

New York University

Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service

Volume XXV 2017-2018

**THE
WAGNER
REVIEW**

NYU | WAGNER

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

In an era when bipartisan propaganda has taken over our sources of information, it has become incredibly difficult to filter what is real from what is fanciful. I have slowly become more hopeful in our ability to synthesize and develop evidence-based, thoughtful and innovative policies to analyze the world's greatest problems ranging from income inequality to terrorism to climate change to the global migration crisis.

We proudly present to you to the 2017-2018 Special Edition of the Wagner Review, the student-run academic journal of the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service at New York University.

Our colleagues and contributors have not only enlightened me, but continue to produce insightful content that will mitigate the world's entrenched problems while building resilient communities. I take great pride and intention in organizing these varied perspectives to promote thoughtful discussion and conversations. This edition continues the tradition of publishing original student work that astutely reflects the policy areas of interest and academic study of the student body.

This year's edition provides me a beacon of hope. It embraces creative recommendations for how to design and implement the necessary infrastructure for communities with multifaceted challenges. We've included an analysis on population limitations, proposed voting policy reform, recommended New York City recycling programs, sustainability models, the economics of refugee resettlement, critiques of the juvenile justice system and cooperative solutions for affordable housing.

The continued mission of the Wagner Review is to encourage dialogue on a wide range of issues related to public service and to provide an outlet showcasing the fine scholarship that exists within the NYU Wagner community. This journal is comprised of original material of peer-reviewed research, analysis, and commentary from a diverse group of students that reflects the research conducted and academic programs offered at NYU Wagner.

We are grateful to the writers who submitted pieces and to our staff who served as editors. We would also like to thank the Wagner Student Association and the NYU Wagner Administration, particularly our faculty sponsor, Thom Blaylock. We could not have produced this journal without your efforts, wisdom and enthusiasm.

We know you will enjoy reading and trust you continue to follow your curiosity and desire for truth and knowledge.

Stephanie A. Owens
Editor-In-Chief

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bringing “Save As You Throw” to New York City <i>Charlotte Hough</i>	1
Leading the Defeat of Juvenile Life Without Parole <i>Lindsey Jackson</i>	7
Mongolia’s 2017 Presidential Election Calls for Compulsory Voting <i>Rentsenkhand Enkh-Amgalan</i>	11
Should a City Limit its Population? <i>Zhen Luo</i>	15
Recommendations to Encourage Sustainable Urban Development in Santiago de Chile <i>Monica Flores</i>	20
A Cooperative Solution for Affordable Housing <i>Steven Morales</i>	25
The Positive Economics of Refugee Resettlement <i>Alison Gratto Ng</i>	28
New York State’s Opportunity to Create a Sustainable Healthcare Workforce (And the Risk of Missing the Critical Window) <i>Sarah Nusbaum</i>	32

MISSION

The Wagner Review is the student-run academic journal of the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service at New York University. *The Wagner Review* promotes dialogue on a wide range of issues related to public service by publishing scholarly writing that includes original research, short papers, and policy memoranda from students and alumni that reflect the diverse range of academic programs offered and scholarly research conducted at NYU Wagner. In support of this mission, *The Wagner Review* publishes online editions of the annual student journal. Visit us on the web at www.thewagnerreview.org for more information, and to read opinion-based commentary, book reviews, and feature articles.

ROBERT F. WAGNER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Established in 1938, the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service offers advanced programs leading to the professional degrees of Master of Public Administration, Master of Urban Planning, Executive Master of Public Administration, and Doctor of Philosophy. Through these rigorous programs, NYU Wagner educates the future leaders of public, nonprofit, and health institutions, as well as of private organizations serving the public sector.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Founded in 1831, New York University (NYU) is the largest private university in the United States. The University, which is composed of 41 schools, colleges, and divisions, occupies five major centers in Manhattan. It operates branch campus and research programs in other parts of the United States and abroad, as well as study abroad programs in more than 25 countries.

The Wagner Review

New York University | Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
295 Lafayette Street | New York, NY | 10012-9604
www.thewagnerreview.org | wagner.nyu.edu | 212.998.7400

THE WAGNER REVIEW ■ VOLUME XXV, 2017-2018

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Stephanie A. Owens

MANAGING EDITORS

Saye-Chantl Joseph

Gail Hankin

Adam Steinberg

FACULTY ADVISOR

Thom Blaylock

JOURNAL EDITORIAL BOARD

Jocelyn Howard

Tyler Stone

Meagan Beckmeyer

Charles Bowles

Ryan Brenner

Gideon Feit

Nicholas Merckling

Camille Mori

Zenani Orenge

Kate Reese

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING TO *THE WAGNER REVIEW*

The Wagner Review accepts submissions from current full and part-time students of the school, as well as from alumni. Articles are vetted through a competitive process by the Executive Board and prepared for publication by the Editorial Board. Articles should be submitted in English, and should represent either current original research or relevant policy analysis. Submissions should represent the broad range of interests relevant to the wider Wagner community. To send inquiries to *The Wagner Review*, please email wagner.review@gmail.com.

BRINGING “SAVE AS YOU THROW” TO NEW YORK CITY

Charlotte Hough

ABSTRACT New York City is burdened with waste from consumption which, among many consequences, contributes to rising greenhouse gas emissions. The administration of Mayor Bill de Blasio has committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 80% by 2050. This paper makes the case that in order to meet such ambitious goals, the city must reduce the waste produced by all New Yorkers. This paper proposes the adoption of a policy that creates monetary incentives for individuals and businesses to reduce waste through a “Save As You Throw” program.

Introduction

On average, each New York City household generates about 1,700 pounds of refuse annually, the equivalent of roughly 30 gallons per week.¹ This consumption threatens our climate and in turn, our city, which has already seen the potential impact of climate change through recent superstorms like Hurricane Sandy. Mayor de Blasio has committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050,² an ambitious goal necessary to combat the looming threat of climate change. The Mayor has also pledged that by 2030, the city will send zero waste to landfills.³

Converting our waste to renewables is one critical strategy that can be used to reduce New York's carbon emissions. It is also the only way to reach the "zero waste" threshold without significantly changing other consumption and production patterns. The city is faced with the current challenge: New York City's overall diversion rate is only 17%⁴ – much lower than that of many other U.S. cities. In order to tackle New York City's waste problem head on, municipal government must implement new policies that will incentivize city residents to recycle more and waste less.

Previous Reform Efforts

Mayor de Blasio's ambitious waste reduction goals do not seem to have been matched with an equal commitment to advancing visionary policy reform to meet these goals. This may be due to the fact that there is no legal requirement to comply with Mayor de Blasio's zero waste plan,⁵ and its target goals have been set for after he leaves office at the end of 2021.

In 2006, the city adopted its current Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP), a 20-year plan detailing upcoming reform issues in waste management. This laid out a strategy for reducing and disposing of the city's waste, with a focus on "equitably distributing sanitation infrastructure, minimizing environmental effects, and keeping costs manageable."⁶ Specifically, the plan focused on waste prevention, waste export and commercial waste. The recycling reforms proposed in the SWMP include setting "aggressive but realistic" diversion goals, identifying fresh recycling initiatives and committing to new in-city processing facilities.⁷ The SWMP plan positions recycling reforms as part of a more holistic plan to manage residential waste, recycling, and commercial waste in an interdependent manner. As a part of the initiatives outlined in the Mayor's OneNYC plan, originally released in 2015, the city has implemented a pilot program for organics collection, in addition to new recycling programs for e-waste and textiles and education programs within NYCHA and public schools.

Progress on increasing recycling has been modest. Data from this year suggests that since 2005, the city has seen refuse collected by DSNY decrease by only 10.9%.⁸ An assessment by the Independent Budget Office (IBO) found that since the 2006 SWMP, diversion rates have actually decreased, but attributes this to the decline of newspapers in the waste stream generally. The capture rate of recyclable materials has increased; with the exception of metals, every major category of recycling was being captured into the recycling stream at a higher rate in 2013 than in 2005 (see table below).⁹

Capture Rate Has Improved for Most Material Types		
Capture Rates	2005	2013
Metals	41%	30%
Plastic	39%	49%
RR2 Plastic	0%	16%
Glass	54%	64%
Paper	46%	47%

SOURCES: Department of Sanitation Waste Characterization Study, 2005, 2013
New York City Independent Budget Office

These gains are positive, but still modest when compared with the ambitious agenda as outlined by de Blasio in One NYC.

Proposed Policy Solution: Moving Closer Toward a “Save as You Throw” Model

With only 12 years remaining to reach de Blasio’s zero waste goal, more aggressive policies must be seriously pursued to meet this target. Mayor de Blasio’s OneNYC plan names the development of an “equitable blueprint” for a residential recycling incentive program as a key sustainability issue. Progress on this policy has been slow. As of the writing of this paper, the city is negotiating with a private consultant to develop a plan.

OneNYC has placed a potential “Save As You Throw” (SAYT) residential recycling incentive program on the city agenda – on paper, at least. In practice, it is important to acknowledge that developing an effective yet feasible policy is a daunting task – but certainly not without precedent across the U.S. and globally. A SAYT program would incentivize New Yorkers to reduce their non-recyclable waste by introducing a volume-based fee for residential garbage pickup, therefore making the costs for wasting upfront and visible.¹⁰ One obvious challenge to imposing a fee of this type is the makeup of the city’s housing stock: three quarters of

housing in New York is made up of rental apartments.¹¹ A tax on the individual by way of government-issued trash bags would be the most effective way to charge all city residents for trash collection in an upfront manner, as most reside in multi-unit dwellings.

