  
12 the post office. And the issue with the post office is  
13 actually a Senate bill to encourage the post office to be in  
14 an urban area. But even right now, the question is the post  
15 office a federal agency like other federal agencies or not,  
16 or they are different, or are they subject to the same laws  
17 that are already on the books for federal agencies, or are  
18 they not. So this is just another point of confusion.

19           We talked about that it is great to have the  
20 federal government willing to participate in fringe areas and  
21 some of the more distressed areas on the fringe between  
22 distressed areas and developed areas. And it is a great



1 opportunity for urban redevelopment.

2           And we also note that in keeping with HUD's  
3 language where they funnel their money, they not only funnel  
4 it to eliminate urban blight, but to prevent blight to take  
5 its place. So there is an opportunity for properties on  
6 locations in the inner suburbs that prevent the area from  
7 deteriorating further.

8           We talked about the RFP process. We were lucky  
9 that we had two GSA people in our meeting. Pam Wessling, who  
10 was just introduced, talked about the RFP process, and how  
11 the decision on where to locate, generally the mayor or the  
12 city does get a first crack at saying that they want to  
13 define it as this area.           They decide what that area  
14 is in the central business district or one that is extended  
15 out a little bit further. Yet there are still exceptions to  
16 these rules in a particular agency such as the FBI that would  
17 be unwilling to locate anywhere where their front or their  
18 security is not enough, that the setback is not large enough  
19 to give them the security that they need. So again, there  
20 are issues with specific agencies.

21           And then finally, Pam talked about GRPS pilots,  
22 which several or a handful of cities around the country have



1 developed a single point of contact for all federal agencies  
2 regarding real estate. That could be a good tie in or a good  
3 link with the cities to be able to find out more about this  
4 multi-hatted monster that they call the federal government.

5 One other thing. We talk about the federal  
6 octopus, but there is also the local city octopus. So the  
7 challenge there is how can the federal government come down  
8 and know who to talk to at the city. And I talked about my  
9 experiences that there are always multi-agencies to help us.

10 So that challenge works both ways. And at least one place  
11 to start is certainly the city economic development  
12 department and the city planning department. But that is not  
13 where you end, but certainly it is a start.

14 MR. GIEFER: Thanks, Ed. And thank you, John, Pam,  
15 and Tonya too, that group.

16 The next one is Group 2, offer transportation  
17 alternatives. They had a lively discussion over in the  
18 corner there.

19 MR. CHEN: We came up with four categories of  
20 recommendations. The first one that we would recommend GSA  
21 to design for choice and safety. When we talk about choice,  
22 we are talking about transportation, and commuting choice, of



1 course. And this applies to not just the creation of new  
2 facilities, but also renovation of existing facilities or  
3 leasing facilities.

4 Just to use a real world example of what can  
5 happen. When my office was looking for office space, we  
6 negotiated with a bunch of real estate entities downtown, and  
7 required that bicycle parking and showers be made available.

8 There were a number of buildings that were competing. One  
9 of the buildings that did not have parking wanted to be more  
10 competitive. They went out of their way to establish these  
11 amenities for us. They got the contract, and we moved in.  
12 So that was a very win-win story for everyone around.

13 And we talked a lot about safety and figuring out  
14 the extent to which design can ensure better safety. And I  
15 think with regard to bicycle, and pedestrian, and transit  
16 access, those factors are also very important, not just from  
17 a terrorism standpoint, but also from a basic bicycling, et  
18 cetera, safety standpoint. So that is the first category.

19 The second category is location efficiency. And  
20 this has to do, of course, with some of the aspects that  
21 other people will be talking about in terms of infill and  
22 location locating downtown, but also in collocating the



1 facility near existing transit stations, bicycle paths,  
2 pedestrian plazas. And also collocating services at  
3 different sites. I understand that GSA already does a lot of  
4 collocation day care centers. And there are dry cleaners and  
5 other types of businesses that generally pop up around these  
6 facilities. And that is something that we think should  
7 continue in all of the different phases of GSA's work.

8           The other two categories are linked. They have to  
9 do with setting goals for reducing single occupancy vehicle  
10 commuting, and implementing programs to achieve those goals.

11       The first of those is setting goals. And what we came up  
12 with is first of all figuring out the potential to reduce  
13 single occupancy vehicle travel.

