

RECEIVED

SEP 21 1962

ADMINISTRATOR



HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR • WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

Federal Housing Administration
Public Housing Administration
Federal National Mortgage Association
Community Facilities Administration
Urban Renewal Administration

September 21, 1962

The Honorable Robert C. Weaver
Administrator
Housing and Home Finance Agency
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Dr. Weaver:

We are pleased to transmit the report you requested early this summer. At that time you asked us to explore the ways in which the mission and direction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency might have been altered by the addition of new program responsibilities and changed circumstances in national living patterns. Specifically, you requested us to analyze the means by which greater emphasis might be given to assisting the people in our new metropolitan regions in shaping the physical form of their environment and the role which your Agency might appropriately play in this endeavor.

To answer these questions we have analyzed factually the potential which exists at Federal, state and local levels for more effective programs of regional development. We have also inquired as to how your Agency might adjust to capitalize on that potential. The results are contained in the report.

The entire task force met together three times in periods extending over several days, and each of us has worked throughout the summer on our respective assignments. We have been greatly assisted by the resources made available through the Office of Program Policy and by the excellent staff services it provided. Without the help of your permanent staff and the cooperation of officials of HHFA constituents and other Federal agencies it would have been impossible either to make the empirical findings we have or to arrive at the judgments and recommendations which the report presents.

We wish to thank them and you for the opportunity which you have given us. We hope that the report may prove an effective instrument in assisting you to establish the guidelines required for the programs operating in rapidly changing environments and uncertain times.

Sincerely,
Victor Fischer
Louis B. Wetmore
Robert C. Wood

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

JAN 13 1969

LIBRARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

NOTE

The work of the task force on metropolitan development was supplemented by special studies made to provide information on -

- the types of areawide organizations that now exist for the performance of metropolitan-wide functions;
- the scope of Federal urban programs and their impact on metropolitan area development; and
- the extent to which appropriate techniques have been developed to permit effective planning for metropolitan development.

These subjects are dealt with in three appendices.

Part of the appendices is on duplimats and cannot be reproduced today. The appendix will be ready during the first part of next week.

CHAPTER I

NATIONAL GOALS

The Federal Government has participated in the shaping of American urban communities over the past thirty years. This participation has taken many forms: helping people save their homes in the depression; helping people build homes in the years thereafter; helping the poor find better housing; aiding cities in clearing slums; working together with cities and private builders in rebuilding the central areas of cities; contributing to the creation of civic centers and parks; assisting cities make plans for their future development; helping communities provide public facilities; aiding them acquire open land for recreation.

These are only some of the more direct ways in which the Federal Government has strengthened the process of community building. The indirect influences have had an even greater impact. For example, in establishing standards for the kinds of housing it would insure, the Federal Government has encouraged particular arrangements of living space for a large number of Americans and stimulated the development of particular forms of neighborhood life. In developing an extensive program of aid for highways it has had a further enormous impact on cities, adding to their economic and social potential in some instances, retarding growth in others. The Federal urban renewal program is today

radically altering entire districts and neighborhoods, in some cases creating completely new patterns of living. All these programs - for housing, slum clearance, urban renewal, road building, assistance for hospitals, airports and other community facilities - have been undertaken because the people, acting through Congress, felt an urgent need for them.

Meanwhile, the patterns of American life have continued to undergo basic changes. The Nation's new communities are more than urban in size and character - they are metropolitan, as are some of its most urgent problems. Public action, previously directed first towards the rural and then the city community, now takes place within the metropolitan framework. The evolution towards the new pattern has been gradual. Only recently have we recognized the dominance of large regional concentrations as the setting for the attainment of social, economic, and political goals of the people.

Today, then, the public powers used since the Republic's establishment to underwrite individual opportunity must operate in the context of the metropolitan community. These dominant themes and goals have emerged as the basis for public action towards the building of metropolitan communities:

1. The attainment of more orderly development of land uses, circulation systems and community facilities.
2. The assurance of a supply of land for future development - especially for low and moderate priced housing, for public uses, open areas and rights-of-way, for industry, and generally for socially-necessary functions which the market will not necessarily "reserve" or make available at a later date.
3. Conservation and effective use of land, water and mineral resources in urban areas, and the prevention of a speculative price spiral in land.
4. The achievement of quality levels of public service in all parts of the metropolitan areas - in lower income districts and moderate income suburbs, as well as in upper income areas.
5. The encouragement of a more equitable distribution of revenue resources to all parts of the urban area to support modern service levels.
6. The development of a wide range of opportunity and choice as to housing types, employment, and educational, social, recreational and cultural facilities, throughout the metropolitan area.

7. Equality of opportunity in housing and neighborhood environment throughout the metropolitan area for all segments of the population.
8. The development of physical patterns and facilities that will enhance economic adjustment and growth, promote efficiency of operations in the private sector and, generally, expand economic opportunity.
9. The encouragement of the continued evolution of governmental institutions which enable all elements among the metropolitan population to participate in area development policy-making.

These are the specific goals towards which government action - Federal, state and local - must be directed in metropolitan areas.

J. W.

CHAPTER II

AGENCY OBJECTIVES

If the achievement of long established and important national goals now goes forward in the context of the metropolitan community, are HHFA's present policies and organization geared to operate in this new environment? How related are Agency objectives to the broader goals - and to the metropolitan framework? Should the general Agency mission be reevaluated and redefined?

Substantive redefinition has already occurred. Despite its title, HHFA is now viewed by the President as the agency most directly and most comprehensively concerned with Federal programs in urban, including metropolitan, areas. Congressional actions likewise reflect a similar view of the Agency's role in the field of urban development - as does public opinion.

Nevertheless, not all of the Agency's present policy, programs and organization are explicitly geared to the broad new mission. For the evolution of Agency activities has taken place over a number of years. Piecemeal, one program has been added to another, each designed to carry out a specific purpose, so that over time their relationship has at times become tenuous and their objectives occasionally conflicting.

Individual programs were, of course, related to the needs of the times. Thus, during the depression years legislation was enacted for home mortgage insurance with the objective of stimulating housing construction (National Housing Act of 1934); low-rent public housing was added a few years later (Housing Act of 1937). World War II saw a whole series of special housing programs that contributed to the war production effort.

