



**TOWARD A  
21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY  
CITY FOR ALL**

**PROGRESSIVE POLICIES FOR  
NEW YORK CITY IN 2013  
AND BEYOND**

# Needed: A Progressive Agenda

**John Mollenkopf**

The Graduate Center, CUNY

**Brad Lander**

New York City Council

The mayoral election of November 2013 presents New Yorkers with a critical turning point and an important opportunity. For the first time since 2001 – and only the second time since 1977 – there is an open seat for mayor, with no incumbent running for re-election. As a result, it opens the political space for defining the future of governance in New York City wider than at any time in the previous decade.

This has drawn many candidates into the fray on both the Democratic and Republican sides, as well as a nominee from the Independence Party. Given the size of his legacy, the election will naturally be framed partly around what Mayor Michael Bloomberg and his administration have achieved in the last twelve years. But it also ought to prompt us to ask how we should move beyond that legacy as well as what we should maintain and extend from it. Additionally, we hope it will permit the citizens of New York City to resurface issues, concerns, and interests that have not received due attention – especially the issues of equity and inclusion.

The mayors who have governed New York City since 1977, except for David Dinkins, have been relatively conservative. For reasons elaborated below, they were propelled into office by electoral majorities rooted in the city's middle-class white ethnic communities, while the disparate elements of a potential alternative progressive majority remaining divided. A lack of consensus about (indeed an inability to comprehensively debate) which goals and values should animate such a new majority contributed to its fragmentation.

Given the large number of progressive issue advocacy groups and organized interests in the city and their tendency to work in parallel or even cross purposes, we cannot realistically expect that they will agree on a large number of specific initiatives. At the same time, open and honest dialogue can provide a real basis for bringing like-minded constituencies together into a broad coalition around common goals and themes. An emerging progressive coalition will not just be about housing or crime or education or taxes, but about the kind of a city in which we wish to live. The next mayor's policies and initiatives, as

[www.21cforall.org](http://www.21cforall.org)

embraced and modified by the City Council, will reflect the diversity of constituencies that help him or her to win office. But the new mayor can also draw on ideas and policy directions that have been percolating in the background to help form and unify that coalition. We commissioned and discussed the following chapters with the goal of contributing to and turning up the heat on that pot of ideas.

We have no illusions that the analysis and recommendations contained in these chapters will radically transform the political campaigns currently under way or the government that will follow it, but we do think that seriously debating the ideas contained in these chapters could improve both. After decades of city government policies that have focused primarily on restoring law and order, ending welfare as we knew it, promoting growth, and reforming the public school system – all reasonable and necessary goals that we must continue to pursue – we believe the next mayoral administration must also take creative steps to make New York City government more equitable, inclusive, and responsive. It must deliberately focus on how best to foster more opportunities for the many New Yorkers who desperately need them. In short, we need a progressive government, not just good government. Since the fiscal crisis of the mid-1970s, many voices have demonized government and undermined support for the public sector. At the local level, however, people need government services, especially in the face of stagnating real incomes, persistently high levels of inequality, and the life challenges facing those of lesser means. New Yorkers not only need and want government services, they are willing to pay for them as long as government is

well-run and actually helps them, rather than responding mainly to insiders or the highest bidders.

## The next mayoral administration must take creative steps to make New York City government more equitable, inclusive, and responsive

In saying this, we acknowledge that a progressive administration must be effective and efficient at such basic tasks as educating, providing infrastructure for, and insuring the safety of the city's residents, businesses, and institutions. It must enhance the city's competitive position, help its firms to become more productive, and improve the skills, ingenuity, and productivity of its workforce. It must do a good job at providing the basic citywide and neighborhood amenities that

undergird civic life. Finally, it must finance these necessary activities in a high-cost, high-tax environment where spending must always be scrutinized. Over the last decade, the city has made real progress on many of these fronts, and we can learn from and build on these successes as well as draw lessons from other big cities.

But this is not enough. New York City faces some existential challenges: providing greater opportunity in the context of lingering high unemployment and a polarizing labor market; creating a shared sense of membership and belonging within an increasingly diverse population; and helping families and neighborhoods to flourish in all parts of the city that, if unaddressed, will cause the city to grow even more unequal, more divided, and less resilient.