14           For example, you could take the addresses of all of  
15 the employees in the facility, and figure out what the  
16 potential would be for them to get to that facility. Using  
17 commuter sheds. This is a concept that basically borrows  
18 from the watershed analogy. You look at the different  
19 transit lines throughout a region and how well they service a  
20 particular GSA site, and you look at the number of people who  
21 live within a quarter mile of the transit stop or a transit  
22 station, or perhaps a bike path or something like that.



1           And you also look at the distance that people live  
2 from the actual facility itself. So you can figure out how  
3 many people can walk. That would represent an optimal  
4 number. Of course, a lot of people would have to get a car  
5 and drive their kids to God knows where and then come back.

6           After going through that process and setting goals,  
7 then comes the task of implementing that program. And I  
8 understand that in the National Capital Region that there are  
9 already transportation command managers for most agencies,  
10 but that is not the case outside of the D.C. region.

11           And so what we would suggest to GSA is to utilize  
12 the managers that you already have working for you. I  
13 understand that there are building managers, and they are  
14 account managers for different clients. And trying to get  
15 them involved in managing the commutes to those facilities  
16 would be a recommendation from us as well.

17           We also noted that there is an executive order out  
18 there. That is by the way is an executive order to offer  
19 transit benefits to federal employees. That is easier said  
20 than done, of course. And we would like to see that expanded  
21 to all modes.

22           MS. JONES: Just one other thing. And that was in



1 selecting locations, looking at what is on the existing  
2 master plan of the areas in which those locations are to be  
3 placed for either expanded transit services or plan to buy  
4 pedestrian facilities. And use the location of the facility  
5 on that site as a way to jump start those planned  
6 alternative, if you will, transportation facilities that  
7 already exist.

8           We have examples of that from the National Capital  
9 Region. The trailer at the ATF site is a way that they are  
10 able to use the location of that as a transit station to push  
11 a planned project forward. So it is an opportunity to give a  
12 jump start to alternative facilities that are already on  
13 existing master plans.

14           MR. GIEFER: Thank you, bikers and walkers.

15           The third principle, to invest in infill and urban  
16 locations. Regina was the facilitator. Is there a speaker?

17           MS. COGAN: We had three folks from GSA, and then  
18 there were two others from outside of GSA. We looked at the  
19 principle invest in infill and urban locations. We said  
20 okay, this is not that easy. So we started talking first  
21 about the challenges to investing in infill and urban  
22 locations. And we noted four basic challenges.



1           One is that there is a basic lack of information on  
2 the availability of the sites, infill sites or buildings that  
3 may be appropriate or available for rehabilitation. We then  
4 noted that there was also a lack of visibility or an identity  
5 associated with GSA. Many people in the community or even  
6 people within the federal government do not really actually  
7 understand what GSA is.

8           The third challenge was that there is a building  
9 use question, what does the client need. And we talked that  
10 a potential problem is that the Army recruiting offices may  
11 feel like they need to be, in the Midwest for example, that  
12 they need to be in a suburban location where they have the  
13 best chance of actually recruiting people. So that is a  
14 challenge, if you are trying to local urban infill sites.

15           And then also the last challenge being for lack of  
16 a better term thinking outside of the box, going beyond the  
17 norm. And it was mentioned that somebody had called a  
18 community saying that they had a perfect site on Main Street,  
19 and somebody put them in touch with a leasing agent in the  
20 field. And the leasing agent was basically unwilling for  
21 whatever reason to engage in a conversation.

22           So we decided that there were a number of solutions



1 that we would to propose. One to deal with the question of  
2 information is that GSA would work better with the  
3 improvement districts or downtown associations, as well as  
4 working with local government or community organizations.

5 Often the downtown organizations or local  
6 governments know where the sites are, and could really assist  
7 GSA in finding the information that they need.

8 The second point was in order to better market GSA  
9 both to the community and other federal agencies, we thought  
10 that they should engage in a public awareness campaign. And  
11 this had many elements, and we started off on a whole spiral  
12 of different things. I believe it was actually in the  
13 material. That the ground floor in government buildings  
14 could actually be service oriented. So people could walk in  
15 off the street and go in and deal with whatever it is, and  
16 hopefully have a more pleasant experience with the  
17 government.