Case Study: Seoul, South Korea

Seoul presents an interesting SAYT case study for New York City, with a comparable population and comparable proportion of multi-unit housing stock of about three quarters apartment buildings and multi-family houses.¹² In the early 1990s, Seoul faced a waste crisis: only five percent of waste was recycled.¹³ Later that decade, the government implemented a volume-based fee for garbage. Seoul’s policy resulted in a 40% reduction in waste generation and the doubling of their recycling rate.¹⁴ Other cities have seen comparable reductions in waste after the implementation of a SAYT program.¹⁵ As written, Seoul’s policy required residents to purchase government-issued trash bags to regulate the amount of waste they produced.

Size of Fee

New York’s volume-based waste fee must be small enough to not have an adverse effect on New Yorkers on the lower end of the income spectrum yet significant enough to actually nudge behavior towards more recycling. All residents should be permitted a baseline allocation of waste by being issued a preliminary allocation of trash bags at no charge. A proposal by the Citizen’s Budget Commission suggests pricing bags at a low fee of \$1.50 for each 30-gallon bag and \$0.75 for each 15-gallon bag, to make the fee reasonable for all New Yorkers.¹⁶ This

would cover the cost for an average household, which CBC suggests is \$80 per year and \$7 per month. New York is socioeconomically diverse,¹⁷ so this fee may not be feasible for residents of all neighborhoods and further study would be wise. In Seoul, policymakers determined the price of bags taking into account local socioeconomic factors, including local standard of living.¹⁸ The DSNY should determine the allocation of trash bags using the current waste and recycling rates of individual neighborhoods as a baseline, simultaneously taking into consideration relevant local socioeconomic factors such as average annual income. If the baseline allocation is set slightly below current waste averages, residents will be incentivized to reduce their waste without facing a significant economic burden. While this will be more administratively complicated, it is the most equitable solution considering the varying diversion rates across the five boroughs.¹⁹ The high cost of current trash collection and management rates currently makes it less feasible to start off with a fee that would actually fully fund them.²⁰ Ideally, a later stage in this policy should strive toward that goal.

A baseline allocation calculated based on local averages will not meet every New Yorker's unique needs, so residents should be given an option to resell their unused bags on a regulated marketplace. As the Citizen's Budget Commission argues, the City Council could facilitate this marketplace, which could give New Yorkers a chance to save money by selling extra bags once they reduce waste.²¹ Since this waste would not aim to fully fund waste costs, but rather raise visibility, it could be offset by a tax credit to further ensure that New Yorkers are not faced with an unmanageable

financial burden.

Implementation

To ensure SAYT's success, it should be implemented through a phased implementation, introducing the policy with a pilot program, as has been done with the city's new organics recycling collection program. After an initial public comment period, DSNY should direct outreach to current participants in the organics program to give the opportunity to participate in Phase One of SAYT. Phase implementation was used successfully in the Seoul case. There, government implemented a pilot program in select municipalities; its demonstrated successes motivated other municipalities to opt into the program.²² A pilot program would also enable policymakers to fine tune the size of the fee to help achieve a balance of high impact in reducing waste with a limited financial burden. Prior to full implementation, New York should also direct a highly visible public education program to make residents aware of the parameters and effective date. Public competitions, which have been used to encourage businesses to reduce their commercial waste in New York City,²³ could be used to further encourage residents to reach targeted reductions in waste.

Conclusion

The current political climate for passing a SAYT bill through the City Council is favorable. In November of 2017, the majority of City Council members were reelected to their positions. A majority of them will not have to face the prospect of reelection as 38 out of 51 are term limited in 2021.²⁴ This means that they are much more distanced from political considerations in the process of

creating policy. Additionally, the Democrat-led Council has demonstrated itself to be a progressive leader on other environmental issues, such as by passing the “Bring Your Own Bag” law last year. These facts create a prime environment for starting a positive and productive conversation around SAYT.

SAYT is a critical step needed to reduce waste and in turn, greenhouse gas emissions, in New York City. By championing such a policy, the City Council could make New York a leader in sustainability and make a lasting impact on our natural environment. That said, a residential recycling incentive program must be matched with equally aggressive commercial recycling incentives, efforts to encourage reduced waste generation, and a commitment to sustainable sanitation infrastructure. SAYT is a piece of the larger puzzle, yet without it, reducing New York City’s waste significantly may not happen quickly enough to stop climate change.

WORKS CITED

1. "A Better Way to Pay for Solid Waste Management." Citizens Budget Commission of New York. February 05, 2015. Accessed June 16, 2018. <https://cbcny.org/research/better-way-pay-solid-waste-management>.
2. "The Plan for a Strong and Just City." OneNYC. December 21, 2017. Accessed June 16, 2018. onenyc.cityofnewyork.us/visions/sustainability/goal-1-sustainability/.
3. "The Plan for a Strong and Just City." OneNYC. December 21, 2017. Accessed June 16, 2018. onenyc.cityofnewyork.us/visions/sustainability/goal-1-sustainability/.
4. DSNY Curbside Collections FY 2017. New York, NY: New York City Department of Sanitation, 2017.
5. Rosengren, Cole. "New York Council Member Calls For Stronger 'Zero Waste' Plan." Waste Dive. April 24, 2017. Accessed June 16, 2018. <http://www.wastedive.com/news/new-york-council-member-calls-for-stronger-zero-waste-plan/441129/>.
6. Assessing Progress on the City's Solid Waste Management Plan. New York, NY: Independent Budget Office, August 2017.
7. "Draft Final Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, September 2006: Executive Summary." New York Department of Sanitation, September, 2006. Accessed June 16, 2018. www1.nyc.gov/assets/dsny/docs/about_swmp_exec_summary_0815.pdf
8. One NYC 2017 Progress Report. New York, NY, City of New York. 2017.
9. One NYC 2017 Progress Report. New York, NY, City of New York. 2017."A Better Way to Pay for Solid Waste Management." Citizens Budget Commission of New York. February 05, 2015. Accessed June 16, 2018. <https://cbcny.org/research/better-way-pay-solid-waste-management>.
10. High Demand, Low Supply." Naked Apartments. Accessed June 16, 2018. <http://www.nakedapartments.com/guides/nyc/renting-in-new-york-city/high-demand-low-supply>.
11. "Housing in Seoul." The Seoul Research Data Service. Accessed June 16, 2018. data.si.re.kr/eng_h_housing_in_seoul.
12. "Recycling (Smart Waste Management in Seoul)." Seoul Solution. October 31, 2016. Accessed February 16, 2018. seoulsolution.kr/en/content/recycling-smart-waste-management-seoul.
13. "Recycling (Smart Waste Management in Seoul)." Seoul Solution. October 31, 2016. Accessed February 16, 2018. seoulsolution.kr/en/content/recycling-smart-waste-management-seoul.
14. "A Better Way to Pay for Solid Waste Management." Citizens Budget Commission of New York. February 05, 2015. Accessed June 16, 2018. <https://cbcny.org/research/better-way-pay-solid-waste-management>.
15. "A Better Way to Pay for Solid Waste Management." Citizens Budget Commission of New York. February 05, 2015. Accessed June 16, 2018. <https://cbcny.org/research/better-way-pay-solid-waste-management>.
16. Adler, Ben. "Manhattan and Brooklyn Are Much Poorer Than You Think." Slate Magazine. January 09, 2014. Accessed June 16, 2018. http://www.slate.com/articles/business/moneybox/2014/01/new_york_city_census_data_manhattan_and_brooklyn_are_much_poorer_than_you.html.

17. "Housing in Seoul." The Seoul Research Data Service. Accessed June 16, 2018. data.si.re.kr/eng_h_housing_in_seoul.
18. DSNY Curbside Collections FY 2017. New York, NY: New York City Department of Sanitation, 2017.
19. "A Better Way to Pay for Solid Waste Management." Citizens Budget Commission of New York. February 05, 2015. Accessed June 16, 2018. <https://cbcny.org/research/better-way-pay-solid-waste-management>.
20. "A Better Way to Pay for Solid Waste Management." Citizens Budget Commission of New York. February 05, 2015. Accessed June 16, 2018. <https://cbcny.org/research/better-way-pay-solid-waste-management>.
21. "Recycling (Smart Waste Management in Seoul)." Seoul Solution. October 31, 2016. Accessed February 16, 2018. seoulsolution.kr/en/content/recycling-smart-waste-management-seoul.
22. Oversight – Getting to Zero Waste By 2030. New York, NY: New York City Council. September 18, 2017.
23. Oversight – Getting to Zero Waste By 2030. New York, NY: New York City Council. September 18, 2017.
24. "Membership of the New York City Council." Wikipedia. June 15, 2018. Accessed June 16, 2018. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Membership_of_the_New_York_City_Council.