It is a real challenge to provide high-quality basic city services while simultaneously promoting equality and inclusion. Many municipal administrations, progressive or otherwise, have done this poorly. We reject the notion, however, that these goals are incompatible. We believe that core police strategies can minimize crime and remove criminals without discriminating against young men of color or undermining support for policing. Our economic development policies can help the city's economy grow while also paying attention to job quality, creating mobility ladders, and sharing the benefits of growth more widely. We can promote real estate investment and manage development without undermining the quality of life in our neighborhoods. We can improve educational outcomes without focusing so many of our efforts just on "teaching to the test." In short, we can make city government muscular while including our citizens more deeply in the project of governing.

Unfortunately, as the current campaign unfolds, progressive forces in cities around the country are failing to present a cohesive and comprehensive governing narrative. While some dynamic big city mayors have campaigned and governed with explicit progressive goals (e.g., the early years of former Chicago Mayor Harold Washington or Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa), the current mayors around the country (e.g., Michael Bloomberg in New York, Rahm Emmanuel in Chicago, or Ed Lee in San Francisco) are focusing overwhelmingly on the pragmatic, with the explicit or implicit presumption that we cannot afford new initiatives to promote equality and inclusion. New Yorkers can fill that gap by developing a progressive governing narrative for our city (and perhaps others) that is coherent, realistic, and clear about how short-term building blocks can lead to longer-term changes in systems and institutions.

New York City has come a long way since its worst years in the mid-1970s. The factors that propelled the subsequent increases in population and economic output have both increased the need for inclusion and upward mobility and provided the resources to achieve it: the shift to an advanced services economy, the growth of immigrant communities, and the key role of public investments in civic and economic infrastructure. While the contemporary knowledge economy is producing a more-polarized job distribution than the preceding manufacturing era, it has heightened the rewards to educational attainment and has been fed by substantial increases in educational attainment. The success of New York City's corporate service firms and nonprofit institutions (whether universities, hospitals, or cultural institutions) have swelled the number of affluent professionals and managers. While this has driven up housing costs and made life more difficult for the simultaneously growing number of low wage workers, it has also created the potential for new paths of upward mobility through the city's educational institutions. (The impending generational succession in the labor market will also open new potential avenues of upward mobility.) The continuing high pace of

**A progressive  
administration must be  
effective and efficient in  
providing basic city  
services while promoting  
equality and inclusion.**

immigration reflects both the willingness of low-skilled immigrants to enter low-wage work, but also the payoff to immigrant enterprise and educational attainment over time.

Therefore, while New York's relatively good overall demographic and economic performance may create problems, it also reflects competitive advantages and creates opportunities not available to the many declining cities of the United States. Given that public investments and public services have been central to this comparatively strong performance, we have a clear obligation to insure that its benefits flow to a wider range of our residents and that public investments promote social as well as private gains.

Most New Yorkers want city government to work harder at expanding opportunity. When the Community Service Society recently asked a broad spectrum of New Yorkers, people at both ends of the income distribution strongly preferred (by a 3-to-1 margin) a mayor who supports policies that help working families rather than policies that make the city a better place to do business (Community Service Society 2013). Three-quarters of respondents also support paid sick days and two-thirds were personally willing to pay more taxes to improve high school-graduation rates.

At the same time, proposals for progressive big-city governance cannot rely on past models. Critics often charge that advocates of greater equality and inclusion want to go back to supposedly failed models of the 1960s, or return to "defining deviancy down," in politician Daniel Patrick Moynihan's words. We have no intention of doing any such thing. Instead, we seek to elaborate and communicate a new, creative, and flexible model of city government that matches the era in which we live. We must root progressive municipal government in accountability mechanisms, such as the accurate measurement of outcomes (which should highlight the fair sharing of benefits and burdens and neighborhood quality of life, not just crime reports and student test scores). Innovative technology and social network tools offer unprecedented new ways of involving residents in government, yielding more efficient and transparent public administration. Spending on social programs that prevent or reduce negative outcomes can ultimately save money over those that merely respond to them after the fact. And creative investments in "smart growth" tools – transit, livable streets, new parks and plazas, and other neighborhood improvements – are entirely consistent with a more equitable approach to municipal government.

**We seek to elaborate and  
communicate a new,  
creative, and flexible  
model of city government  
that matches the era in  
which we live**

New Yorkers are therefore at a moment when it is both essential and possible to offer a powerful and coherent progressive governing narrative for our city (and perhaps others) that shows how short-term building blocks can yield longer-term changes in systems and institutions.