18 Also, we also talked about a great way to engage  
19 the community is to engage children. And we thought that  
20 wouldn't it be wonderful if GSA found a new site and needed  
21 to design a new building. And you actually had kids, fifth  
22 graders or sixth graders, do a little building design program



1 themselves.

2           They have a program here called City Vision at the  
3 National Building Museum. And it is amazing what these kids  
4 can design. And, of course, the building is built by an  
5 architect. You could actually display some of those best  
6 designs from the kids in the foyer.

7           Also, we talked about maybe doing some work with  
8 junior achievement, and really instilling a sense of the  
9 importance of our buildings in communities with high schools  
10 and junior high schools.

11           And the last solution that we talked about. I have  
12 been to a number of conferences the last few months, and it  
13 seems like everyone is saying the same thing. We should make  
14 infill and urban location decisions easier for everyone, why  
15 not make it so easy that it is the obvious choice for a new  
16 location decision.

17           And we thought that a couple of ways to make those  
18 location decisions easier would be again to pass that  
19 information to GSA. It is a two-way street. The community  
20 needs to communicate with GSA, and GSA needs to communicate  
21 to the community what their needs are.

22           And then also we thought that it would very



1 important to engage in educating both the leasing agent and  
2 also the federal agencies that are reflecting on a new  
3 building. We heard that what happens, if I understand this  
4 correctly, is if EPA needs a new building in some city, that  
5 they would call up GSA and say what the requirements are.  
6 And GSA actually would not know what their properties are.  
7 So EPA wanted to locate in the suburbs, and that is the first  
8 place that GSA starts, that is a problem too. So we thought  
9 that education both within the leasing agencies and the  
10 federal agencies would help.

11 MR. GIEFER: Thank you, Jessica.

12 Team 4, how to seek ways to leverage investment,  
13 facilitated by Frank Giblin.

14 MS. BARNES-GELT: I will be brief, and look to my  
15 colleagues to pitch in. We had a pretty wide ranging  
16 conversation, as you can imagine, because it took us twice as  
17 long as it took anybody else to get there. But I think that  
18 we agreed that Philip Angelides gave an inspiring speech  
19 today, and we need to start thinking in terms of the double  
20 bottom line. And perhaps taking a step back and beginning  
21 with a marketing plan.

22 And a marketing plan would develop who is the



1 client, and it is multi-layers. The client is the  
2 communities that we locate in. It is the agencies that we  
3 serve. And it is the people who actually work in the  
4 agencies that we serve. And in some cases, there is a pretty  
5 good overlap. And in some cases, there is almost no overlap.

6

7           And we decided that the GSA had in this kind of  
8 marketing and implementation strategy a three-pronged role at  
9 the very least. A role as the convener to those various  
10 partners, including the federal government. Essentially, the  
11 idea is to get people actually talking to each other the way  
12 that Hillary and Harriet talk, and Don as well. So you have  
13 got somebody over in Transportation talking to someone in EPA  
14 talking to someone in GSA, and hopefully talking to someone  
15 even at the post office. So we think that would solve a lot  
16 of problems.

17           Then obviously, the GSA has a huge role as the  
18 developer of real estate and the disposer of real estate.  
19 And I was happy to learn that particularly when it comes to  
20 disposal, that the community voice is big, no pun intended.

21           And I am throwing this in, and this is me since I  
22 am a politician. I do not always agree with the consensus.



1 I also think that disposal with a bias to residential. A lot  
2 of us, John particularly, felt that residential, residential,  
3 residential ought to be a big piece of everything that the  
4 GSA does.

5           And I think that there should be, and this is me  
6 again, extra points appointed, even if the community is not  
7 visionary enough to understand that this building that is  
8 being abandoned in the middle of the downtown, especially in  
9 a small town, especially like the wonderful post office  
10 building or some fabulous neoclassical building, maybe should  
11 be given over to artist lofts or something that would  
12 actually bring life back to a downtown.

13           I am all for issuing extra points for giving  
14 residential use highest priority on disposal, even though  
15 locals might not see it that way. You can a leader i that  
16 regard.

17           Obviously, there is a big role in new facilities.  
18 And again, that is where that marketing to partners really  
19 becomes important. And marketing to other colleagues in the  
20 government vis-a-vis the discussion that we had earlier about  
21 the Denver federal and the post office across the street.