The enactment of the slum clearance and redevelopment program in 1949 marked the first expansion of Agency mission beyond that of a strictly housing nature; the addition of aids for community facilities in 1950 was another step in this direction. The 1954 Housing Act assigned major community-wide responsibilities to the Agency through the greatly broadened urban renewal concept. The planning assistance program, contained in the same act, created a new Agency function with comprehensive urban responsibilities. And the 1954 provision for the Workable Program vested directly in the Administrator the responsibility of seeing that assisted communities satisfactorily carry out their own activities necessary for orderly urban development. Most recently, the broadened Agency function has been reinforced by establishment of the mass transit and open space programs.

These successive additions of programs have transformed HHFA from a housing agency to an urban development agency. No longer is the Agency exclusively concerned with the financing of individual homes or the construction of housing projects. Now its scope includes concern with general urban facilities and the processes of community building.

Yet, while major changes in duties and objectives have taken place, there has been no equivalent explicit redefinition of overall Agency mission. The Declaration of National Housing Policy contained in the Housing Act of 1949 no longer serves as an appropriate framework for Agency action.

Accordingly, a new statement of national policy in the urban field is required, a policy geared to the pursuit of generally accepted national goals in the metropolitan community. Legislative enactment is the most obvious form of such a statement. Pending such actions, however, the Agency can formally and explicitly acknowledge the new context of goals within which its programs are carried out. Indeed, the President's 1961 message on housing and community development points the way to the new policy. The new declaration can provide a frame of reference for Agency operations and place its programs within the specific context of urban development.

The Agency's mission is not all encompassing, however. Though it must be so oriented as to enhance all urban goals, its most direct responsibilities deal with the character of physical development in urban communities and the processes required for its promotion. We suggest that the immediate and specific objectives of the Agency in metropolitan areas are:

1. To achieve metropolitan development patterns that:
 - a. encourage and sustain rapid economic growth,
 - b. give maximum opportunities to all individuals and groups for economic, social and cultural advancement, and
 - c. lead to allocation of land and other resources consonant with a clear expression of the public interest and explicit community goals.
2. To develop transportation and other basic community facilities necessary to effectively serve the metropolitan area, and designed to establish the patterns of urban expansion that have been adjudged desirable by the community's people.
3. To preserve appropriate open spaces to meet the needs of the people for conserving valuable resources and enhancing the urban environment.
4. To strengthen the planning process to the point where it is effective in guiding metropolitan development.
5. To develop effective governmental organizations to deal with metropolitan affairs - both with authority to act decisively and responsive to public needs and desires.

6. To maintain strong local government action below the metropolitan level, consistent with and contributing to areawide goals and policies.
7. To establish effective arrangements for intergovernmental solution of common problems, and achieve coordinated action by Federal, state and local governments towards planned metropolitan development.
8. To strengthen the ability of private enterprise to carry on those activities which will assist in attaining metropolitan goals and planned development.

Basically, these are national program objectives. But unlike the pattern in many Federal agencies, HHFA programs are realized through action by others - states, localities and the private sector. The achievement of Agency objectives depends, therefore, upon the governmental structures and private institutions that directly provide community services and facilities. Thus, the organization and characteristics of local governments, of the private housing industry and financial institutions, of the market structure, the process of planning and decision-making, and community participation are the important elements in determining the success or failure of Agency programs. All need to be attuned to Agency objectives.

The reliance on these other public and private institutions is right and proper in the American Federal system. It does, however, raise special difficulties when Agency goals are set in the metropolitan context, for the governing process of our new communities is still in an early stage of development. If real progress is to be achieved, Agency programs and policies will have to be so designed as to strengthen public and private capacity to take action on a metropolitan-wide basis and to make constructive use of Agency and other Federal programs in this action. Thus, in addition to the general objectives stated above, the Agency has these more explicit procedural objectives:

1. To provide aid to State, metropolitan and local agencies and to private enterprise to prepare metropolitan plans and programs into which the projects for provision of areawide facilities, preservation of open space, and land development and housing can be fitted.
2. To give direct assistance, as required, to metropolitan governmental organizations established for the performance of metropolitan functions, including planning.
3. To establish such administrative and planning criteria as prerequisites for Federal financial aids to governmental and private entities as will promote effective organization and planning.

4. To develop common Federal urban policies and obtain broad Federal agencies' support for metropolitan planning and strengthening of metropolitan organizations.
5. To provide appropriate technical and other assistance to metropolitan areas.
6. To undertake research, development of professional manpower resources and other means of meeting the need for information, know-how and skilled personnel to maximize the opportunities of urban growth.
7. To achieve internal Agency coordination and organization for effective metropolitan action.

How these objectives can be achieved is the subject of the remainder of this report.

* * * * *

In Summary - the Agency's primary concern is with urban, and today especially with metropolitan, development, the physical necessities of urban life, and the processes and institutions required to meet the developmental and physical needs of the community and its people. The physical orientation of the Agency is expressed in the provision of community facilities (such as water, sewers, transportation) and open space, and through its various housing and renewal programs. While these tangible results bespeak the Agency's purpose, the related concentration on institutions and processes is of paramount importance to effectuation of national goals and Agency objectives.

But an acknowledgment of these concepts and of goals and objectives is not enough. More than pious statements are required for the effective and democratic development of our new communities. The operating Federal programs themselves must function in a metropolitan framework. Hence, four issues are central to reshaping the Agency mission in realistic ways:

1. Is the time ripe for new policies which explicitly deal with the great public issues in our urban regions today?
Is it too early to redirect major programs, given the political structure of urban regions and the Federal involvement?
2. Can the new policies be effected? Have we the professional skills?
3. What kind of a program could be created to relate Federal and metropolitan actions?
4. How would such a program be administered?

CHAPTER III

POLICY-MAKING AT THE METROPOLITAN LEVEL

The decision to proceed with new, constructive approaches to metropolitan issues depends in the first instance on two evaluations:

1. A determination that government mechanisms and processes at the metropolitan level exist which are capable of devising and executing programs, that are consonant with good planning practice, in accord with the judgment of responsible public officials and civic leaders, and command widespread public support.
2. A determination that Federal activities in urban development can, if purposefully employed, accelerate and strengthen these mechanisms and make their own ^{own} meaningful contribution to regional development.

So far as the metropolitan level is concerned, arrangements dealing effectively with development must exhibit at least four characteristics: First, metropolitan programs should encompass a sufficient portion of the metropolitan area, so that these programs can have consequential effect on the overall character of development. Second, they should include the bulk of public functional activities - transportation, land use controls, community facilities and services -

so that the impact of the public sector is internally consistent. Third, decision-making in the process should be representative in character, not only with respect to established local governments within the region, but also including spokesmen for interest groups and professional associations that have a direct interest in the developmental program, civic or service organizations with a regional perspective, and state government. Finally, the process must possess legal and administrative competence: it should raise no major constitutional issues, and it should be equipped with sufficient staff and powers to make implementation of the program seem likely.