## 1. Reflections on the Recent Past

Each of the relatively conservative mayors who governed from 1978 through 2013 achieved some valuable and important policy gains: the subsidized housing policies of the Ed Koch years, the falling crime rate in the Rudolph Giuliani era, and the public health gains and education reforms of the Bloomberg era. They also all won office in racially-polarized elections and oriented their administrations toward business and their core voters. This often meant promoting real estate development projects over neighborhood objections, stressing taxpayer interests over those of public service producers and consumers, and focusing on Manhattan more than the other boroughs. Few of their senior managers and political advisors came from the city's minority and immigrant communities. Despite periodic economic booms, these mayoralties did not worry much about rising inequality, but focused instead on the economic recovery of the city, prudent financial management, and bringing down the rate of reported crime.

While Mayor Bloomberg's tenure fits this pattern, he and his administration nevertheless have presented a markedly more inclusive narrative and policy set than that of his predecessor – partly because Mayor Giuliani was so extraordinarily polarizing, partly because Bloomberg is a social liberal, and partly because his wealth somewhat insulated him from the need to play to the tabloid press. As a result, the debate about where the city needs to go now inevitably begins with an assessment of his administration. While we recognize his many achievements, we think the record is far from sufficient.

### What the Bloomberg administration did well:

**Role of government:** The current administration has supported and invested in the role of government with (in most cases) attention to making sure it is well managed. It has not sought to demonize government, but instead has presented a coherent (if, in our opinion, incomplete) narrative about the role of government, and has hired skilled deputy mayors and commissioners (with a few notable exceptions).

**Environmental sustainability:** Through PlaNYC, Mayor Bloomberg's Office of Long-Term Planning and Sustainability, and the livable streets work of the Department of Transportation, he has led the way (at least in the United States) in connecting nuts-and-bolts improvement to quality of life and broader environmental concerns, and done it in a way that is seen to enhance, rather than detract from, the city's economic vitality.

**Social liberalism:** The mayor's work in advancing the causes of marriage equality, immigration reform, barring smoking, and gun control have made a difference on those issues (locally and beyond), and won him deserved support.

### What the Bloomberg administration did poorly:

**Inequality:** Despite his anti-poverty initiatives, Mayor Bloomberg has shown no real concern for the broader pattern of increasing inequality in NYC, seeing it as the inevitable consequence of the prosperity of the city's top earners, who pay a disproportionate share of local taxes. His economic program has sought to advance growth, but his anti-poverty initiatives have done little to lift the incomes of the lowest earners. His policing strategies have resulted in massive increases in the stops and frisks of young men

of color, drawing hundreds of thousands into cycles of interaction with law enforcement with negative consequences for their labor market prospects. He has belittled calls to mandate a living wage or paid sick days.

**Neighborhoods:** The administration has not involved neighborhoods in its decision-making. In this largely centralized administration, agencies have made decisions based on a narrative about the importance of data, leaving neighborhoods often feeling that their opinions have been ignored. He has not appointed neighborhood activists to key positions in his administration. Purported economic benefits were used to justify many land use and economic development decisions (with the important exception of the many downzonings granted to mostly-white outer-borough communities), policing, and education (where community input has been almost entirely tokenized). Even in the area of livable streets, there has been little upfront, genuine effort to include neighborhoods in planning.

**Participatory democracy/civic engagement:** The mayor has not sought to include citizens and community residents in decision-making. While the 311 system for enabling citizens to ask or complain about city services is an impressive innovation, it is a one-way street, not a partnership that involves people in planning or shaping what government does. The mayor has shown little interest, and sometimes outright contempt, for more inclusive spaces of government (abolishing community school boards, paying little attention to community boards). His contempt for legislators in Albany has often hamstrung his efforts there. The extension of term-limits rankled many, even from his core constituencies.

### Where Bloomberg's record has been mixed:

**Economy:** The New York City economy fared less poorly than the national economy under Bloomberg's tenure, and has now recovered to its pre-crisis employment level, although unemployment remains historically high. The mayor has plenty to show in terms of new buildings (residential and office), tourism numbers, jobs, and GDP. The new Applied Sciences campus(es) initiative is a promising approach to economic development projects. But most of the administration's growth plans have simply been real estate development, which has tended to amplify inequality. Workforce development efforts have been a low priority and mostly disconnected from economic development strategy. Little has been done to nurture sectors outside of the predominantly high-wage/high-skill FIRE and low-wage/low-skill tourism industries. And it has not conducted comprehensive planning about the physical or economic infrastructure needed to support growth. He has opposed local efforts to leverage private resources for public benefits, such as Community Benefit Agreements and living wage laws.