LEADING THE DEFEAT OF JUVENILE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE

Lindsey Jackson

ABSTRACT In 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Juvenile Life Without Parole sentences are unconstitutional. In 2017, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that inmates serving these sentences are each retroactively entitled to sentence reviews. Despite these court rulings, an estimated 2,500 children wane in prison until they die. States are striking out on their own to enforce these rulings piecemeal. However, this paper argues that the U.S. Congress must take action to ensure that constitutional rights are upheld equally throughout the country. It further illustrates how New York legislation that has led to the successful enforcement of these rulings can serve as a model for national legislation. This paper proposes a method of successful adoption and implementation of such legislation in Congress.

Robbing Children of Their Lives

U.S. prosecutors are illegally leaving 2,500 children to wane in prison until they die. Last year, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that inmates sentenced as juveniles to life without parole (JLWOP) are each retroactively entitled to sentence reviews. New York stands at the national forefront, eliminating JLWOP sentences. New York's successful example should spurn national legislation to end JLWOP with the programmatic structure and funding to defend children's rights.

Children are Less Culpable

In 2012's *Miller v Alabama*, the U.S. Supreme Court outlawed JLWOP sentences as an unconstitutional use of cruel and unusual punishment.¹ Then in 2016, the U.S. Supreme Court followed by ruling in *Montgomery v Louisiana* that all people currently incarcerated on JLWOP sentences are entitled to have their sentences retroactively reviewed.² Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote for the majority that the Constitution demands that a child's culpability for crimes be examined differently than an adult's.³

Researchers are universally concluding that youth's brains do not finish development until their mid-twenties.⁴ Courts are taking note. Sentences for youth offenders are now being mitigated by virtue of this modern science, which reinforces the U.S. Supreme Court's finding of reduced culpability for young people in *Miller*, and later affirmed in *Montgomery*.⁵

The New York Model

The U.S. Congress should undertake federal legislation to enforce the U.S. Supreme Court's decreed protection of children's rights. New York can serve

as a prime example of effective enforcement. New York stands as a beacon of Constitutional protection, but there are currently no systems of review for prosecutors, judges, and parole boards in other states to follow New York's lead. In the absence of clear direction, Constitutional rights are falling by the wayside. Simply leaving other states unassisted as they struggle to implement individual systems of JLWOP sentence review is not working. A structure must be approved by Congress to implement the Court's mandate to protect the rights of people imprisoned as children across the country as soon as possible. Since *Montgomery*, few states have implemented the Court's retroactive mandate. Different states are haphazardly trying different things, the net result being unequal access to individual liberty.⁶ Standardizing and funding a review process for JLWOP cases across the country would relieve states from the fiscal and managerial burden of creating and funding review programs themselves.

Today, New York has zero prisoners serving JLWOP sentences.⁷ National legislation should be drafted with the goal of achieving the same results.

A Formula for National Legislation

National JLWOP legislation should systematically enforce reviews of this illegal sentence. This should include Department of Justice funding to support local sentence review hearings. First, local parole boards would convene to interview each JLWOP prisoner and prepare a recommendation for the sentencing judge. Second, local sentencing judges would hold formal hearings for each JLWOP case with local prosecutors and defense attorneys to decide how to appropriately alter the JLWOP

sentence. Department of Justice (DOJ) funding would support these two hearings.

Legislation should require all JLWOP cases to be heard by both the local parole board and local sentencing judge within two calendar years from the date of the bill's passage. Inmates serving JLWOP whose sentences are not reviewed within two calendar years from passage should be automatically made eligible for parole. All people serving JLWOP sentences found suitable for parole via hearing, or released on parole via the two-year expiration, should be released according to typical, local parole practices and supervision.

Building a Coalition of Support

This legislation will require mobilization of a broad coalition of support, including the U.S. Attorney General and DOJ, state parole boards, and children's rights advocacy groups. As of this publication, Attorney General Sessions comes from Alabama where they have already reviewed over one-fourth of their JLWOP cases in light of the 2016 *Montgomery* ruling. Alabama is demonstrating a commitment to eliminating JLWOP, but is an example of a state that would greatly benefit from federal funding and assistance. His sway on prosecutorial enforcement of U.S. Supreme Court rulings is critical for success.

Likewise, the support of lobbyists and representatives of parole boards and children's rights groups will be necessary to unite Congress to support this issue. DOJ allocations will mean an increased use of parole boards and increased jobs on parole boards across the country. This additional funding is likely to help secure the support of parole board advocacy groups.

Additionally, children's advocacy and children's rights groups will be important voices to help garner public support of this proposed legislation.

With strong support and incentives, this legislation can pass. Creating a system that can be easily transposed onto existing local judicial structures, all parole boards and sentencing judges will have the direction and funding to hold hearings for each individual serving a JLWOP sentence. The alternative is to either allow states to continue fumbling on their own, with little success, or to wait for the U.S. Supreme Court to issue another similar ruling that may still go unheeded. In either scenario, America's children lose.

Children are a Bipartisan Concern

Some conservatives in Congress may view this as a liberal agenda item and not want to support it. However, this concept has already flourished in traditionally red states like Kansas, West Virginia, and Wyoming, who each have eliminated JLWOP sentences.⁸ Although some may argue that this legislation has the appearance of federal overreaction, this proposed bill would actually grant states the funding to carry out justice themselves in their own way, without federal oversight. If states wish to maintain the ability to review JLWOP sentences themselves, it is imperative that they implement a system that grants the rights promulgated in *Montgomery* by enacting this proposed legislation.

Conservative members of Congress should also take note that individual states and courts will still be able to make case-by-case rulings as they see fit, which falls squarely within Republican values. However, because children's rights and defendant's rights

will also be acknowledged, this measure will have broad appeal across the aisle.

Gather Support to Lead this Movement

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Miller* that JLWOP sentences are unconstitutional and then added that existing JLWOP sentences require retroactive review in *Montgomery*. Congress can learn from New York State how effective review of JLWOP sentences can lead to positive outcomes in the justice system. Members from across the political spectrum should be able to support its provisions, and an effective program would be economically feasible with funds from the Department of Justice. With a proper mobilized coalition, this legislation should be able to pass in any Congress.

2 (2014): 63-65.

8. Cohen, Alexandra O., and B.J. Casey. "Rewiring Juvenile Justice: The Intersection of Developmental Neuroscience and Legal Policy." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 18, no. 2 (2014): 63-65.

WORKS CITED

1. *Miller v. Alabama*, 567 U.S. 460 (2012)
2. *Montgomery v. Louisiana*, 577 U.S. ____ (2016)
3. "Miller v. Alabama." Oyez. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.oyez.org/cases/2011/10-9646>
4. Associated Press. "A state-by-state look at juvenile life without parole." Associated Press News Online. Jul. 31, 2017. <https://www.apnews.com/9debc3bdc7034ad2a68e62911fba0d85>
5. Cohen, Alexandra O. et. al. "When is an Adolescent an Adult? Assessing Cognitive Control in Emotional and Nonemotional Contexts." *Psychological Science* 27, no. 4 (2016) 549-562
6. Cohen, Alexandra O., and B.j. Casey. "Rewiring Juvenile Justice: The Intersection of Developmental Neuroscience and Legal Policy." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 18, no. 2 (2014): 63-65.
7. Cohen, Alexandra O., and B.j. Casey. "Rewiring Juvenile Justice: The Intersection of Developmental Neuroscience and Legal Policy." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 18, no.

MONGOLIA'S 2017 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CALLS FOR COMPULSORY VOTING

Rentsenkhand Enkh-Amgalan

ABSTRACT The collapse of socialism in Mongolia in the 1990s did not guarantee the natural development of strong institutions of democracy. Since the first free election in 1992, voter turnout rates have been low and continue to decline. Attempts to mitigate the issue, like public education campaigns, election day holidays, and changing the election day to the weekend, have not solved the problem. Low voter turnout can lead to unrepresentative government and distrust of the government. This paper argues that Mongolia strengthen its democracy by adopting a mandatory voting policy.

After the collapse of socialism in the 1990s, Mongolia's low voter turnout for almost every presidential election has been quickly threatening its newly established democracy. Since the first democratic election in 1992, voter turnout rates dropped from almost 95% to 67%.¹ In the 2017 presidential election, there was no candidate who received the majority of votes (50% plus one vote), which forced a run-off for the first time in history.² The low voter turnout signals a crisis of democracy; Mongolia has to preserve the legitimate values of political participation and equal representation of its citizens for a sustainable democracy. A move to a compulsory voting policy can be the most effective and efficient way to significantly increase turnout in Mongolia.

In an effort to increase voter participation, Mongolia started organizing elections on weekdays and made them official holidays. However, this did not result in any improvements in the voter turnout rate. The United Nations Development Programme collaborated with the General Election Commission of Mongolia and produced educational materials, posters, websites and TV ads to mobilize voters,³ but these persuasion tactics failed to produce significant results. These techniques are clearly not enough.

There are two major reasons why Mongolians are not voting: a lack of trust in both nominated politicians and the electoral process, as well as voters' feelings of confusion and hopelessness that they will never see positive change.⁴ For example, all three presidential candidates from 2017 were involved in corruption scandals (including illegal offshore accounts, bribery for government jobs and prohibited donations),⁵ which caused

high disapproval rates among voters. One voter simply said, "I won't vote because there is nobody to choose from."⁶ According to the International Republican Institute's public opinion poll in 2016, 61% of respondents expressed their disenchantment with poor governance.⁷ As a Mongolian voter living abroad and keeping informed about the candidates' profiles, I also felt the same way.