As for the character of the Federal activity, there is no implication that Federal policy will be employed in a manipulative or authoritarian way. Neither HHFA nor any other Federal agency is in the business of inventing new public mechanisms or altering the constitutional Federal system. No national prescriptions are appropriate of the specificity which is usually understood by proposals for "metropolitan" or "super" government. Indeed, past history suggests that this type of structural reform is not likely to appear very frequently in the next few years.

What Federal policy is concerned with in regard to metropolitan development programs is (1) whether its activities can be employed so as to strengthen the responsible development of the regional governing process, and (2) whether its own programs are consistent with the goals which are popularly supported by regional leadership and residents.

The Fermenting Fifties: Ten Years of Experimentation

From one academic point of view, governmental innovation in metropolitan regions during the last ten years has been disappointing. Compared to the models of metropolitan government conceived as ideal by political scientists, few major breakthroughs have occurred. Toronto, Miami, Winnipeg, Baton-Rouge, Nashville and Atlanta represent the boxscore for major structural reform. Few can be regarded as "complete", and all must be counterbalanced by defeats of reform plans in St. Louis, Cleveland, Seattle, Montreal, Knoxville, Macon, Durham and Albuquerque. Annexation by central cities of sizable hinterland has been recorded by such cities as Houston, Kansas City and Phoenix, but this activity has been limited essentially to the Southwest or Midwest, where seven out of ten annexations occurred. Compared to the number of research-action studies launched with at least the implicit expectation of structural change, the accomplishments seem small.

But if we adopt less utopian standards of performance and focus empirically on local governmental changes in response to urban pressures, one finds a considerable number of metropolitan political innovations during the 1950's. First of all, the postwar response of local governments as service units, concerned with meeting established and new demands of their constituencies, should not be minimized. Local expenditures and public employment in metropolitan areas have risen in recent years at a rate at least one-third faster than domestic

expenditures of the Federal government, and local debt has gone up twice as fast; local expenditures in 1960 were almost twice state expenditures. State and local expenditures together were two-and-one-half times Federal domestic expenditures. Clearly, in terms of reaction to needs and flexibility of resources, local units have demonstrated capacity for expansion and adaptation.

Even discounting this record as service-oriented, one designed principally to underwrite- and not guide - private expansion, local urban government has exhibited growing sensitivity to developmental problems. Increasingly during the 1950's, urban governments tackled the job of revising the traditional municipal ideology that local public enterprises were essentially just "a bundle of services."

One aspect of the reformulation is expressed in the institutionalization and professionalization of planning on a multijurisdictional basis. The July 1962 National Civic Review lists some 60 such agencies now operating in standard metropolitan areas, with conspicuous examples in Atlanta, Louisville, Baltimore, Chicago, Norfolk, Detroit and Tulsa. Alongside of these "purely" planning enterprises come units with corollary functions: The Metropolitan Sewer District of St. Louis, The National Capital Transportation Agency in Washington, the Air Pollution Control District in San Francisco, the port authorities in the Delaware River region, Boston and Toledo. Not all these agencies can be rated as operative or active; some seem bent on courses which

make political scientists wince for the future. But they all represent, in one degree or another, a new concern for defining the role of government in developmental activities.

A second type of innovation worthy of note has been the emergence of the professionally oriented, professionally conducted research enterprise. The three massive metropolitan studies in St. Louis, Cleveland and New York, begun in the early fifties, were followed by others in Dayton, Kansas City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Milwaukee, San Francisco, Detroit, Indianapolis, Baltimore, Richmond and Fresno. Under various auspices and for different purposes, these studies had varying results. But they shared in common the experience of bringing together scholars and practitioners, and introducing groups of civic leaders into fields of public concern with which they were previously unacquainted.

Still another dimension of the evolutionary phase of metropolitan politics is represented by the piecemeal mergers of specific functional programs among governments in metropolitan areas. Most of these adaptations occurred in the field of public health, but they also took place with respect to expressways, civic facilities and water development activities. So Buffalo, Milwaukee, Detroit and Phoenix each accomplished program consolidations in these areas. And in California, the contractual approach to interjurisdictional service arrangements promises to become a political movement: some 700 contractual agreements have been made in

Los Angeles County, 200 are in effect in Orange, over 100 in Alameda. By themselves, these adjustments rarely spoke to the problem of metropolitan development, but they strengthened the capacity of specialists in particular fields to respond to pressures on their programs.

Culminating the governmental adaptations on the 1950's has been this so-called "council" movement. This instrument for metropolitan action has various names and takes various forms. Its most simple version consists of gatherings of local officials on a regularized basis, with more or less regular agenda and work programs, as is the case of the Washington Metropolitan Regional Council. Or it may assume, as with the Supervisors' Inter-County Committee of Metropolitan Detroit, more formal characteristics, with legal recognition, a secretariat and a program of sponsored economic research, highway planning, and water, port and aviation development. Other examples, paralleling in many ways the main line of the Detroit experiment, are the New York Metropolitan Regional Council, the Association of Bay Area Governments in the San Francisco region, and the Intergovernmental Cooperation Council of the Salem, Oregon area, with its "Massive Cooperation" approach. Similar experiments are reported from such dissimilar places as Wichita, Bangor and Denver.

Appended to this report is a digest of institutions and agencies carrying on developmental or related activities in twelve of the largest metropolitan areas. Due to varying conditions and governmental setups, these agencies come in all shapes and sizes in the different areas. But common patterns do emerge, supporting the argument that a governmental evolutionary process is occurring. Each of the twelve areas has some form of planning organization, with most having officially established areawide planning commissions. The majority have metropolitan councils of elected officials. Every area contains two or more functional agencies. Metropolitan transportation and traffic bodies exist in all but two of the twelve regions; sanitary and similar authorities will be found in most of them.

While special districts have proliferated in these metropolitan areas, the movement towards establishment of areawide planning agencies and councils of local governments is indicative of increasing concern with coordination and programming of metropolitan activities and the willingness to at least get together and review joint problems.