**Education:** Bloomberg has invested significant funding and political capital in public education. He won mayoral control early in his tenure and symbolically moved the Department of Education from 110 Livingston Street to the Tweed Court House next to City Hall. He reorganized the agency, and also became a national leader in the campaign to reform public education. His administration has focused on achieving accountability based on test scores, closing failing schools, more aggressive teacher evaluation, and creating new charter schools. While graduation rates and test scores have inched up, this has produced a strong backlash from parents and educators (including, but not limited to, the United Federation of Teachers union) reacting against too much testing (and the crowding out of arts and other



elements of a well-rounded education), too many school closings, and favoritism toward untested charter schools. Despite these initiatives, the evidence that student and school performance has improved is limited and racial gaps in achievement remain large.

**Poverty and social services:** Mayor Bloomberg and Deputy Mayor Linda Gibbs have identified poverty and lack of opportunity for young minority people, especially males, as an appropriate target for government action and initiated a series of policy experiments to improve the situation. Their anti-poverty initiatives, which focused on changing individual and family behavior, have achieved some modest successes and demonstrate an innovative response to a number of challenges. However, while the Bloomberg administration spent more on education and public safety, it drastically cut spending on social services. Last June, negotiations between the City Council and the mayor prevented the proposed elimination of more than 7,000 subsidized child care slots for young children and a similar battle is already unfolding for fiscal year 2014 as advocates seek to protect the existing 49,000 slots in the subsidized system from proposed cuts.

**Criminal justice and policing:** Quite remarkably, the NYPD has continued to drive down the rates of reported crimes, particularly violent crimes, while the criminal justice system has reduced the number of people in city jails and state prisons. At the same time, however, the NYPD has ramped up the number of stops and frisks and arrests for low-level misdemeanors, antagonizing many residents of the communities where these activities are concentrated and undermining support for the police department. The administration has also occasionally shown little regard for civil liberties, as in the arrests of protestors at the Republican National Convention.

**Housing and homelessness:** The administration has developed new avenues for building and preserving subsidized housing as previous programs used up the *in rem* housing stock, setting and achieving an ambitious goal through the “New Housing Marketplace” and made strong and innovative use of the New York City Housing Development Corporation (though housing advocacy groups have raised concern that the majority of these units were not affordable to many residents of the neighborhoods where they were built). While the administration undertook an innovative effort at homelessness prevention, the number of people in the city’s shelter system has reached historic highs, with over 50,000 New Yorkers sleeping in shelters each night.

## 2. Moving Forward: Posing Hard Questions

As we have highlighted, the political successes of relatively conservative mayoralties rest in part on the divided, fragmented, and disorganized nature of the potential progressive majority. For much of the last quarter century, anxieties about losing political power, concerns over public order, and the persistence of fiscal stress lead many white Democrats who normally vote for liberal candidates in state and national elections to vote against Democratic mayoral nominees. Together with the core Republican vote and varying degrees of support from minority groups, this yielded close electoral majorities for Mayor Koch in 1981 and 1985 and for Republican-backed mayors Giuliani and Bloomberg between 1991 and 2013.

On the other side of these electoral contests, progressive coalitions differ greatly in socio-economic position, racial and ethnic group membership, and views about the salient issues as well as have conflicting political ambitions. They include white liberals, African Americans, Afro-Caribbeans, Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, and the Asian communities, especially people who work in the public and nonprofit sectors or belong to or have family members in labor unions. While most of them wholeheartedly supported Barack Obama in the 2008 and 2012 general elections, they often went separate ways in

## The 2013 mayoral campaign affords the disparate elements of a potential progressive majority an opportunity to move in a common direction

mayoral primaries and were often unhappy about the ultimate Democratic nominee. Relatively conservative mayoral candidates succeeded in this environment by presenting a coherent policy message – tame the local welfare state, reduce the power of public service providers and consumers, hold the line on taxes, and control the city’s budget. This contrasted with the wide range of group interests and policy positions espoused by components of the potential progressive majority. In the process, Mayor Bloomberg and his relatively conservative predecessors established that the city is not ungovernable.

the rest of the city’s electorate mean that a strategy of racial polarization no longer yields a conservative electoral majority. As Mayor Bloomberg’s campaigns so astutely demonstrated, a candidate for whom middle-class whites provide the core vote must reach well beyond that base to win. More fundamentally, as the African American and Puerto Rican populations that once seemed to threaten white majorities have also declined and immigrant-origin populations have grown, the city’s racial divisions have grown fuzzier, if not declined.