22           The other thing that we talked about that I thought



1 was really innovative was the use of GSA procurement as a  
2 catalyst for economic development. And somebody gave a great  
3 example about brooms.

4 MR. MCILWAIN: Tony was the one who hit on it.  
5 There have been all kinds of procurement for minority and  
6 women owned businesses. But there is some new thinking about  
7 procuring from specific geographic locations. So if you  
8 could tie procurement priorities to enterprise zones and  
9 empowerment zones for businesses located in there.

10 And there has been a very successful example of  
11 that in Washington with a small company, a fellow who started  
12 to make brooms, and got some contracts with Safeway and  
13 Giant. And it supported the growth of a business in a  
14 disadvantaged area.

15 MS. BARNES-GELT: We thought that was really  
16 thinking outside of the box.

17 To sum up, and then I want my colleagues to chip  
18 in, we also felt strongly, and Harriet was extremely  
19 articulate on this point, that we need to broaden the  
20 measurements that we use. So instead of just talking about  
21 the cheapest, quickest, fastest, on time, and on budget, we  
22 need to talk about the full menu of costs, life cycle cost



1 gains, sustainability of materials, and doing measurements, as  
2 the EPA does on fuel burning and using up highways.

3           And we thought that the various agencies that have  
4 expertise in this area could come together, and maybe create  
5 some guidelines that they should ship out to the different  
6 regions, and the guidelines would be relative to cities,  
7 towns, and rural communities. That when the local person  
8 pulls the criteria off the database, that included in the  
9 regular criteria is this sort of broader measure of  
10 sustainability.

11           I think that one was particularly intriguing,  
12 because it gets to the underlying values of mixed use,  
13 sustainable development, residential, and creative  
14 procurement. So we thought that was something that was  
15 pretty doable, and again pretty doable as it would relate to  
16 whatever you call that thing. I call it the Office of  
17 Management and Budget, but that is really not what it is, is  
18 it?

19           MS. FREGONING: It is OMB, but we were talking  
20 about OPM. But also the productivity measurements would be  
21 of interest too.

22           MS. BARNES-GELT: So we can actually get very



1 bottom line with cost cutting members of our Congress. I  
2 suspect that I left much out. So I encourage other people on  
3 our team to pitch in.

4 MR. GIBLIN: We went around the horn at the last  
5 minute. The double bottom line was key, and like that was  
6 something that was mentioned right off the bat at the  
7 beginning of the day, that Commissioner Peck mentioned. That  
8 certain business interests or bottom line measurable issues  
9 of different stakeholders, that it is really important to be  
10 able to measure those things. And right now, there are a lot  
11 of things that are very difficult to measure.

12 And then we need to go out and reach each of those  
13 stakeholders in different ways. OMB and Congress may  
14 approach it in a different way, but they all need to  
15 understand the double bottom line.

16 Someone also said that in order to make leverage  
17 work that we have to be thinking about serving the community  
18 as much as our client agencies. Again, that is really a  
19 broader issue. And it is just that we need all of our  
20 stakeholders, especially those that control budget or  
21 authorities for us, to understand the broader mission, and we  
22 need to buy into that.



1           In order to work with communities and leverage, we  
2 need to be flexible. And that means jumping in quickly when  
3 a community is having a planning process going. We need to  
4 be responsive to that. And we also have to be proactive and  
5 understand that a community might not know about our actions,  
6 but we can anticipate that they would have an interest, and  
7 we need to approach them right off the bat.

8           We touched on encouragement for residential again.

9           We talked about building places and not buildings. And then  
10 finally again that the client is so important in doing  
11 everything, because our primary mission is serving the  
12 clients. And if we cannot get them to buy into these issues,  
13 it is very difficult to do any kind of leverage.

14           MR. GIEFER: Thank you very much, Susan, and Frank,  
15 and that whole group. As many of you know, a lot of these  
16 things are outside of what GSA does and can do. But the  
17 whole idea here is to brainstorm.

18           MR. MCILWAIN: Can do as of today. We are here to  
19 say you may be able to do it in the future.

20           MR. GIEFER: Yes, thank you.

21           Group 5, promote mixed use, live-work-play, 24 hour  
22 cities. Who wants to speak on that? We have about ten



1 minutes left in the day.