Accelerating the Evolutionary Process

What do the innovations in planning, research, service mergers and metropolitan councils add up to? Clearly they are not yet a new set of fully matured, well financed, regional institutions equipped with authoritative developmental powers. Judged by standard criteria of local government in the United States critics are quite right in concluding that these agencies and conferences do not possess traditional attributes of a duly-constituted "unit." Some are little more than

instances of "cocktail cooperation", infrequent generalized discussions which studiously avoid the serious metropolitan issues of the area. Others are more covert alliances among professional specialists in bureaucracies making decisions by virtue of defaults in the general political arena. But our standards are not the formal ones applicable to specific institutions. For our purposes, the issue remains whether or not the rudiments of a metropolitan political system have been achieved in a number of regions. Is it possible that de facto politics can be able to take the place of de jure government, so far as developmental policies are concerned?

Four qualities are usually attributed to a going political system, whether or not it is accorded formal recognition. Its actors must have the capacity to (1) communicate with one another, (2) articulate their interests and objectives, (3) have some means for aggregating them (i.e., building coalitions and striking bargains), and (4) arrive at a purpose or goal, distinct from the original interests, that is accepted as a common ideology.

It would certainly be wrong to suggest that major metropolitan regions have achieved even embryonic expressions of all of these requisites or that any one of them had gone all the way. But there is evidence which suggests that several areas have political systems which verge on possessing these properties.

So far as communication is concerned, the process is at least partially formalized in the regions with councils. There a number of elected officials meet regularly; the metropolitan press covers their deliberations seriously; information is exchanged and sometimes public policy positions based on unanimity have been adopted. Study groups and planning commissions have performed the same functions, and in limited areas the professional specialists have made progress. At a minimum, issues of metropolitan development have been made visible and have become marketable political commodities. We need not doubt that proposals for metropolitan development programs would be rapidly transmitted to those who have stakes in the outcome of the decisions. This was not necessarily the case twenty or even ten years ago.

In the field of interest articulation, two significant developments have occurred. Local public officials have increasingly formulated their views as to what metropolitan matters concern them most and how far they are prepared to yield local sovereignty in what fields. (Sizable flexibility with respect to transportation; little so far as land use controls are concerned.) And business groups have recognized their interest in wider participation in area affairs, rather than restricting themselves to individual negotiations with political leaders on specific projects. Even though the business interest is still largely oriented downtown and devoted to a limited range of issues, the function of interest-articulation has progressed considerably.

Other groups have also been heard from in recent years. For specialized objectives, building associations have sponsored community "growth conferences" in a dozen or so regions, usually focusing on the problems of multiple building codes and zoning regulations. The railroad and mass transit industries have become active; so has the American Automobile Association. Recreation and conservation groups have played a more active part in metropolitan issues, as have legal and medical groups in some areas. Privately financed planning associations have emerged in several regions, and the Leagues of Women Voters have moved from a position of non-involvement to one which places regional development on their agenda as an accepted field of study.

Notably absent from direct involvement in most areas have been the local political parties. In part, this is accounted for by the county and judicial basis of political organization and a scope of interest and jurisdiction which seldom deals with issues of metropolitan development head-on. Partly, it is explained by the personal character of many of the campaign organizations today. Sometimes, the parties are content to exercise indirect and usually negative influence through the representation of local officials. But relatively few party leaders, outside of big city mayors and governors, have taken active interest in issues of metropolitan development. Their absence or often quiet opposition represents a major weakness in the operational capacities of the embryonic systems. Taken together with a particular

species of local bureaucrat - the executives of special purpose authorities or public corporations, party notables are probably those least interested today in seeing the continuing emergence of regularized metropolitan politics.

As for the means by which interest aggregation is achieved, the stage of development is more primitive. So far as the purely service functions of local government are concerned, the contract devices used in California appear to have provided an effective instrument for bargaining and negotiations. But on matters of generalized development, the existing agencies - councils, planning commissions and study groups - have proved far less satisfactory. By and large, they have seemed indisposed to undertake studies of such a nature as to constitute a genuine development program nor have they tackled the "hard decisions" in the allocation of scarce resources involved in land use control, water supply and economic development. In generalized development activity, regional agencies have usually been prepared to move only on the basis of a consensus which approaches unanimity.

The exception in this respect is in the field of urban transportation. There, as the Institute of Public Administration's report "Urban Transportation and Public Policy" makes clear, state highway departments, sometimes in consort with regional authorities, have been able to move ahead in their programs in circumstances where consensus has not been achieved. Indeed, a growing number of case studies demonstrate that the controversies which arise in metropolitan transportation decisions

are settled in terms of minimal adjustments to the positions of affected local governments. Broader transportation planning, as is the case in Washington, New York, Philadelphia and Boston, has also been carried on without the unanimous consent of all parties involved, and sometimes over violent opposition.

The reasons for activity in urban transportation are not obscure. For one thing, substantive public concern has been great, both in respect to automobiles and their accommodation and more recently in terms of mass transportation. Second, agencies in this field have possessed concrete, though often incomplete, criteria for action, such as origin and destination studies and specific cost-benefit measures for alternate routes. Third, the responsible agencies have been coupled with the going political system of state governments, maintaining strong links to governors and legislatures, where programs can be translated into political resources. Fourth, they have had liberal access to funds under conditions which do not require the direct assent of local governments or major constituencies. Thus, the transportation agencies stand out as "strong men" in the still fragile and incomplete metropolitan political system.

As to the last prerequisite of a going system, the recognition and acceptance of a differential set of goals, only a few scraps of evidence are available. A consensus among intellectuals apparently exists as to the appropriateness of public action to influence metropolitan growth trends. Some business opinion, notably CED,

has also adopted much the same position. State governors, more and more required to base their electoral majorities on a combination of city-suburban votes, have become increasingly articulate about "the metropolitan problem". But it is not at all clear that groups otherwise active in the fledging system - local officials, suburban or central city service organizations, or direct interest groups - share this recognition of some new policy imperatives. "Cooperation" on service matters is still the hall-mark of coordinated endeavors among localities; the traditional ideology of efficiency and economy may be a major appeal for many other participants, but sentiments of isolation and parochialism still run strong among bureaucracies and local governments.

In summary, then, the present metropolitan political system is embryonic, consisting of components not completely linked with one another, nor firmly established, and its present operation is precarious. The greatest progress has been made in the development of communication channels and the identification of participants. But the legal basis for its support is frequently nonexistent; the power centers involved are separated and widely disparate in terms of objectives; the usual cement of the political party is not forthcoming; and a considerable imbalance in political resources exists among the actors, with transportation agencies in a clear position of dominance. Moreover, the acceptance of a fairly sophisticated rationale for public action on a metropolitan front has not been universally achieved among the participants. At the same time, it is

probably accurate to say that (1) an ill-defined sense that "something ought to be done" is general; (2) evolutionary tendencies are clearly discernible; and (3) opportunities for speeding the emergence of the system obviously exist.