There is an alternative option for Mongolians to protest the candidates. According to Article 99.5 of the Law on Election, voters can select a none-of-the-above option and express their dissatisfaction with the nominated candidates, or simply turn in blank ballots.⁸ This means that if the majority casts blank votes, a new election would be held with new candidate nominations. This is an important distinction because a common decision is made by the citizens, not because of the low voter turnout. During the 2017 presidential election, a group of young people organized a social media movement to popularize blank ballots and force new elections with new candidates, which resulted in 8.6% blank votes.⁹

Another reason for low voter turnout is that Mongolian citizens are not particularly experienced in democratic elections and knowledgeable about the importance of voting. As a new democracy, Mongolians have only had a total of eight parliamentary elections since the transition to democracy in 1990.¹⁰ The 2017 presidential election runoff named only the fifth president of Mongolia. Mongolia is not alone. For example, Tunisia, one of the world's newest democracies, had a low level of voting with 80% of eligible Tunisian voters boycotting the vote.¹¹ Serbia, another new democracy, also experienced the same issue with only

22% turnout in their presidential election.¹² According to the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, during the past 25 years, new democracies that consist of post-communist states experienced a much steeper decline in voter turnout as compared to established democracies.¹³ It is clear that a transition to democracy itself does not guarantee voting. A government must establish a national culture of active citizen engagement. Compulsory voting can help facilitate this.

Many argue that mandatory voting violates an individual's freedom in a democratic electoral system. However, this policy does not force citizens to vote; it simply compels them to show up at the polling stations. From that point on, it is up to the voters to decide who they want to elect or leave the ballot blank to show their disappointment with candidates or the electoral process. There are over 26 democratic countries enforcing this strategy, including Belgium and Australia, with turnout rates of 87% and 80% respectively.¹⁴ These democracies are not known for curtailing the rights of their citizens.

The historically low voter turnout in 2017 triggered an important call-to-action for the Mongolian government to take a policy intervention and educate the public on the significance of active voting. Given the lack of previous experience in practicing such policy, it would be beneficial to first pilot this in the upcoming 2021 presidential election, analyze its feasibility, and evaluate the results before considering it for all elections.

Mongolia's General Election Commission should draft a policy agenda that incentivizes active voters and punishes non-voters as part of the

compulsory voting. This may not occur, however, without the active urging of the citizens of Mongolia who care about the health of its democracy. Democracy advocates must organize and raise their voices for the adoption of compulsory voting. Their mobilization can serve as an example of what a healthy democracy looks like, which can be institutionalized through the adoption of a mandatory voting policy.

WORKS CITED

1. Lessons Learned from Electoral Support to Mongolia 2008-2012. United Nations Development Programme, 2012. 12. Accessed October 20, 2017. [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/mongolia/Publications/DemGov/Lessons Learned from Electoral Support to Mongolia_EN.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/mongolia/Publications/DemGov/Lessons%20Learned%20from%20Electoral%20Support%20to%20Mongolia_EN.pdf).
2. Edwards, Terrence. "Mongolia's Presidential Election Forced Into a Second Round." Reuters. June 27, 2017. Accessed July 27, 2018. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-mongolia-elections/mongolias-presidential-election-forced-into-a-second-round-idUSKBN19H238>.
3. Lessons Learned from Electoral Support to Mongolia 2008-2012. United Nations Development Programme, 2012. 12. Accessed October 20, 2017. [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/mongolia/Publications/DemGov/Lessons Learned from Electoral Support to Mongolia_EN.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/mongolia/Publications/DemGov/Lessons%20Learned%20from%20Electoral%20Support%20to%20Mongolia_EN.pdf).
4. Mongolia-Presidential Election, Second Round, 7 July 2017. Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2017. Accessed October 15, 2017, <https://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/mongolia/328381?download=true>
5. Denyer, Simon. "Mongolian Democracy Has a Familiar Ailment, And It's All About Money." The Washington Post. June 26, 2018. Accessed July 27, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/mongolian-democracy-has-a-familiar-ailment-and-its-all-about-money/2018/06/25/76c4452a-68cb-11e8-a335-c4503d041eaf_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.11fdb5cb942.
6. "Corruption Scandals Muddy Mongolia's Presidential Vote." The Daily Mail. June 22, 2017. Accessed October 17, 2017, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/afp/article->

4630896/Corruption-scandals-muddy-Mongolias-presidential-vote.html

7. "Mongolian Elections: Voter Dissatisfaction Drives Opposition Victory." International Republication Institute. July 01, 2016. Accessed October 20, 2017. <http://www.iri.org/resource/mongolian-elections-voter-dissatisfaction-drives-opposition-victory>.
8. Mongolia-Presidential Election, Second Round, 7 July 2017. Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2017. p.4. Accessed October 15, 2017. <https://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/mongolia/328381?download=true>
9. Kohn, Michael. Bloomberg Politics, "Nationalist Candidate Battulga Wins Mongolian Election in Runoff." Bloomberg. July 7, 2017. Accessed October 17, 2017. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-07-07/nationalist-candidate-battulga-wins-mongolian-election-in-runoff>
10. "Mongolian Elections: Voter Dissatisfaction Drives Opposition Victory." International Republication Institute. July 01, 2016. Accessed October 20, 2017. <http://www.iri.org/resource/mongolian-elections-voter-dissatisfaction-drives-opposition-victory>.
11. Yerkes, Sarah. "Youth Voting: What a New Democracy Can Teach Us about an Old One." Brookings. November 6, 2016. Accessed October 20, 2017. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/markaz/2016/11/06/youth-voting-what-a-new-democracy-can-teach-us-about-an-old-one/>
12. Zelenko, Michael. "Democracy in Decline?" World Policy. 2012. Accessed October 15, 2017. <https://worldpolicy.org/2011/08/29/democracy-in-decline/>
13. Solijonov, Abdurashid. "Voter Turnout Trends Around the World." Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. 2016. p.25. Accessed October 20, 2017. <https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/voter-turnout-trends-around-the-world.pdf>
14. Santiago, Jose. "Which Countries Make Voting Compulsory." World Economic Forum/ October 26, 2015. Accessed October 18, 2017, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/10/which-countries-make-voting-compulsory/>

SHOULD A CITY LIMIT ITS POPULATION?

Zhen Luo

ABSTRACT Megacities, which accommodate millions of people, are always challenged by the impact of population growth. By comparing Beijing and New York City, this paper suggests that restrictions to the population should not be included in a city's development plan. The freedom to immigrate is not only a right, but also reasonable from an economic perspective.

The Population Problem in Megacities: Global Trends

Megacities, which accommodate more than ten million people, are densely populated because they are rich in perceived fortune and opportunities. As the developed world is undergoing dramatic globalization and the developing world is witnessing rapid urbanization, we can anticipate two trends in the next decades:

First, as Saskia Sassen explains, globalization means stronger connections between global gateway cities.¹ As globalization deepens, we can expect more immigrants, domestic or international, seeking opportunities in metropolitan areas, such as New York, Tokyo, Paris, Hong Kong and Shanghai. Free migration in the age of globalization is a trend toward not only certain cities, but also certain countries.

Second, countries like the Philippines, Vietnam, India and Ethiopia are competing to be the next “factory of the world” with economic growth rates above six percent.² As a result of undergoing rapid economic growth and urbanization, new megacities are going to emerge on the coasts of Africa, South Asia and Southeast Asia. In less than a decade, Shenzhen, which used to be a small village in the Pearl River Delta, became one of the most prosperous cities in China. We can expect more stories like that in the developing world.

Urban Population Problem in the Two Worlds

Rapid population growth could bring new problems to megacities in not only the developing world, but also the developed world. For the latter, growth in megacities does not inevitably carry

with it growth in the values of openness and diversity. There is still a growing portion of the population that hopes to build walls between countries; the zeitgeist of isolationism could indeed affect urban planners.

For the developing world, new immigrants will bring about new problems that governments may not have encountered before, such as a growth in traffic, housing prices and pollution. Urban planners in the developing world must ask themselves how to proceed: to close the borders and maintain their outdated administration, or to embrace new immigrants as well as the opportunities they carry.

Thus, municipalities in current and growing megacities must ask what population policies – if any – should be implemented.

Experiences from Beijing and New York City: A Comparison

Large urban centers like Beijing and New York City, as defined by population and economic output, are natural cities to compare. A comparative analysis of their population policies can be informative for other megacities, especially future ones. This section will review the divergent policy approaches to population of Beijing and New York City.

Beijing: Government-Regulated Population Limits

Challenged by the problems associated with the growth of megacities, Beijing tried to control its population by enforcing growth limits. Beijing recently announced that the population should be kept under 23 million until 2020. To achieve this

goal, Beijing has implemented a household registration policy - one of the few living legacies of China's planned economy policies - to keep immigrants from using the city's health care, education and other public service systems. Recently, the municipal government launched a plan to "gut the city of all functions unrelated to its status as national capital, to push the growing population into the surrounding provinces."³

New York City: Unregulated Population Growth

New York City does not control its population with any restrictions. American citizens can come and go freely, and international residents can stay if they have visas. There is no gatekeeper for the city and there is no registration policy to deny resources to immigrants. While it is true that for international immigrants with visas, there are strict laws limiting their access to resources, the laws are set by the federal government, not by the city itself. In other words, while the country does have a border, the city itself does not.