2 MS. MORRIS: I have a jumble of recommendations and  
3 issues here. The overriding theme of our group was that the  
4 GSA buildings need to be a full participant in the  
5 communities, both in the community at large and in the  
6 immediate vicinity where they are located.

7 In terms of the 24 hour city, I think that there is  
8 so much going on right now within cities themselves to bring  
9 housing downtown, to do infill development in downtowns, that  
10 GSA needs to capitalize on the efforts that are under way  
11 already.

12 The issues that we pointed to are the ones that we  
13 have been talking about all day. Of course, security. We  
14 were very big on Harriet's point about the need to minimize a  
15 federal presence where possible, and to remove the bulls-eye  
16 so to speak. Issues of ownership, what can you do, and what  
17 can you not do in terms of the percentage of the buildings  
18 that can be leased or used by non-government agencies.

19 And then, of course, issues of parking. One thing  
20 that we did not talk about but that I would like to mention  
21 is the need to really revisit parking requirements that you  
22 use to apply to federal buildings, and not assume that the



1 standards that have been in place for many years are the ones  
2 that still need to exist.

3           There has been a lot of damage that has been done  
4 through ITE parking requirements that people take as a given,  
5 whether it is four spaces per 1000 square feet or whatever  
6 that are creating the excess parking problems that we have.  
7 And of course, allowing the trips that can be made by  
8 alternative modes to count towards vehicle trips that are  
9 applied to each building.

10           In terms of the recommendations as far as the  
11 historic buildings, we think that we should use flexibility  
12 to pursue policies of mixed use, and be very open minded  
13 about the types of uses that may be allowed in the buildings.

14       The residential component was mentioned. In terms of  
15 leasing, to continue to do what you are doing already, which  
16 is to look downtown or at existing sites rather than green  
17 field sites.

18 For old buildings, the issue was to go to Congress to expand  
19 the authority for who can lease GSA buildings.

20           We have a bunch of solutions here. This is in  
21 terms of the space itself in the immediate vicinity of the  
22 buildings. To look at programming special events in and



1 around GSA buildings. The example that I gave was when I  
2 lived in Chicago where the federal plaza is used for a  
3 farmers market all summer, and for the October fest.

4 We looked at planned amenities and activities  
5 around buildings like the Miami courthouse example where  
6 approved kiosks and parks are going to be included. And  
7 also, the example that we saw earlier today where pedestrian  
8 connections are allowed to be made through these large  
9 facilities. They seem to be so big, that you often cut off  
10 connections that people make on foot. And we think it is  
11 important to be welcoming to bring people through spaces to  
12 allow them to see what is there to make them less foreboding.

13 The issue was raised to look at the authorities  
14 that were given to the Reagan Building, and try to apply them  
15 elsewhere. A type of an applied livability criteria when  
16 making leasing decisions. So the types of tenants that you  
17 have would promote the 24 hour city. And again, delivering  
18 the federal presence.

19 MR. GIEFER: Thanks, Marya, and the group.

20 One more group and then we will wrap up. Group 6  
21 talked about considering the effect of technology on space  
22 needs.



1           MR. HARDING: It is kind of ironic that we are  
2 using technology and we are using a flip chart. What we did  
3 is we started to talk about the changing work place, and how  
4 the changing work place is going to dramatically change the  
5 way that we look at real property. We talked a bit about  
6 tele-work centers, which currently are being used, and are in  
7 many ways are being band-aids. It seemed like a good  
8 approach, but it does not appear to be answering the real  
9 need. And there is a question of is this also a reflection  
10 of larger urban sprawl issues.

11           A PARTICIPANT: What is a tele-work center?

12           MR. HARDING: A tele-work center is location  
13 outside of the urban area, and is set up for employees to  
14 come into. It is sort of like a partial way station than to  
15 come and do work on a part-time or full-time basis.

16           A PARTICIPANT: And do we have that in the federal  
17 government?

18           MR. HARDING: Yes. So what we are talking about in  
19 the tele-centers is actually it is an extension on the way to  
20 tele-work, where everybody in our agency is now considered to  
21 be a tele-worker. Where you work and where you do your work  
22 are all determined by how it is that you are going to get



1 your job done. And what this becomes is if you look at some  
2 of the things to be done in the private sector, instead of  
3 fully built-out offices, they are going to basically white  
4 boxes where you come in and you plug in and you do your work,  
5 and you move on. And what type of changes will this make in  
6 the type of real property that the federal government holds.