The Federal Involvement in Metropolitan Policy-Making

Federal programs affecting metropolitan areas have in the past been only indirectly involved in metropolitan policy-making, either in terms of assisting the regional political process or establishing community oriented goals of their own. At the same time, it is true that, in largely unprecedented and accidental ways, Federal activities have tremendously affected the course of metropolitan development. This means that a sizable potential for policy influence has rarely been capitalized upon.

The ad hoc, random, "non-policy" posture of Federal activities is evident in three ways. First, some Federal programs have increased the magnitude of forces in the private sector operating to expand metropolitan regions and accentuate characteristics of diffusion. The housing mortgage and home guarantee programs and highway activities are notable examples of this effect. Second, Federal programs have supported and reinforced the traditional operations of local governments; 701 planning grants, renewal activities, community facilities and service assistance are cases in point. Finally, the non-relatedness of Federal programs in housing, health and highways has added a major diffusive force, serving to complicate and make more difficult efforts for coordinated action at the metropolitan level. Thus, Federal activity has simultaneously intensified the diffusive effects of private activity, supported individualistic responses to special interest pressures and complicated efforts to develop a common approach.

But what if this random impact were transformed into conscious, deliberate assistance to policy makers? Is the Federal impact big enough to accomplish much? Is it capable of being directed? Could it be realistically employed?

1. Magnitude of Federal Involvement

The scope of Federal involvement in metropolitan areas was the subject of a special study undertaken in conjunction with this report. The results, set forth in Appendix B, indicate that some 12 major departments and agencies of the Federal government and some 30 of their constituent agencies, divisions, and departments operate more than 60 programs affecting, directly or indirectly, the development of metropolitan areas. Federal activities range from such obvious ones as road construction, housing and renewal, and water and sewerage facilities, to flood protection, public buildings and small business aids. The total impact of the listed programs is in the nature of \$20 billion annually; considering multiplier effects, the total significance of these activities to metropolitan areas is even greater. The appendix description of Federal programs, the funds at their disposal, their organization and method of operation makes plain the vast array and diversity of services and the substantial input of resources which annually represent the Federal contribution to metropolitan development.

This impact can perhaps be most dramatically illustrated by reference to specific metropolitan areas.

In the Atlanta metropolitan area, approximately \$112 million in public and private expenditures was generated during 1961 by programs of twelve major Federal agencies. This total covered: direct grants and matching funds for such projects as road construction, airport construction, etc., in the amount of \$19,663,100; authorization of \$2,746,300 for expenditures on Federal Government projects; direct Federal loans for housing, small business, public works planning, etc., of \$12,624,400; and various types of insuring programs for housing and construction amounting to \$87,010,900. Authorizations for Federal programs in 1962 in this metropolitan area totaled \$117,697,600.

The dramatic diversity of the impact of these programs is illustrated by the variety in scope and content of the programs affecting the Atlanta area. Grant authorizations for the interstate highway program in the area were \$25,696,700 in 1962, while farm research accounted for only \$10,000. Types of programs ranged from a saline water research program carried out by Interior's Office of Saline Water to urban renewal programs administered by the HHFA. A complete tabulation of Federal programs operative in this metropolitan area is also included in Appendix B.

Another example that illustrates the Federal Government's impact on the functioning, composition, and development of a metropolitan area is provided by an Institute of Public Administration survey of the tri-state New York metropolitan region.

From 1956 through 1961 over \$426 million in Federal highway funds was authorized for the New York region, and it is estimated that an additional \$3 billion will be allocated for highway purposes by 1971. Other Federal aid programs listed by I.P.A. include, to name but a few, \$210 million for navigation projects, airport assistance in the amount of \$28 million, \$397 million for urban renewal, hospital construction grants of \$32 million. In addition to direct assistance programs are the various Federal government insuring loan programs which have aggregated in excess of \$1 billion in VA-FHA home mortgages and \$1-1/2 billion in property improvement loans.

These illustrations of Federal activities in metropolitan areas serve to demonstrate at once the magnitude of forces which present Federal programs generate in the private and public sectors of metropolitan economics and their diffusion within the executive establishment. They raise in sharp focus questions as to whether or not the Federal effort proceeds in a manner consonant with the present goals of developing an effective urban framework and whether they assist local governments in their efforts to provide plans for the future.

2. Capacity for Direction

Within limits, many Federal programs seem suited to being applied consciously to further the goals of region-building. Some Federal programs clearly are being directed toward the new goals and the new institutions.

A case in point is the present operation of the Urban Renewal Administration. Here in the past year, over and above the accelerated program which deals primarily with central cities, the Urban Renewal Commissioner has made substantial progress in encouraging metropolitan areas to provide a backdrop for renewal activity in the form of metropolitan plans and programs, and has solicited the cooperation and support of the governors of several states with large metropolitan areas. He has also taken steps to assure that individual 701 planning grants to communities of under 50,000 bear some relevance to metropolitan development planning. URA has sought to explore the interrelationship involved between the planning, renewal and the open space programs, and has investigated the areawide impact of urban renewal and relocation activities.

Other intraagency examples of consciously relating programs to metropolitan areas can be found within the Public Health Service and the Bureau of Public Roads. The former has created new programs and organizational units designed primarily to deal with metropolitan problems and needs on an areawide basis. The BPR likewise has been

continually moving towards a comprehensive view of regional transportation requirements, and statutory plan prerequisites have been proposed.

So far as intraagency collaboration is concerned, the agreement between the Department of Commerce and HHFA for the joint use of highway and urban planning funds in areas where local and state bodies are prepared to establish coordinated planning provides an excellent example of potential Federal capacity to deal with metropolitan areas. The objective of these joint efforts is not merely to assist agency activities, but is also to develop effective cooperation and coordination both among local governments within a metropolitan area and between these governments and the state and Federal agencies involved in area development activities. The objective is furthered by interagency committees set up at the national and regional levels to promote better understanding of the cooperative approach and to aid in working out necessary arrangements.

Another example of the capacity of Federal agencies to coordinate their programs is provided by the recent agreement on policies, standards and procedures for use in development of water resources, entered into by the Army, Interior, Agriculture, and Health, Education and Welfare Departments. While this agreement is not related to the metropolitan field, it demonstrates what can be accomplished through strong executive direction. Unlike the HHFA-BPR agreement which was designed primarily to eliminate prevalent non-coordination of metropolitan

programs, the water resources action brought together the two most traditional antagonists within the Federal establishment - the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Successful follow-through on their joint agreement would clearly demonstrate that the Federal government possesses the capacity for coordinated action and establishment of common purposes.