A Comparison of the Policy Consequences

Even though China has a powerful central government by whom policy implementation is always guaranteed, the population control policy has proved to be a failure. By the year 1980, the municipal government drafted a plan to control the population under 10 million until the year 2000, but the goal failed before 1985. By the year 1990, the government drafted another plan to keep the population under 15 million until the year 2005, but the goal failed before 1995.⁴ To this date, Beijing has not achieved its intended targets.

New York City remains manageable with an open population policy, which is contrary to the Beijing policy. Crime rates have decreased by more than 20% over the last decade.^{5,6} Moreover, the city has continued to prosper with an open city border. Life expectancy went up from 72.4 years in 1990 to 81.2 years in 2015,⁷ and people's wages went up more rapidly than the rest of the country.⁸ Although inequality remains a major challenge, the city's top earners are voluntarily advocating higher taxes on themselves in order to provide better public services to the poor.⁹

New York's openness can provide a lesson for Beijing and other major cities. Population growth does not necessarily harm an urban center. Indeed, New York statistics show that a city can even thrive under such conditions.

Why Megacities Should not Limit Their Population

First and foremost, people's right to immigrate should be protected. The right to migrate is protected by most countries' constitutions as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.¹⁰ A city government's laws should not supersede international agreements. Thus, any effort to deport anyone from a city or discriminate against anyone based on where and when they migrated from should be considered illegal under international law.

Secondly, economic forces can adjust the population to an optimum level. Not everyone wants to migrate to an urban core. Big cities may have more economic opportunities, but the high prices and heavy traffic can deter migration. If a city is too crowded,

newcomers may be stopped by the economic burdens. This can explain why cities like New York and London witnessed smooth (less than one percent) population growth in the past decade. A city needs a diverse labor force, including blue collar, white collar and no collar workers. The interdependency of various income groups is a complicated structure, like an ecological system, with economic reasons. The government has neither authority nor precise enough knowledge to decide who is optimal to leave and who should stay.

Finally, larger populations can lead to innovation and development. Rome, the beating heart of the ancient Mediterranean world, had one million inhabitants at its climax, larger than any other city at that time. This large population pushed Rome to its fullest potentials in urban planning: insulas, hygienic water, bath houses and even fire brigades. Romans enjoyed these advanced infrastructures and institutions two thousand years earlier than the rest of the world.¹⁰ Millions of people in a single city can mean better division of labor and intense cooperation, which are the sources of innovation.¹¹ It is the energy and creativity of human power which make megacities key factors in economic development.

The Counterargument: Slums

Some people argue that lack of regulation can lead to economic inequality. Slums are often highlighted as evidence for economic polarization. However, as Harvard economist Edward Glaeser points out, cities are not where the inequality problem is created, but where the problem is being solved. Poverty rates of long-term residents are much lower than that of new-comers, which means that

immigrants are more likely to climb the economic ladder long-term in cities. The poverty rate is much lower than that in rural areas. Lagos, for example, has a poverty rate that is less than half of that of rural Nigeria.¹² Income inequality in cities attract attention not because the problem is worse in urban areas, but because the greater concentration of people necessitate action.

Conclusion

As Glaeser contends, urban lives make us "richer, smarter, greener, healthier, and happier."¹³ It is unjust and unfair to keep a portion of the humankind from such a great achievement. Urban growth requires careful and thoughtful planning. However, population limitations should not be a part of it. They do not solve the social ills they are purported to correct.

WORKS CITED

1. Sassen, Saskia. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton University Press, 2013.
2. "World Bank Open Data." The World Bank. Accessed May 10, 2018. <https://data.worldbank.org/>
3. Haas, Benjamin. "China: 'Ruthless' Campaign to Evict Beijing's Migrant Workers Condemned." *The Guardian*. November 27, 2017. Accessed May 10, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/nov/27/china-ruthless-campaign-evict-beijings-migrant-workers-condemned>.
4. Chen, Yiyong & Liu Tao. "Reflections on Predictions and Realities of Beijing's Population Management" (Chinese). *Urban Planners*, 2015(10).
5. *Seven Major Felony Offenses, 2000-2017*. New York, NY: New York Police Department, 2017.
6. *Non-Seven Major Felony Offenses, 2000-2017*. New York, NY: New York Police Department, 2017.

7. Short, Aaron. "New Yorkers are Living Longer, Happier and Healthier Lives." *New York Post*. June 4, 2017. Accessed May 10, 2018.
8. <https://nypost.com/2017/06/04/new-yorkers-are-living-longer-happier-and-healthier-lives/>.
9. Magdaleno, Johnny. "Measuring the Inequality Factor of NYC's Success." *Equity Factor*. December 16, 2016. Accessed May 10, 2018. <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/inequality-new-york-city-wealthy-poor-divide>.
10. UN General Assembly. "Universal Declaration of Human Rights." A. Paris, 1948. Accessed August 29, 2018. <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/> (accessed August 29, 2018).
11. Macaulay, David. *City: A Story of Roman Planning and Construction*. Newton, KS.: Paw Prints, 2013.
12. Glaeser, Edward. *Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier*. NY, NY: Penguin Books, 2012.
13. Glaeser, Edward. *Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier*. NY, NY: Penguin Books, 2012, p.70-73.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENCOURAGE SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN SANTIAGO DE CHILE

Monica Flores

ABSTRACT The purpose of this memorandum is to recommend a series of changes to Santiago de Chile’s urban policies in order to encourage a more sustainable urban development and future growth. The proposal is framed within the Sustainable Urban Development Act of 2010 (S. 3229) and aims to solve Santiago’s most pressing developmental issues: (1) an overburdened subway system; (2) the increasing pollution in the city due to car usage, and; (3) the density polarization of affordable housing supply: overcrowded towers in central areas and tract housing in the periphery.

Issue 1: Metro Over Use and Access Inequality

Santiago's Metro system is the best in Latin America and seventh best in the world in terms of frequency.¹ The Metro carries an average of 2.2 million people daily.² The main Metro line — Line 1 — is located in the north of Santiago, connecting east to west, and running across the "northeast cone" (the wealthier area of the city) in which the three major job-concentrated municipalities are located. The other three lines connect Line 1 to southern Santiago, which is mainly a low-to-middle-income residential area. Metro trains are overburdened daily at peak hours, especially Line 1, which has increased from an average of 610,000 in 2015 to 617,000 passengers per hour in a working day in 2016. Stations like "Los Heroes" (Line 1) bear almost 46,000 passengers per hour in peak hours, getting close to their maximum design capacity at 50,000. Moreover, Santiago's subway surpassed six passengers per square meter on average, double international recommendations.³

Residents overwhelmingly prefer to use the Metro, displaying "incomparable confidence levels in terms of travel times and frequency, qualities that do not exist in alternative transportation means like buses and car".⁴ However, only 26% of the city has direct access to it. The other 74% of the city has to rely on buses or private transportation,⁵ generating an overload of street traffic and increasing bus commute times.

Issue 2: Car Usage and Pollution

Santiago de Chile is the fourth highest polluted city in the whole continent. Its

average particulate matter (PM10) in 2016 was 64 microg/m³, four times the New York City average.⁶ 41% of Santiago's particulate matter has its origin in automobiles and trucks.⁷ Moreover, automobile usage has increased during the last decade, and is the most used means of transportation. During peak hours, 29% of travel is done by car (increasing from 21% in 2001), whereas 24% is done through public transportation (decreasing from 30% in 2001). Commuters prefer private cars over the public bus system when there is no subway alternative, especially among high-income (57%) and middle-income households (29%).⁸

Issue 3: Affordable Housing

The Ministry of Housing subsidizes the demand for housing, mostly for property ownership.⁹ In Santiago, 63.1% of subsidized units are new developments.¹⁰ However, the government depends on real estate developers to supply new affordable dwellings. Most of these are provided by large-scale real estate developers that sell a large number of units per project in order to cover their fixed costs.¹¹ This has led to an extreme "typological polarization": high density apartment towers in the center versus tract houses in the suburbs, generating negative externalities.¹² On the one hand, low-income central municipalities are being densified faster than the urban infrastructure is being improved, generating high traffic, collapse of sewers and diminished water pressure in the area.¹³ These high-density buildings have also been denounced for harboring prostitution, drug-dealing businesses, and increased levels of violence and insecurity in the surroundings. On the other hand, most

of Santiago's available affordable units are located in neighborhoods with a low quality of public services. Among the subsidized units for low income families in Santiago Metropolitan Area, over 70% are tract houses and 48% are located in municipalities that do not have access to the subway),¹⁴ meaning that residents face commuting times of more than an hour to downtown Santiago.¹⁵

Proposal 1: Expand the Metro Network

Santiago can both ease stress on the Metro and create greater access by creating a parallel to Line 1— Line1a — that runs through the north side of the Mapocho River reaching further areas of the northeast-cone.¹⁶ Another eastern-western line should be developed in the southern area of the city, where low income households are located. This policy will increase access to subway transportation for the high and middle classes, creating less car dependence, and therefore decreasing pollution caused by car usage. This will also result in lower travel times for bus-dependent users. Finally, this will guarantee fast connectivity for the low and middle income households of Santiago, making it easier for them to move towards the more productive and better-served areas of the city and to take advantage of its agglomeration economies.