Today, however, we face a different political juncture. The continued decline of the non-Hispanic white share of voting-age citizens and the increasing diversity of

Moreover, the rigors of the recent economic crisis and the slow and uneven recovery have highlighted for many the narrow distribution of the benefits of the previous decades. This was highlighted by OWS’ success in reviving national attention to inequality and opportunity. Racial division and unlimited campaign resources may therefore no longer be able to deliver relatively conservative white electoral majorities.

The 2013 mayoral campaign thus affords the disparate elements of a potential progressive majority a new opportunity to talk through their differences, reach consensus on the main directions they would like city government to pursue, and mobilize their respective constituencies to move in a common direction. However messy the process by which candidates make the political promises necessary to gain broad electoral support, we believe that a thorough discussion of principles and goals can strengthen the basis for progressive government no matter which candidate is ultimately elected.

The chapters contained in this volume are therefore intended to generate a full and frank discussion of what such a coalition can and should want out of a progressive government, how government can best deliver these elements once in office, and how the parts can fit into a cohesive whole. Each chapter has



been discussed initially by a broad group of stakeholders focusing on how a progressive government can approach three key issues: addressing inequality, making healthier families and neighborhoods, and improving both service delivery and civic participation.

## Addressing Inequality

*How can a wide range of city policies not only strive to make the city economically competitive and innovative, but ensure that the resulting gains flow to and create mobility opportunities for the bottom and middle of the income distribution, not just the top? How can city policies also reduce the damage of growing inequality by reducing levels of misery at the bottom of the income distribution?*

A progressive governing vision for New York City needs a strategy for inclusive economic growth. It needs not only to make better use of economic development tools, but coordinate them with a wide range of other policies, including K-12 education, workforce development, post-secondary education, work-family balance, child-care, planning for generational succession, and enhancing neighborhood and city-wide infrastructure.

The chapters in this volume point the way. Laura Wolf-Powers provides “a new play book on reconciling growth and equity.” She calls for a shift from deal-by-deal subsidies to strategies that stimulate labor demand, including sorely needed investments in public infrastructure. This call is echoed in the chapters by Michael Freedman-Schnapp and Brad Lander as essential for a more resilient city with vibrant and sustainable neighborhoods. Proposals by Freedman-Schnapp, Lander, and James Parrott call for a more unified, transparent process to connect planning and budgeting for infrastructure and development that would help make sure these investments are thoughtfully prioritized, coordinated, and leveraged for shared benefit.

**How can government make the city competitive and innovative while ensuring gains create mobility opportunities for the bottom and middle, not just the top?**

The city’s approach to human capital development must be a high priority for better coordination and improvement. The workforce development system is one small part of this overall system, which stretches from early childhood development, through the K-12 system, City University of New York, and beyond. But it is particularly in need of reform. The city’s workforce programs are currently disconnected from each other, and especially from the city’s economic development efforts. Wolf-Powers (on how the integration of economic and workforce development should include a “career pathway platform”), Aaron Pallas (on K-12 education), and Josh Wallack et al. (on early

childhood education) identify opportunities to build this system. Higher levels of educational attainment will lead to growing per capita earnings over time, thus helping the city to preserve and enhance the safety net in the face of limited resources. As the chapter on the city’s changing demography by John Mollenkopf and colleagues highlights, we have moved substantially toward a better-educated workforce,

but we must ensure that these gains flow to young people growing up in New York City as well as young adults migrating to it for career opportunities.

A progressive mayoral administration will build job quality into growth strategies. Cecilia Estolano describes how she did this during her tenure leading the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles, aligning the roles of local government with the goals of jobs with family-sustaining wages, affordable housing, and sustainable neighborhoods. Wolf-Powers tells us how to build on and enhance sectoral strategies, including a deeper and better-coordinated commitment to manufacturing, which is undergoing something of a renaissance in New York City. These strategies should all be motivated by a common theme: using all the tools of local government to change the rules and behavior of businesses and institutions in ways that expand opportunity.