Despite such examples, the fact remains that compared to the consequences of Federal activity - the implications of Federal decisions to redirect, halt or speed up a major program - the national effort is proceeding only with a sporadic recognition of the results of its own actions. There is still ample opportunity for imaginative, creative redirection of Federal policy to simultaneously strengthen the regional political process and clarify the effects of national programs.

3. Federal Program Coordination

The case for Federal government involvement in strengthening metropolitan development processes does not rest only on the magnitude of the National Government's impact on these areas and its potential capacity to rationalize that impact. A sizable compulsion for improved performance exists within the Federal program itself. Washington has an obligation quite simply to assure effective Federal program execution - to avoid waste and dissipation of efforts. Not only can these programs have negative effects on local areas if not related to metropolitan development objectives, but also one Federal activity (or lack of it) may nullify the benefits attained under another one.

Conflicts between highway and renewal or housing projects are obvious examples; disagreement among airport and road and residential development plans are others. Aside from such outright conflicts, when Federal or assisted projects are not related to development patterns and local plans, their effectiveness is greatly diminished. Finally, liabilities accrue from adverse public reaction that frequently greets Federal project and location decisions.

All of these factors suggest that considerations of executive self-interest dictate placing Federal programs within the context of a coordinated framework for development. These considerations supplement the regional ones in indicating that the Federal government encourage the establishment of institutions and processes that make developmental decisions from a metropolitan perspective.

4. Limitations on Direction

It must also be recognized that sizable constraints exist upon and within the Federal Government which preclude complete flexibility in the adaptation of existing programs to regional development goals.

In the first place, Federal agencies interpret future goals for metropolitan areas in different ways, place different priorities on the accomplishments of different tasks. No one should presume that honest and important divergences of opinion are not present among Federal agencies concerned with metropolitan development.

Second, the handling of metropolitan affairs affects other policies of moment - general economic growth and stability, as well as important functional concerns such as transportation, health and safety. No single executive decision can elevate the establishment and effectuation of a coordinated program for metropolitan development to the top of the list of Federal responsibilities and ignore its conflicts with other legitimate and established goals.

Third, Federal powers are not and ought not to be all pervasive in their application. The task of formulating appropriate goals for each metropolitan area depends on the governing institutions of that area. The initiative is theirs, and even if all Federal programs were perfectly coordinated and perfectly attuned as to objectives, it does not follow that they should be unilaterally applied.

5. Basic Principles for Federal Action

The opportunities, compulsions and constraints above enumerated suggest that the character of Federal involvement should be on an inter-agency basis as far as possible and so far as the regions are concerned. It ought not speak to details of substantive operations, either in the form of direction or by prescription. Drastic program sanctions such as outright withholding of funds are neither feasible nor legitimate options. Rather, the real alternatives for Federal policy help lie in the coordination and application of procedural standards and in strengthening the regional development processes. Though later sections

will deal with specific approaches, the basic principle of Federal action geared to procedural rather than substantive influence should be clearly established.

Put concisely, it is this: For generations, the operation of grant programs has consisted of the conferring of substantive benefits on the part of the national government (in the form of money or skills) in exchange for acceptance by state and local governments of procedural requirements, the negotiations being rationalized on the grounds that both are in the national and mutual interest.

Our concern now is whether or not this classical exchange can be applied to metropolitan improvement programs and the metropolitan political system. More specifically can reasonably coordinated procedural requirements be extended and reformulated to deal directly with the problems of strengthening the system so that requisite characteristics of the local governing process can be obtained?

The possibilities of interagency action on the Federal level have already been indicated. So far as Federal-metropolitan relations are concerned, a rundown of the parties-in-interest to date - their substantive stakes in Federal action and their probable sensitivity to procedural requirements - is the best indicator of feasibility. As to local public officials involved, the substantive stakes are now clear to them - renewal for the big-city mayor, community facilities for small town officials, the possibility of some participation in

transportation and open space decisions for suburban officials, as well as some rationalization of tax resources (though concurrently, consideration of local autonomy are high among this group). State governors would also have a clear stake in gaining "a handle" on the politically sensitive metropolitan issues, though again state interests require a special posture. Transportation functionaries would be more directly sensitive to procedural intervention, but the Federal money leverage is at its most persuasive here.

The posture of state legislators and party leaders is considerably more dubious. The emergence of the metropolitan political system can constitute direct threats to their own positions, and their substantive interests are not substantial. But here the impact of Baker vs. Carr suggests forthcoming reapportionment that will result in their increasing political concern with urban affairs.

As for private groups, important segments of the business community, notably downtown, could be counted on to give open and direct support. So would service organizations, so long as they understood the purposes of the program to strengthen representative processes at the developmental decision-making level. The position of home building, construction and financial interests is less clear: there would be substantive gains in more effective governmental planning and action to provide urban facilities, but there might be clear losses on the dampening of land speculation and restrictions on building choices.

There would be one result of the strategy which might be favorably viewed across the board - the reduction of uncertainty of the present situation. This is an advantage which certainly would appeal to important public actors and might well be desirable to the private ones, given the growing institutionalization of their activities.

In summary, the rundown suggests that, granted variations in the political patterns among metropolitan areas, no overwhelming adverse reaction to a new Federal strategy for metropolitan areas can be expected to occur and that considerable favorable response should be forthcoming. The likelihood is that opponents would prefer to use covert means of controlling or manipulating the process, rather than outright opposition.

Conclusion

A review of the evolutionary progress in public decision-making at the metropolitan level, of the extent of Federal involvement - direct and indirect - and of the Federal capacity to assist both the regional development process and to better direct its own efforts indicates that it is appropriate now to pursue new policy directions. As with all major policy decisions, there is no royal road to quick success. The evaluations have identified obstacles in the path of the emergence of strong centers of metropolitan policy-making and constraints on Federal capacity to readjust and coordinate programs. But a reckoning of opportunities and handicaps results in a conclusion that

the odds favor action. Institutions concerned with developmental activities are in being in most urban regions. Though they are in many instances possessed with only fragile legal authority, slender financial bases and exhibit deficiencies with respect to scope and capacities, they are at work. The objectives listed in the beginning of this chapter - adequate area and functional coverage, and a democratic and legal basis for action - are possible of attainment.

Federal programs too have already demonstrated their capacity to assist in developmental policy-making and to direct their programs to that end. Federal agencies have shown new ability and willingness to rise above jurisdictional perspectives and to make common cause in promoting orderly regional development. Though misunderstandings continue, progress here too has been substantial.