The central government will carry the cost of expanding the subway system. All taxpayers will receive the benefits of new public infrastructure; it will generate a positive externality that accrues directly to landowners of areas surrounding new Metro stations by increasing land values. Considering Santiago's new construction rate,¹⁷ redevelopment and densification are likely to happen in these areas.

Santiago should also implement a variation of a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) method that helps bring affordable housing to better connected areas of the city. Specifically, Santiago should mandate affordable housing units within walking distance of every subway station. The rate of affordable units should decrease with an increase of distance to the subway station.¹⁷ These units should remain affordable according to the Ministry of Housing affordability price reference every time they are sold or rented, and only a person who receives subsidies should be able to buy or rent these units. By imposing this kind of TIF, development may slow down in the short-run, but pick up in the long-run; the TIF will be transferred to the landowners, lowering the sale price that increased by having a new subway station in front of them.

Proposal 2: Internalize the Negative Externalities of High Density Development

In order to prevent "vertical ghetto development," Santiago can mitigate the negative effects of high density through a density bonus. Santiago should provide incentives for developers to invest in local public infrastructure, including sewage renewal, improving water pressure provisions, transit impact reduction, local surveillance, and public space maintenance. This way, developers will internalize the negative externalities that projects with excessive density generate, especially in low-income municipalities.

Proposal 3: Incentivize Development in Mid-Density Areas

Santiago should subsidize the supply rather than demand for housing. In this scenario, the government will

know the number of affordable units available in the market and their locations prior to assigning benefits. Moreover, there is less risk for the developer: they will be guaranteed the sale units being subsidized by the government. This could incentivize small and medium sized developers to enter the market, who would be willing to build fewer units per project. Furthermore, specific incentives for middle scale development should be made in the form of increasing subsidy rates: a higher subsidy should be added for projects with medium density. Moreover, a higher subsidy should be given for units located close to the subway and to projects located within neighborhoods with higher quality services, such as public schools, public health clinics, parks, and street maintenance.

Further Research

The costs and benefits that have been outlined are certainly not exhaustive. Further research is needed to estimate the following: an accurate mapping and investment impact of new subway lines, the rate of mandatory affordable units to be funded by the TIF according to the actual increase in land value, the maximum density that the city should allow, the amount of the density bonus according to investment in public infrastructure, and what is the medium-density range to be encouraged and subsidized by the government.

WORKS CITED

1. Palavecino, Angélica Baeza. "Metro De Santiago En Cifras: Transporta Al Año Casi La Mitad De La Población De China." La Tercera. Accessed May 11, 2018. <http://www.latercera.com/noticia/metro-de-santiago-en-cifras-transporta-al-ano-casi-la-mitad-de-la-poblacion-de-china/>.
2. "Nuestra Organización." Metro De Santiago. Accessed May 11, 2018. <https://www.metrosantiago.cl/corporativo>.
3. "Restricción De Recursos Deja En Suspense La Construcción De La Línea 7 Del Metro." Emol. April 23, 2017. Accessed May 11, 2018. <http://www.emol.com/noticias/Nacional/2017/04/23/855308/Restriccion-de-recursos-deja-en-suspense-la-construccion-de-la-linea-7-del-Metro.html>.
4. De Grange, Louis. "Metro, Nuestro Metro, Por Louis De Grange - Voces De LA TERCERA." La Tercera. Accessed May 11, 2018. <http://www2.latercera.com/voces/metro-nuestro-metro/>.
5. "Tres de Cada diez Santiaguinos enfrentan un acceso deficiente al transporte público. Plataforma" Urbana, Accessed May 11, 2018. <http://www.plataformaurbana.cl/archive/2016/07/16/tres-de-cada-diez-santiaguinos-enfrentan-un-acceso-deficiente-al-transporte-publico/>
6. "WHO Global Urban Ambient Air Pollution Database (update 2016)." World Health Organization. June 26, 2017. Accessed May 11, 2018. http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/cities/en/.
7. De Grange, Louis. "Metro, Nuestro Metro, Por Louis De Grange - Voces De LA TERCERA." La Tercera. Accessed May 11, 2018. <http://www2.latercera.com/voces/metro-nuestro-metro/>.
8. Telecomunicaciones. Presentamos Resultados De La Encuesta Origen Destino De Santiago | Ministerio De Transportes Y Telecomunicaciones. Accessed May 11, 2018. <http://www.mtt.gob.cl/archivos/10194>.
9. During 2016, 46,976 subsidies were allotted for ownership and 12,000 were rental vouchers. See: Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo de Chile. "Vivienda Adecuada Y Asequible." Presentation. Habitat III Conference.
10. During 2016, 46,976 subsidies were allotted for ownership and 12,000 were rental vouchers. See: Ministerio de Vivienda y

Urbanismo de Chile. "Vivienda Adecuada Y Asequible." Presentation. Habitat III Conference.

11. Among buildings over 15 floors in Santiago, 23% have more than 250 apartment units per building, concentrating 46.4% of the units (mostly affordable) within these buildings. See: (Astaburuaga y Grandón (2017) according to building permits between 1994 and 2015) in *Densificación urbana en edificios en altura: ¿gana o pierde la ciudad?*. April 2017. Retrieved from: Centro UC: Políticas Públicas. "Densificación Urbana En Edificios En Altura: ¿gana O Pierde La Ciudad?" April 27, 2017.
12. Over 80% of projects with more than 250 apartments per tower are concentrated in Santiago Downtown, Estación Central and Independencia. The last two are low-income municipalities located right next to Santiago Downtown towards the western end. See note 11.
13. Important note: In Santiago, there is no city government and every municipality provides their own zoning regulations and public goods. This generates a competition, especially between low-income municipalities, to attract real estate development and increase their income via property taxes and building permits fees. Poor municipalities have fewer-to-no regulations for new development. The best example is Estacion Central, a municipality with no density or height regulations. Estación Central is the one with the highest rate of small housing units, with around 3800 units with less than 50 square meters (60 square yards) built per year. See: Informe MACH: Macreconomía Y Construcción. Report. Cámara Chilena De La Construcción, June 2016.
14. Ministry of Housing and Urbanism of Chile (MINVU). 2010.
15. Travel time by public transportation estimated from the center point of each municipality to the government palace in Santiago Downtown, using Google maps.
16. Line 1 currently runs east -west parallel to south shore of Mapocho river in the northern area of the city. See: "Metro De Santiago." Google Maps. Accessed September 23, 2018. https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=17t7cd_Mf5XNKob9SCWcm-TdnYvs&ll=-33.48802180001793,-70.650758&z=11.
17. Annually in Santiago de Chile, eight million square meters are built for housing. This equals 45% of the whole country's housing construction. See note 13.

A COOPERATIVE SOLUTION FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Steven Morales

ABSTRACT Over 50% of New Yorkers spend more than 30% of their income on rent despite the fact that Mayor Bill de Blasio has pledged to create and preserve 200,000 units of affordable housing. This paper proposes that New York City replicate the model of success exemplified by Co-op City in the Bronx, which was built in the late 1960s as part of the Mitchell-Lama program. This provided land, loans, and tax abatements to developers who agreed to keep rents affordable for middle income tenants. Unlike Mandatory Inclusionary Housing, which only creates a small percentage of affordable units while contributing to New York City's expensive luxury housing stock, expanding this limited equity-controlled rent model throughout the city could create 100% permanently affordable units for hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers. Though Co-op City is far from perfect—the complex has struggled through periods of financial trouble, mismanagement, and board corruption—these challenges could be mitigated through strong oversight.

Despite Mayor Bill de Blasio's promise "to create and preserve 200,000 affordable homes through his expansion of the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing program," New Yorkers still cannot afford to pay the rent.¹ According to a 2017 report by the New York City Rent Guidelines Board, over 50% of New Yorkers are rent-burdened, meaning that they spend more than 30% of their income on rent.² People who are rent- or cost-burdened, according to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, "may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation and medical care."³ We need new long-term, large-scale, affordable housing solutions to provide relief to millions of struggling New Yorkers.

One strong example of affordable housing that could work for many New Yorkers lies in the Northeast corner of the Bronx: Co-op City. Now home to over 43,000 residents, Co-op City was built in the late 1960s as part of the Mitchell-Lama program, which provided land, loans, and tax abatements to developers who agreed to keep rents affordable for middle income tenants.⁴ My grandparents were among Co-op City's first residents when they moved there from Morris Heights, and three generations of my family have lived there ever since. Co-op City allowed my grandparents, my parents, and thousands of other lower middle class New Yorkers to create economic stability for their families. Expanding Co-op City's model of limited-equity affordable housing throughout New York City can provide a valuable long-term option for the millions of New Yorkers struggling to pay rent every month.