## Making Healthier Families and Neighborhoods

*How can city policies raise the quality of family life (happiness, personal fulfillment, balancing work and family commitments, and nurturing children) and neighborhood life (sustainability, safety, transportation, and public and private amenities) for all city residents?*

In too many circles, “quality of life” has become a conservative buzz-phrase for the idea that aggressively policing small crimes will prevent larger ones. But there is a much broader opportunity to focus on how city government can improve the quality of family and community life. Some governments (e.g., Great Britain and Somerville, Massachusetts) and some economists are increasingly thinking about, and measuring, how public policy can maximize happiness in the public at large.

At a time when family life is strained for many, our authors argue for new government policies that help people reconcile their work and family commitments. Building on the City Council’s extension of paid sick leave to nearly 1 million working New Yorkers, Dina Bakst, Janet Gornick, and Sherry Leiwant would make New York City itself a “model employer” on issues of work-family balance – including encouraging flexible work scheduling policies such as telecommuting and flexible scheduling – providing a model (and incentives) for New York’s private employers to follow. Josh Wallack and Gail Nayowith would create a Department of Early Childhood Education so that parents can work, and all kids can show up at public school ready to learn. And with a rapidly growing number of older New Yorkers, Ruth Finkelstein and Tom Kamber re-imagine an “age-friendly” city that not only provides essential services to frail elderly, but enables seniors to participate more fully in the economic, cultural, and neighborhood life of the city; these are, in many cases, subtle changes whose impacts will extend far beyond seniors.

On the neighborhood level, a strong theme emerges from many papers in this volume: the next mayor should seek to promote and enhance the quality of community life and strengthen neighborhoods as key nodes of urban life. Andrew White makes a powerful and specific case that the next mayor “could help a well-managed, neighborhood-centered, community infrastructure emerge in New York City,” that moves the city in the direction of “collective efficacy – working together for the common good – so that the government oversees and funds service systems in such a way that they do a better job of providing the essential social service infrastructure to neighborhoods and families.” This theme is underscored in Pallas’ call to “develop the capacity of schools to serve as integrated centers supporting community social and health service needs,” Caron Atlas’ vision for arts and cultural policy, and Michael Jacobson

and Martha King's emphasis on bolstering trust and legitimacy in policing through improved community relations.

This effort should build on Mayor Bloomberg's sustainability and livable streets work, while being more proactive about including communities in defining a broader vision for the city and linking together various systems (land use/planning/design, transportation, parks, housing, small business, economic development, and arts/culture/libraries) at the neighborhood level, and to make these investments in all neighborhoods across the city. Lander proposes reinventing city planning and community development together, building on models for comprehensive and community planning from London to Portland. Freedman-Schnapp argues that this is especially important in the wake of Hurricane Sandy and the urgent need to take strategic action to confront climate change and build a more resilient city. He and White both cite Eric Klinenberg's arguments (drawn from his work on the 1995 Chicago heat wave) that social capital is an essential defense against climate impacts.

This focus on neighborhoods must include deeper attention to inequality and persistent segregation – as argued by Pallas for schools, White for services, Lander for planning, and Freedman-Schnapp for sustainability – which stubbornly mocks our ambitions for economic mobility or genuine opportunity in life chances.

## Improving Both Service Delivery and Civic Participation

*How can city policies strengthen the public sector as a performance-based partnership between city managers, public service providers, and citizen consumers? How can we balance effective public management with practical efforts to attain a more just city? How can city policies broaden civic engagement in the work of government, give people more voice in shaping their neighborhoods, and empower people to come together to solve problems?*

A key challenge for progressives, both in campaigning and governing, is to address the pervasive backlash against the role of government by ensuring that it delivers high-quality public services. On this topic, the progressive coalition and public sector unions face a core challenge, perceived and real. The right-wing populist critique asserts that progressive forces are beholden to public sector unions and thus resistant to efforts to improve performance or address cost or be accountable for measurable results. While some of this is a straightforward attack on the gains of working people (such as legislation adopted in Wisconsin and under consideration in Indiana), this critique has substance when progressives (inside and outside the labor movement) fail to put forward practical paths for improving the quality of public services. The next mayor must grapple with these challenges in the face of the looming problem created by Mayor Bloomberg's failure to negotiate contracts with municipal unions for the last several years, which, as Parrott identifies in his comprehensive analysis of the City's budget, is likely to cost the city several billion dollars.