These findings do not suggest a uniform set of policies for all regions and all programs. Small metropolitan areas for example, while presenting no great organizational problems, exhibit serious deficiencies in terms of policy-making capacities. Large metropolises are more ready to think in policy terms but have greater problems in achieving organizational collaboration. Some Federal programs have clear legislative mandates to move ahead on meshing their operations with regional developmental activities. Others have authorization solely on functional terms. But the essential fact remains that elbow room exists now for substantial flexibility.

Three issues remain. Have we the professional know-how, particularly in planning, to engage in effective development policy? What means would we use to effect such policy - what precisely would this Agency and other Federal agencies do? How should the policy and program be administered? Successive chapters deal with these questions.

CHAPTER IV

METROPOLITAN PLANNING

Given institutions capable of metropolitan decision-making, the next prerequisites are tools and techniques sufficient to support informed and competent decisions. Hence, the specific question: can planning in its present state be truly instrumental in the preparation of policies and actions toward integrated metropolitan development and for coordination of Federal developmental activities within urban regions? For no matter how representative and comprehensive the formulation of development programs may be, to be successful, they must be professionally prepared and expertly detailed. This chapter, therefore, explores (1) the scope and nature of metropolitan planning and the availability of professional techniques for effective policy and plan formulation, and (2) the criteria that should guide future planning efforts to effectively meet metropolitan and Federal objectives.

Scope of Metropolitan Planning

It is now generally recognized that planning can contribute toward metropolitan development by providing the specific skills and knowledge necessary to guide action in a coordinated fashion. At the same time, it can lead toward a gradual strengthening of intergovernmental cooperation and an improved metropolitan development process. Planning achieves these broad purposes by:

1. giving tangible form to social and economic objectives;
2. permitting decision-making based on knowledge of the urban environment and an explicit range of choices regarding future growth;
3. developing a framework and program for metropolitan development within which decisions and actions can be carried out and functional programs can be interrelated; and
4. coordinating intergovernmental and special purpose activities in metropolitan areas.

Related to these basic purposes of planning is the general dissemination of information useful to both public and private actions in the development of a common, cohesive approach to areawide problems.

Metropolitan planning is still in its evolutionary stages. Only relatively recently has it divorced itself from traditional city planning and started developing its own orientation and techniques. The departure from municipal planning is necessary because (1) municipal boundary lines no longer embrace the new and larger urbanized areas, and (2) the metropolitan region presents an environment within which many governmental and functional agencies carry on developmental activities. These considerations, plus the much larger area and population components and the complex inter-

and intra-regional relationships, have pointed to a different planning orientation for metropolitan areas. The difference in approach is evinced in metropolitan planning organization, planning program emphasis and the scope of major plan components.

Organization for Planning

The general subject of metropolitan organization and decision-making was covered in the preceding chapter. Obviously, metropolitan planning, if it is to be effective, has to take into account the many governmental and functional interests described there. These interests must be represented in plan formulation, and the technical capabilities of these units must be called upon for assistance in the areawide planning process. The political structure of our large urban areas, then, specifically calls for participation in areawide planning by local, state, federal and regional organizations.

The pattern of governmental representation has already evolved in most areas. In 54 of the 63 inter-jurisdictional metropolitan planning agencies covered by the National Municipal League survey cited earlier, the planning body includes representatives appointed by mayors, city councils, county commissioners, and other representatives of local government bodies. Elected officials are found on at least 8 agency boards, including Tulsa, Little Rock, Indianapolis, Baltimore and Durham-Raleigh. State representation through gubernatorial appointment exists in five areas--Northeast Illinois, Detroit, Minneapolis, Durham-Raleigh, and Milwaukee. Only five of the 63 agencies do not include members selected by the political process.

While this survey demonstrates a pattern of broad representation, it also points up the fact that the states, which have increasing stakes in the character of metropolitan development, are still largely under-represented. Furthermore, the functional interests of the Federal government, the state and the urban area are usually not given voice or do not take a sufficiently active role either in policy-making or technical advisory capacity. Because of the absence of more general metropolitan organization and responsibility, broader scale participation in urban regional planning is necessary to insure that planning will reflect the values of the many subdivisions and interest groups in metropolitan areas and that planning will lead to action programs.

Metropolitan Planning Activities

An effective planning program includes four principal activities:

1. Research and information.
2. Goal and policy formulation.
3. Comprehensive planning.
4. Development programming.

The first and last of these activities have already found wide operational acceptance on the metropolitan level. This is due to a recognition that the metropolitan area, though not a governmental unit, is by definition a social economic and physical whole. Thus, the areawide approach has been used for economic, housing market and population studies and has been utilized for functional programs, such as transportation or water supply. Development programming is done

here and there, but is still carried on in a fragmentary manner, rather than as part of a systematic areawide approach. Policy and plan formulation have to date been significant in scope only where a formal organization for planning has been established. Nevertheless, these activities are now being increasingly undertaken as experience with fragmented approaches demonstrates the need for a more comprehensive effort for intergovernmental cooperation in metropolitan development.

The first two planning activities require little elucidation here. They are necessary to provide the basis for plan and program formulation. Together and singly they aid in creating understanding of metropolitan area needs and potentials, encourage participation and provide the vehicle for greater intergovernmental cooperation.

The comprehensive metropolitan plan and the metropolitan development program are the two principal instruments for achieving desired metropolitan growth. The comprehensive planning process is designed to develop a relatively longrange statement of the environmental goals for the area, formulated in terms of plan elements relevant to future metropolitan development and attainment of social and economic objectives. The comprehensive plan provides direction and unity in the area's development and establishes the balance between the various land use and programmatic components of the plan.

The development program is the action-oriented phase of the plan formulation process. Depending on the degree of governmental or intergovernmental unity achieved in a given area, the metropolitan development program can include only a few or the full range of metropolitan development functions. Under the latter alternate, the program sets out in a coordinated way all actions to be taken over a period of five to ten years toward accomplishment of the metropolitan plan. In this instance, the process is similar to that used in capital improvement programming, where functional requirements are balanced against each other and related to the community's fiscal capacity. The comprehensive development program permits allocation of resources and measurement of accomplishments on an areawide basis, tied to areawide decision-making.