Co-op City works by requiring new residents to purchase "limited equity"

shares in the community. These shares, which cost between \$13,500 for a one-bedroom and \$29,250 for a three-bedroom apartment, entitle shareholders to occupy their apartments in exchange for a monthly carrying charge. The carrying charge for a spacious two-bedroom apartment is roughly \$1,000 per month and covers water, electricity, central heat, air conditioning, routine maintenance, and administrative fees.⁵ The unique element of Co-op City's "limited equity" shares is that they do not fluctuate in value with the market. When shareholders leave, they receive their initial investment and nothing more.⁶ This gives Co-op City residents an incentive to stay for the long term and contributes to a shared sense of ownership and investment in the community. At the same time, as a Mitchell-Lama development, carrying charges are required by law to remain affordable. The Co-op City model ensures that monthly costs remain low and that residents are invested in their community.

Unlike Mandatory Inclusionary Housing, which only creates a small percentage of affordable units while contributing to New York City's expensive luxury housing stock, expanding the limited equity-controlled rent model throughout the city could create 100% permanently affordable units for hundreds of thousands New Yorkers.⁷ Just like Mitchell-Lama in the 1960s, government subsidies should be set aside for developers who build or convert existing buildings into limited-equity, rent-controlled apartments. Taking it one step further, additional income-based subsidies or low-interest loans could cover some or all of the equity payments for those living in extreme poverty.

Co-op City itself is far from perfect and its model will not work for everyone. Indeed, the complex has struggled through periods of financial trouble, mismanagement, and board corruption.⁸ In addition, not all families would be able to commit to the upfront equity payment or to staying in one place for an extended period of time. But these barriers could be resolved through strong oversight and may be a small price to pay for rent relief for hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers.

Contributing public funding to build sustainable affordable housing is not an easy political task. Neither is convincing developers to forego the potential profits of large luxury developments. But Co-op City shows that it is possible. It's time to take bold action and build more limited equity, rent-controlled housing in the Co-op City model to reduce New Yorkers' rent burden and keep New York City affordable for all.

WORKS CITED

1. Housing New York: A Five-Borough, Ten-Year Plan. New York, NY: City of New York.
2. 2017 Income and Affordability Study. New York, NY: New York City Rent Guidelines Board, 2017.
3. Affordable Housing. Accessed June 10, 2018. https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/comm_planning/affordablehousing/.
4. "History." Mitchell-Lama Residents Coalition. Accessed June 10, 2018. <http://www.mitchell-lama.org/history.html>.
5. Apply. River Bay Corporation. Accessed June 10, 2018. <http://riverbaycorp.com/apply/default.html>.
6. Cheslow, Jerry. "If You're Thinking of Living In/Co-op City; A City, Bigger Than Many, Within a City." The New York Times. November 20, 1994. Accessed June 10, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/1994/11/20/realestate/if-you-re-thinking-of-living-in-co-op-city-a-city-bigger-than-many-within-a-city.html?pagewanted=all>.

7. Chan, Sewell. "Bronx Odyssey: From Rebel to Executive to Felon." The New York Times. October 10, 2006. Accessed June 10, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2006/10/10/nyregion/10rosen.html>.
8. Block, Dorian. "Former Co-Op City Board President Gets 6 Months in Jail in Plea Deal - NY Daily News." New York Daily News. March 27, 2008. Accessed June 10, 2018. <http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/bronx/co-op-city-board-president-6-months-jail-plea-deal-article-1.288650>.

THE POSITIVE ECONOMICS OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

Alison Gratto Ng

ABSTRACT This paper argues that refugee resettlement is an economic net positive, specifically for communities in America's Rust Belt. There is documented evidence of economic growth and job creation as a result of resettlement in St. Paul, Minneapolis and Pittsburgh. This paper highlights Clarkson, Georgia as a microcosm of these trends in which a failing local grocery store was turned around by attracting the new customer base offered by resettled refugees. The evidence shows that refugees buck the stereotypes and fears that justify advocacy for a reduction in refugee acceptance and resettlement. Refugees work and go to school at higher rates than native-born Americans, augment the workforce in aging populations, contribute to the local economy, are vetted through intensive background checks and have comparatively low crime rates. That is why many cities are actively enacting policies that welcome refugees. This paper proposes that pro-refugee cities can form a coherent advocacy block that highlights the successes of refugee integration.

Recently, studies have shown that cities — especially declining cities in America’s Rust Belt — can gain enormous economic benefits from refugee resettlement. Despite this evidence, President Trump decided in 2017 to slash the number of refugees admitted to the U.S. by over 50%.¹ His ruling was wrong and misguided. The United States should keep the resettlement cap at 110,000 refugees per year. It is not just refugees who will suffer from this resettlement reduction; communities across the country will bear the economic costs.

Refugees are stateless people whose lives were interrupted by war and persecution. While the President’s policies are based on the idea that refugees are dangerous and a drain on the economy, studies show refugees have actually had a positive economic impact throughout the U.S., and particularly in the Rust Belt. Refugees help reverse depressing trends such as industry exodus, unemployment and brain drain. Cleveland and Akron, for example, benefit from an expanded tax base and increased population.² Refugees balance the housing market and generate more tax revenue by purchasing and renting homes that would otherwise be vacant.³ Northern towns and cities of New York State are experiencing similar trends. When industries left, cities such as Utica and Buffalo went into rapid decline. Refugee resettlement turned the local economies around. Among many others, St. Paul,⁴ Minneapolis⁵ and Pittsburg,⁶ show parallel improvements.

Throughout the U.S., refugees work and go to school at higher rates than native-born Americans.⁷ In areas suffering from population decline or an aging population, the positive effects of an augmented workforce are

substantial.⁸ Refugees that are resettled before age 14 go to college and are employed at the same rates of their native-born counterparts.⁹

Clarkson, Georgia is a clear representation of these trends.¹⁰ This small suburban city enacted policies to facilitate resettlement and integration of refugees, and the resulting signs of economic vitality are unmistakable.¹¹ In one iconic case, for example, an ancient local grocery store called Thrift Town reversed its demise by stocking its shelves with international products and attracting a refugee clientele.¹² It is a common scenario in places that welcome refugees. Cities — especially those in economic decline — need a population that will work hard, contribute to the economy and remain there. Refugees can be the solution.

Opponents of resettlement argue that refugees take jobs away from natives. However, studies find that refugees actually create jobs by starting businesses at higher frequencies than natives.¹³ Further, the increased population translates to more jobs in schools and support services.¹⁴ Since refugees only make up about 1% of the entire U.S. population, there is simply no evidence to suggest they flood the job market and lower wages for natives.¹⁵

President Trump and his administration have further argued against resettlement claiming refugees are too expensive, use too many social services and are too dangerous.¹⁶ His argument is myopic; evidence refutes all of these claims. According to new research by the Department of Health and Human Services, refugees contribute more to the economy over the long term than they use in benefits. Refugees are a net gain of approximately \$63 billion over a 10-

year period.¹⁷ Furthermore, refugees already undergo intense background checks,¹⁸ and areas with high numbers of refugees have low crime rates.¹⁹

Cities that understand the long-term benefits of resettlement are not interested in turning refugees away. Rather, they are trying to create policies that welcome refugees for the benefit of all.²⁰

To combat negative perceptions of refugees, cities that have gained from resettlement must exhibit their economic advances. Further, Rust Belt cities like Buffalo and Cleveland must show how a decrease in resettlement, now undertaken by President Trump as of this writing, effects economic conditions there. Cities can work together to form a cohesive advocacy strategy to welcome resettlement and highlight economic gains across all sectors — business, sports, education, faith, government and nonprofit. Cities that have yet to gain from resettlement can study and display how a refugee population could improve their economies.

Welcoming refugee resettlement should be part of every American city's plan for economic vitality. The benefits far outweigh the costs.

WORKS CITED

1. Davis, Julie Hirschfield and Miriam Jordan. "Trump Plans 45,000 Limit on Refugees Admitted to U.S." *New York Times*. September 26, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/26/us/politics/trump-plans-45000-limit-on-refugees-admitted-to-us.html>
2. Economic Impact of Refugees in the Cleveland Area, Calendar Year 2016. Report. Cleveland, OH: CHMURA Economics & Analytics, September 7, 2017.
3. Economic Impact of Refugees in the Cleveland Area, Calendar Year 2016. Report. Cleveland, OH: CHMURA Economics & Analytics, September 7, 2017.
4. Kallic, David Dyssegaard and Silva Mathema. *Refugee Integration in the United States*. Report. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress, June, 2016.
5. Kallic, David Dyssegaard and Silva Mathema. *Refugee Integration in the United States*. Report. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress, June, 2016.
6. Deto, Ryan. "Immigrants are Propping Up the Pittsburgh Metro Area Population." *Pittsburgh City Paper*. June 7, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.pghcitypaper.com/Blogh/archives/2017/06/07/immigrants-are-holding-up-the-pittsburgh-metro-area-population>.
7. Evans, William N., and Daniel Fitzgerald. "The Economic and Social Outcomes of Refugees in the United States: Evidence from the ACS." *National Bureau of Economic Research*. June 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w23498.pdf>.
8. Kallic, David Dyssegaard and Silva Mathema. *Refugee Integration in the United States*. Report. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress, June, 2016.
9. Evans, William N., and Daniel Fitzgerald. "The Economic and Social Outcomes of Refugees in the United States: Evidence from the ACS." *National Bureau of Economic Research*. June 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w23498.pdf>.
10. Long, Katy. "This Small Town In America's Deep South Welcomes 1,500 Refugees a Year." *The Guardian*. May 24, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/may/24/clarkston-georgia-refugee-resettlement-program>.
11. Shaer, Matthew. "Ellis Island South: Welcome to the Most Diverse Square Mile In America." *Atlanta*. January, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <http://www.atlantamagazine.com/great-reads/ellis-island-south-welcome-diverse-square-mile-america/>.
12. Stokes, Stephannie. "How Refugees Helped a Struggling Ga. Grocery Store Succeed." *WABE*. January 26, 2016. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.wabe.org/how-refugees-helped-struggling-ga-grocery-store-succeed/>.