7           One of the other issues that we looked at was  
8 considerations for storage and archiving demands. We are  
9 being told that we are moving into a paperless environment.  
10 I am not there yet, and there is still going to be a need to  
11 archive. And how you archive, and where you archive, and how  
12 you connect to those archives is something that technology is  
13 going to be important in.

14           Client interaction. There are some federal  
15 functions like the Social Security Administration where you  
16 have a population that needs to have face to face contact.  
17 Those types of services, you are going to have to deal with  
18 those on a people to people basis. However, as the  
19 population changes and moving toward the idea of information  
20 kiosks, as are being set up in some communities now, where  
21 you can go to a kiosk in a mall and get a lot of information  
22 about federal programs and how to access those federal



1 programs. How many ways are we going to be able to transfer  
2 the technology use like this.

3 One of the thoughts is that the kiosk can be used  
4 for permitting also. Right now in Phoenix if you want to  
5 draw a recreation permit, you have to go into the central  
6 business district with your truck, with your trailer, with  
7 your horse pulled behind you to draw a permit. There is no  
8 reason to think that the technology will not allow permits to  
9 be drawn out in the kiosk in the near future.

10 MR. MCILWAIN: Is a kiosk like the ATM, or is it  
11 the kiosk a small office?

12 MR. HARDING: It is a machine, an informational  
13 machine that is set up for the non-technologicals to get  
14 their information.

15 A PARTICIPANT: Could we assume that one day you  
16 may be also be able to pick it up at home on the Internet?

17 MR. HARDING: I think that is a safe assumption.  
18 But again, these are all going to have impacts on what you  
19 own, and what you lease, and where you have it. The question  
20 was raised about using geographic information systems and  
21 global positioning systems. Using those jointly would be a  
22 way to be able to track development in how development is



1 moving through a community. How your population is changing.

2 Again, useful information.

3 The changing work place. In changing to the  
4 integrated work place, the integrated work place is a  
5 situation where you look at the work you do and how to get  
6 the job done, and then look at the pieces that are going to  
7 support that. Right now, a lot of people think that work  
8 stations are a solution, but there are extensions of that.

9 The Federal Technology Service moved into new space  
10 a year and a half ago with fully set up work stations. All  
11 of their phones are being moved out of the system, because  
12 everyone now has a cell phone that is in a holster, so you  
13 are readily accessible wherever you are. Again, impacts on  
14 the overall real estate.

15 I think that one of the things that we saw this  
16 morning, the idea of meeting dynamics. It was great to be  
17 able to connect with the people from California, but how  
18 different is that from a face to face meeting with people.  
19 There are also locational concerns once you become very, very  
20 technological when you are using antennas and when you are  
21 using communication dishes. What about security, and what  
22 about privacy. Are there locations where you would impact



1 neighbors or neighboring uses would impact you. Again, that  
2 becomes a locational decision.

3 And then ultimately the integration of all services  
4 within an agency like GSA where PBS, the Federal Technology  
5 Service, and the Federal Supply Service, the major branches  
6 of our organization, will be able to provide turnkey service  
7 to any federal customer.

8 These are less immediate issues, but these are  
9 certainly things that are going to have a real effect on  
10 where the government is five, ten, and twenty years from now.

11 And then sort of a side bar piece. It came up in a number  
12 of different discussions this morning. There are a whole  
13 series of executive orders out there involving urban location  
14 transits sustainability. And there is a real need to align  
15 all of these, so that when we make locational decisions that  
16 they serve both the urban center and align the investments in  
17 transportation and infrastructure, and the overall  
18 sustainable outcomes of a federal location in an urban area.

19

20 MR. GIEFER: Thanks, Bob. Maria.

21 MS. ZIMMERMAN: On technology, I think that I  
22 personally fall into this category. That I assume because I



1 have technology that everybody has it and has access to it,  
2 and has the same speed technology. Hearing about this gap in  
3 income, there is a huge technology gap as well.

4 And so while we are rushing to embrace that, there  
5 needs to be equity considerations not only in our using it to  
6 disseminate information, but also is there a way that we can  
7 achieve greater equity, is there a way to use the technology  
8 that we are using, so school students can have their training  
9 in technology and access to it. Maybe as we are rushing to  
10 change technology systems, that there is a way that we can  
11 give our old systems to people to facilitate training and  
12 access.