We believe it is possible to reconcile the public's appropriate demands for high-quality and accountable services, the taxpayers' concern about living within our means, the interest of citizens and workers in helping to shape and inform those services, and the rights and interests of public workers, municipal labor unions, and nonprofit social service providers. Tom Kochan, in his short but compelling outline for a labor strategy for the next mayor, and Parrott suggest a framework for these efforts. Parrott is clear

that the city must live within its means, and even calls for research “to establish some benchmark measures for a sustainable individual, business and property tax burden that takes into account the city’s unique circumstances and cyclical economic tendencies.” He identifies an extensive set of current tax breaks and policies that are both regressive and inefficient, yielding opportunities to make the city’s tax structure more fair and efficient, while also generating revenue for our long-term needs. Parrott and Kochan explore strategies for genuine negotiations around “gain-sharing” between the city and its workforce (which are nearly impossible in the climate of eroded trust that has emerged in the Bloomberg administration).

Many of the recommendations in this volume will not cost money, and some would be revenue positive. Parrott and Kochan focus on city employee health care, where there are real opportunities to achieve both cost savings and better health outcomes. Jacobson and King’s appeal for court reform would address the morally intolerable delays in processing justice for some of the city’s most disadvantaged and save many millions of dollars. Reducing unnecessary tax expenditures for economic development, establishing a unified development budget, better linking workforce and economic development, and expanding the city’s composting and recycling programs can similarly lead to improved social and fiscal outcomes.

Finally, the next mayor must continue to deliver a well-run city. A progressive administration should build on the Bloomberg administration’s rightly-praised metrics-based approach to accountability, reflected in the multi-colored bi-weekly performance reports the mayor receives, the Office of Performance Management, improvements to the Charter-mandated Mayor’s Management Report, and the “mayor’s geek squad,” which has used data to more quickly remove trees felled in Hurricane Sandy and to efficiently target restaurants illegally dumping oil and stores selling bootlegged cigarettes.

As Megan Golden and Liana Downey lay out, the next administration should strengthen the city’s performance management with a stronger analytic focus on outcomes by cohort and neighborhood and more attention to big-picture outcomes (like living-wage jobs, reducing poverty, and promoting overall well-being). This will require budget incentives that give managers real incentives to collaborate toward long-term, cross-departmental goals. The administration’s Center for Economic Opportunity is a highly-innovative approach to these challenges and its mission and capacities should be maintained and broadened in a new administration. More must also be done to address the problem of perverse incentives that can result in cheating (as seen in school testing scandals around the country), fudging results, or shifting problems to areas that are not measured (as is alleged around downgrading crime statistics). Pallas digs into these problems in K-12 public education, detailing steps to a strong performance management system that maintains accountability while shifting away from high-stakes testing toward support, capacity building, and equity (with an entertaining Dilbert cartoon to boot).

Inclusive technology can be an ally in this effort, not just one-way systems like 311, but tools that enable communities to collaborate to solve problems or shape local policy. Data-driven performance management and efforts to build collaborative community capacity are not at odds (as Mayor Bloomberg has sometimes seemed to suggest). Both work better in combination.

The following chapters not only look at these questions broadly, as part of a broader governing philosophy, but apply them to specific policy areas. They combine a careful analysis of the state of the

city's basic policy systems and policy challenges with thoughtful and even bold proposals for policy reform. Each essay reflects not only the insights of highly capable authors, but revisions of those insights based on an initial discussion with experts and advocates. We present them now in the hope and expectation that they will provoke a broader discussion in the months leading up to the general election in November and beyond.

### Acknowledgments

A great many people contributed to the development of this overview. We would particularly like to acknowledge members of our organizing committee who responded to the initial draft in June 2012 as well as Laura Wolff, Megan Golden, and Michael Freedman-Schnapp.

We are deeply grateful for financial support for this project from the Brooklyn Community Foundation, the Charles S. Revson Foundation, the J. M. Kaplan Fund, the New York Foundation, the Open Society Foundations, the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, and the Scherman Foundation. The opinions expressed in this work are solely those of the authors and do not represent those of the funders, The Graduate Center, or the City University of New York.

### References

Community Service Society. "The Unheard Third Vote 2013. The Race for Mayor: What's in it for Low-Income New Yorkers?" Nancy Rankin and Apurva Mehrotra. New York: 2013: 11.

All essays are available online at [www.21cforall.org](http://www.21cforall.org)