13. Kerr, Sari Pekkala and William R. Kerr. "Immigrants Play a Disproportionate Role in American Entrepreneurship." *Harvard Business Review*. October 3, 2016. Accessed May 12, 2018. https://hbr.org/2016/10/immigrants-play-a-disproportionate-role-in-american-entrepreneurship%20and%20http://www.communityresearchpartners.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/IMPACT-OF-REFUGEES-ON-CENTRAL-OHIO_2015SP.pdf.
14. Mickinley, Jesse. "A Surprising Salve for New York's Beleaguered Cities: Refugees." *New York Times*. February 20, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/20/nyregion/a-surprising-salve-for-new-yorks-beleaguered-cities-refugees.html?mcubz=3&r=0>.
15. "Rejected Report Shows Revenue brought In by Refugees." *New York Times*. September 19, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/09/19/us/politics/document-Refugee-Report.html>.
16. Davis, Julie Hirschfield and Somini Sengupta. "Trump Administration Rejects Study Showing Positive Impact of Refugees." *New York Times*. September 18, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/18/us/politics/refugees-revenue-cost-report-trump.html>.
17. "Rejected Report Shows Revenue brought In by Refugees." *New York Times*. September 19, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/09/19/us/politics/document-Refugee-Report.html>.
18. Park, Haeyoun and Larry Buchanan. "Refugees Entering the U.S. Already Face a Rigorous Vetting Process." *New York Times*. January 29, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/01/29/us/refugee-vetting-process.html?mcubz=3>.
19. "Is There a Link Between Refugees and U.S. Crime Rates?" *New American Economy*. February 7, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://research.newamericaneconomy.org/report/is-there-a-link-between-refugees-and-u-s-crime-rates/>.
20. "Dayton, Ohio, Announced as First Certified Welcoming Community in United States." *Welcoming America*. September 13, 2017. Accessed May 12, 2018. <https://www.welcomingamerica.org/news/dayton-ohio-announced-first-certified-welcoming-community-united-states>.

NEW YORK STATE'S OPPORTUNITY TO CREATE A SUSTAINABLE HEALTHCARE WORKFORCE (AND THE RISK OF MISSING THE CRITICAL WINDOW)

Sarah Nusbaum

ABSTRACT New York state has reached the halfway mark in its \$6.24 billion, five-year plan to redesign its Medicaid program. Cost savings is chief amongst the state's priorities. This has shifted much of the burden of healthcare to frontline workers, low-paid, unlicensed individuals who spend the most time with patients. Home health aides have taken on the task of care as the industry as a whole has shifted towards reducing the amount of time patients spend in hospitals, the most expensive form of healthcare. This paper acknowledges the benefits that frontline workers bring to reducing costs and inefficiencies in the healthcare system and argues that reliance on this workforce will be unsustainable without systemically improving working conditions and salaries.

*This article was originally published in *Crain's New York Business* on October 19, 2017 and can be found online at <http://www.craigslist.com/article/20171019/OPINION/171019906/as-new-york-adds-home-health-aides-lets-stop-burning-them-out>.

Transformation is happening across healthcare delivery systems, not least in New York, where the state has reached the halfway mark in its \$6.24 billion, five-year plan to redesign its Medicaid program.¹ The chief goal of reform is to achieve some variation of the “triple aim:” improve population health, improve patient experiences and decrease costs.² With an emphasis on cost savings, providers are working to increase service coordination, task-shifting, and patient outreach. Reform efforts also mean shifting patient care to the least expensive settings and providers. Rather than seeing a doctor, you might benefit from the services of a health coach to help you manage your chronic conditions, a community health worker to link you with services in your neighborhood, or a peer specialist to help you with your behavioral health needs. This makes sense from a cost perspective (providers and taxpayers stand to save a lot of money) and from a patient-care perspective (we want healthier people, fewer ER visits, and better disease management), but from a workforce perspective, it’s a little stickier: we have begun to put the burden of reforming our state’s healthcare system on our lowest paid workers- the frontline workforce.³

The frontline workforce is typically made up of unlicensed individuals who spend the most time with patients, visit them in their homes, escort them to appointments, check their vitals and help address their health-related issues like housing and childcare. Creating tens of thousands of new frontline jobs without thought to job quality, wages, training and career ladders would be a grave mistake, and one we have made before.

Our nation’s reliance on home health workers, which number more than

120,000 in New York City alone, was born from a need to shift patients out of expensive hospitals after acute stays. First people were moved to nursing facilities to rehabilitate, but that was also too expensive. Instead, we moved them home earlier and hired minimum wage workers with minimal training—home health aides (HHAs)—to tend to them. But as life expectancies dramatically increase and people choose to live in their homes as long as possible, we rely more and more on HHAs, not just for companionship for the frail and elderly but as frontline providers, caring for those with complex medical conditions and disabilities. HHAs make up the largest healthcare workforce in New York City, and the number is expected to grow by 20% in the next decade. Especially in a tightening labor market, recruitment is difficult and retention is poor, yet these are the jobs that are the most immune to recessions or to outsourcing.

While our reliance on HHAs grows, we are making little progress towards improving their wages, job quality or career prospects. They are often given inconsistent hours, earn very low wages (\$11.14 per hour as of 2016-although this will go up to \$15 over the next few years) and, as a result, 23% live in households below the federal poverty line.⁴ This means that the person helping your aging parent or ill neighbor in their most private moments—going to the bathroom, bathing, and eating their meals— may not be able to care for their own family members. Beyond caring about this out of compassion for workers, poor job quality of this workforce also lessens the quality of patient care.⁵ Efforts to improve the HHA job, such as the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act’s wage and hour protections to HHAs, raise very real

challenges for other stakeholders in the homecare field. Many agencies are barely able to survive with current Medicaid reimbursement rates and will be unable to cover the increased compensation. This means they will have to lay off aides, reduce their hours, or close their doors. Reforming home care is such a cumbersome and complex task that politicians reasonably shy away from real reform and focus instead on providing quick fixes, ultimately causing more problems. We now find ourselves at an impasse because plans for caring for America's aging population were created haphazardly; HHAs were the answer to a need for cheap and quick care.

I do not propose a solution to our homecare dilemma, but instead want to raise it as a cautionary tale. Just as we addressed the needs of our aging and ill population with frontline workers, we now look to direct service providers again to achieve our healthcare reform goals. These workers are the foundation of initiatives that benefit healthcare providers, taxpayers, and patients. Whether the workforce will also benefit is yet to be determined, and as we have seen with HHAs, is critical to the success of our healthcare goals. Right now, community health workers and peer specialists often find themselves making minimum wage with demanding and irregular schedules, yet the hiring demand for these two immensely important positions is skyrocketing. They are asked not only to do their jobs, but also to navigate undefined boundaries, bridge cultural gaps, and display patience and empathy in the face of extreme human destitution. Their value is immeasurable and our reliance on them needs to be fully recognized. We risk building a system on a shaky

foundation—and should it collapse, exploited workers won't be the only ones to suffer.

We are currently redesigning our healthcare system to be better. Let's value our workers for the benefits they bring to our system at large and compensate them accordingly. If we do this, we have the opportunity to build new, qualified, and sustainable factions of the healthcare workforce. Should we fail to do so, we risk repeating history and ending up with another homecare dilemma: impoverished workers, struggling providers, and dissatisfied patients.

WORKS CITED

1. "Delivery System Reform Incentive Payment (DSRIP) Program." NYS Department of Health. July 2018. Accessed August 1, 2018. https://www.health.ny.gov/health_care/medicaid/redesign/dsrip/
2. "Triple Aim for Populations." Institute for Healthcare Improvement. 2018. August 1, 2018. http://www.ihl.org/Topics/TripleAim/Pages/default.aspx?gclid=CjwKCAjw6ZLOBRALeIwAxzyCW5nItFREnkVxVp1xAnPEsMDGdOy50foNYXKO_8gO7eiAopg4sVcXwRoCWewQAvD_BwE
3. "Prepare to Care: Key Findings and Training Recommendations for New York City FQHC's Emerging Titles." Community Health Care Association of New York State, New York Alliance for Careers in Healthcare, and Center for Health Workforce Studies, State University of New York. January 2016. August 1, 2018. <http://nyachnyc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Prepare-to-Care-Key-Findings-and-Recommendations-for-New-York-City-FQHCs-Emerging-Titles.pdf>
4. "U.S. Home Care Workers: Key Facts." PHI. 2017. August 1, 2018. https://phinational.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/phi_homecare_factsheet_2017_0.pdf
5. "Paying the Price: How Poverty Wages Undermine Home Care in America." PHI. February 2015. August 1, 2018. <https://phinational.org/wp-content/uploads/legacy/research-report/paying-the-price.pdf>