13 MR. HEBERT: Well, that program is in place.  
14 Computers to Schools is a program of the administration in  
15 which we participate. And we have a number of school  
16 districts who come get the computers, and are very thankful  
17 for the 386 versions. So there is a gap there.

18 MS. BARNES-GELT: We have had problems with that.  
19 We have tried to do that in Denver, and the school district  
20 does not want our computers.

21 MR. HEBERT: Send them to us.

22 MS. BARNES-GELT: Perhaps we should.



1 MR. HEBERT: There are a lot of takers.

2 MR. HARDING: We should have a broader definition  
3 of technology. It encompasses not just information  
4 technologies, but also technologies in buildings and building  
5 materials, and how we put our spaces together, and how we  
6 maximize sunlight within the work space. There are all sorts  
7 of technologies that apply to the other set of issues that we  
8 are dealing with. So I think that we ought to put that up  
9 there and consider it for further discussion.

10 MS. ALTMAN: Does anyone else have anything other  
11 thoughts from any of the groups or on the comments that we  
12 heard?

13 (No response.)

14 MS. ALTMAN: I am going to ask Bob to just make  
15 some closing remarks, and then I am going to wrap it up, as  
16 we are getting on to 4:00.

17 MR. PECK: I apologize. I missed most of it,  
18 except for a couple of the wrap-ups. Why don't I start with  
19 Don at the end. We just yesterday agreed on a research  
20 agenda, which actually hit on a number of things you were  
21 talking about. Because we thought about some of the ways in  
22 which we could be a unique test bed for various work place



1 productivity issues, materials, technology, historic  
2 buildings, and all of that kind of stuff, which could make a  
3 difference not just to GSA but to the country. It is hard to  
4 find any other place in the government that think that it is  
5 something that they should do.

6 I will note a couple of things. Obviously,  
7 everybody walks in here with their agenda. Mine is that I  
8 heard a couple of you say things, and I encourage you to keep  
9 saying them to yourselves and other people.

10 One is it is interesting. People think that the  
11 government, on the one hand people recognize the government  
12 as very decentralized and thinks that it cannot really get  
13 its act together, and never sets out on a goal and actually  
14 gets there. Until we go to communities where communities  
15 tell us that we, GSA, are totally in the driver's seat when  
16 it comes to locating federal agencies. And they know that if  
17 the agencies went to the suburbs or some location they do not  
18 like, it was our fault.

19 And in fact, as I have had occasion to say to some  
20 mayors, you know, I bet you have an economic development  
21 program. I will bet if you had someone who controlled 1.1  
22 million square feet of office space in your city, you would



1 probably talk to them a lot. Well, that is what our GSA  
2 office managers do, number one.

3           Number two, I bet if a half a million square feet  
4 was the Internal Revenue Service and they were in the private  
5 sector, I will bet that the head of Internal Revenue Service  
6 would be on civic committees. You would be sending people to  
7 talk to them. It does not happen.

8           And then you wonder, like we used to say in the  
9 Army, you know that guy who is not reenlisting who tried to  
10 talk to you, lieutenant, for the last six months and you did  
11 not have time for him until he decided to leave the Army.

12           That kind of stuff happens to use, too. So I just  
13 encourage you. I am not trying to deflect at all our  
14 responsibility when an agency says they are going to a  
15 location that we think is wrong, or when this happens when  
16 agencies fight us when we say we would like to have a mixed  
17 use building, that we would love to have shops on the ground  
18 floor. And they start telling us that they have security  
19 concerns, our people are scared, it is not our image of a  
20 government building, our employees do not feel comfortable.  
21 We are a little worried that if we are the Justice Department  
22 and there are law firms in the building, if we were ever to



1 out lease space to law firms, what would that look like.

2           Interestingly, we lease space in private sector  
3 buildings for the Justice Department all of the time right  
4 down the hall from private law firms, but that is not an  
5 issue. So there are all of those kinds of interesting things  
6 which we all need to grapple with.

7           Finally, just this afternoon, I have heard a number  
8 of things which we need to work on. And I do want to say  
9 again, because this is my pitch back to you all, let's be  
10 honest. I was an early participant in STPP. STPP has a big  
11 agenda. The GSA federal building location is this big  
12 compared to the CMAC program. I understand that. The same  
13 with a lot of other urban issues.

14           But all of the nice things that we could do will  
15 not happen if no constituency, and I have talked to people  
16 about this before, not the Conference of Mayors, not Urban  
17 Land Use, and not anyone else, if GSA is always it is one of  
18 those things that you could also do. It is very important if  
19 people think that we should have other authorities to do  
20 things, or flexible authorities, it is important that there  
21 be groups out there who say that. Because our saying it, as  
22 I said there is morning, raises some questions about why are



1 you doing this, your job is just to provide seats for federal  
2 bureaucrats to sit in.

3           So I hope that the GSA folks who have been here  
4 will take away from this a lot of good ideas. And I will  
5 hope that you will take away the sense that there is a pretty  
6 active constituency inside GSA itself that really wants to do  
7 these things. Folks in GSA know that I am just not a  
8 Pollyanna, kumbaya guy. But it is literally true that there  
9 are an awful lot of things that we can all do working  
10 together.

11           And GSA is a very transformed organization from the  
12 one that I sued 25 years ago when I was a historic  
13 preservationist. There are a lot of differences going on,  
14 and the fact that we are having this meeting is one sign of  
15 that. The fact that you were willing to come gives me some  
16 hope that there will be a lot of follow-through, too. I hope  
17 you will tell me what it is that we learned today that we can  
18 make it happen.

19           MS. ALTMAN: Does anyone else have any other  
20 closing thoughts before I wrap it up?

21           (No response.)

22           MS. ALTMAN: Great. I basically want to say that



1 what I was hoping that we would today we did, which is to  
2 come up with a lot of ideas, to look at some of our  
3 practices, and to look at some of the principles and some of  
4 the things that we need to be doing, and how they fit  
5 together. And what we got this afternoon were some very  
6 specific ideas and things that we want to follow up.

7 Today is really the first strategy session. It has  
8 been great to bring you all together, and I am really excited  
9 that you are all so interested in working with us on the  
10 inside and the outside. So it has very exciting.

11 A couple of things we are going to do. We are  
12 going to issue this report at the end of the year. So we  
13 have a lot happening in the months preceding that starting  
14 today. We are going to get notes out to you in the next  
15 couple of weeks with some thoughts, and we will hold some  
16 follow-up focus groups with a lot of GSA folks and follow up  
17 on some of the topical areas that we touched on. Parking, of  
18 course, jumps out as one that we need to explore in a lot  
19 more depth.

20 And I think that another idea about relating our  
21 measures, very specifically looking at how we sort of measure  
22 this and relate these issues to our mission is something that



1 we want to also explore very carefully.

2 So the next steps are we are going to take all of  
3 these ideas and start to sift through them, and get them back  
4 out to you in some form, and begin to refine them over the  
5 next few months. And continue to sort of build a  
6 constituency for those ideas, and really create what is a  
7 framework for change. So thanks for agreeing to help us do  
8 that.

9 MS. ZIMMERMAN: I just wanted to say that I think  
10 it is wonderful that you did invite from representatives of  
11 congressional staffers here. I really appreciated the  
12 discussion. But it seems to me a lot of times that while the  
13 federal government cannot lobby, your point, Bob, that there  
14 are people here at the table that represent very large  
15 organizations.

16 And in Congress, a lot of folks really do not care  
17 about GSA appropriations and policies, who cares, it is  
18 federal buildings, blah, blah, blah.

19 MR. PECK: We like that a lot of the time.

20 MS. ZIMMERMAN: But I think that there is an  
21 opportunity if people feel strongly that this is a good  
22 center, and that we need to make sure that it continues to



1 voice that to your membership, and say GSA is doing a good  
2 thing, let Congress know that you appreciate this program,  
3 that it is helping local governments to have better local  
4 communities, or however you want to phrase it. But do not  
5 forget that federal piece. Because you are right, there are a  
6 lot of people who hate sustainability, smart growth, whatever  
7 you want to call it. But there are surprisingly a large  
8 growing number of people who are supportive of it.

9 MR. BAILEY: There are a lot of people who do not  
10 like livability, but most people love the idea of local  
11 control. So they frame it like that.

12 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Interesting. Thank you.

13 MS. ALTMAN: We are adjourned.

14 (At 4:05 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

15 \* \* \* \* \*