Considering the present stage of metropolitan organization, development programming along individual functional lines is likely to be the more prevalent method. Under this approach, specific activities such as highway development, open space acquisition or sewerage facilities would be programmed for a similar, shortrange period based on the comprehensive plan. Program formulation and final responsibility for capital outlays remains with the operating units, such as state highway departments, regional land agency or sanitary district. These activities could and should, however, be carried out in conjunction with the metropolitan planning agency and

should, in any case, be subject to its review prior to final program commitment. The greater the degree of planning coordination of individual functional programs, the more effective will be the aggregate result of developmental activities.

Content of Metropolitan Planning

Planning must cover all factors that affect the direction and patterns of urban regional development and must specifically deal with the interrelationships between the functional elements. Specifically, the substantive content of both plans and programs should include these four major components:

1. Urban land development, including developed communities and areas for future urban growth.
2. Open space, including major recreation spaces, rural and other nonurban use areas.
3. Transportation, including highways, mass transit and other intraregional systems.
4. Regional facilities, including:
 - a. sewage collection and treatment facilities,
 - b. water supply,
 - c. airports,
 - d. and others, as appropriate.

Depending on the situation and needs in particular areas, plans may also include higher education, health and welfare facilities; port and harbor development; power installations; cultural and other institutions; and other functions of regionwide significance. In some of these cases, specific functions may be regional in character but will not have direct effect on the metropolitan structure - such functions can, optionally, be covered only in metropolitan development programs rather than necessarily forming an integral part of a comprehensive plan. Hospitals, for example, have less of a structuring nature than highways and could more suitably be dealt with in a development program.

The four major planning components are directly interrelated and must be planned on a coordinated basis. The land use elements will determine requirements for transportation and other facilities; these in turn will directly affect development patterns. It is these interrelationships that mandate a unified, comprehensive planning program.

Approach to Metropolitan Planning

While one often hears of "the comprehensive plan", planning is now viewed as a continuing process. Specific plans and programs are no longer considered the final end product of a planning effort; they are but a step in the planning process that leads to developmental decision-making.

Faint, illegible text at the top of the page, possibly a header or introductory paragraph.

Main body of faint, illegible text, appearing to be several paragraphs of a document.

Faint text at the bottom right of the page, possibly a signature or footer.

It is imperative that planning be thought of as continuous in nature. Because conditions are forever changing, knowledge and understanding are constantly changing. The effects of current development decisions and executed projects, therefore, require continuous updating of plan assumptions and of plans themselves. Thus, a static approach to comprehensive planning is most unrealistic, for it ignores the dynamic aspects of urban development. An effective planning program requires the constant input of new agreements on goals and policies, current data on conditions affecting development, new methodological techniques, and, generally, new concepts and ideas about the future. This means, that (1) planning must be viewed as a continuous process, forever expanding and refining the basis upon which decisions for development action are made, and (2) it must be carried on by a qualified, permanent technical staff.

But if planning is viewed as a continuous process, then how can one think in terms of comprehensive plans or development programs? The two actually are not inconsistent. One can have plans and programs at any given point in time to guide decision-making, while concurrently continuing to review and update plans. Initial plans can be stated in a limited form to reflect the scope of initial agreements on goals and actions; they can be thought of as sketch or general plans, reflecting the best informed judgment of the time. Then the process comes into play to develop an ever higher degree of plan

sophistication and integration of the various developmental elements. The result of the process will be an ever better framework for developing action programs and for making program and project decisions.

It is important to keep a balance between the concept of planning as a continuing process and plan formulation. Too often, preparation of plans is delayed due to attempts to collect ever more reliable data and to make sure that the plan when completed will be right. When so approached, planning can go on infinitely without providing the community with an integrated basis for development. Since development never stands still, an initial objective of planning should be the formulation and completion of at least a general development plan. This is particularly important in metropolitan areas, where such a comprehensive plan may provide the only means for bringing together the various elements that are constantly interacting to create and pattern the growth of the area.

Comprehensive Plan Formulation

Sufficient progress has been made in recent years in metropolitan planning and related fields to provide a firm basis for areawide planning. Economists, political scientists, sociologists, and others have increasingly applied themselves to problems of urban and regional structure analysis. This, in turn, has led to a fuller appreciation of the forces - economic, political, social - that affect urban growth and patterns. Those concerned with planning now have available to them techniques permitting reliable analyses and forecasts of economic growth and its components, employment patterns, population trends

(in terms of size, characteristics and distribution) and other factors necessary for intelligent planning.

Concurrent with the development of these basic analytical tools, promising innovations have been made through application of mathematical techniques and processing devices. Comprehensive transportation studies, sponsored by the Bureau of Public Roads and often assisted under the 701 program, have undertaken large scale collection of information and use of high-speed data processing equipment to analyze and chart future development. Mathematical models have been employed in Baltimore, Philadelphia, Chicago, Hartford and other cities to determine the interrelationship between land use, employment and traffic and to forecast changes over time. In the Penn-Jersey Study for the Philadelphia area, for example, a regional growth model has been developed showing how the urban region grows in response to a variety of developmental forces; the model is being used there to produce a set of generalized alternative patterns of regional development that would result from the construction of alternative transportation systems.

These and other current and new techniques are reviewed in a special appendix report on the technical state of planning and related arts. Developments to date have demonstrated that capability exists for systematic analysis of the complex forces shaping urban development. Sufficient application of these techniques has been made to show that

their use can lead to rational comprehensive metropolitan planning. Furthermore, the progress of recent years indicates the promise of evermore refined techniques for dealing with regional planning.

The greatest need today is to bring together the fragmented approaches to metropolitan development and to extend the use of new analytical techniques to additional fields. Transportation planning has dealt primarily with developmental interrelationships between land use patterns and highway routes. Environmental studies for metropolitan areas point the way towards meeting more effectively sanitation and other health requirements of urban areas. Airport location and impact studies have generally been approached strictly on a single function basis. The same is true for the limited planning which has taken place with respect to open space and recreation, regionwide water and sewerage facilities, and other elements having areawide implications. Similarly, provision of state or submetropolitan facilities usually bears no relation to urban regional planning or development. Thus, statewide hospital plans prepared under the Hill-Burton program and projects sponsored under the community facilities program are generally developed without consideration of or relationship to metropolitan development. If planning is to serve the purposes of urban development, it must deal with all of these factors and programs on a comprehensive, interrelated basis.

Aside from functional interrelationships, metropolitan planning must also be concerned with areal interrelationships. The metropolitan area does not exist in a vacuum. On the one hand, the metropolitan area is usually composed of a number of smaller political and geographic units; on the other, a metropolitan area constitutes a region within one or more states. Its planning must, therefore, take into account these constituent and larger areas. It must deal with subregional development, particularly insofar as that affects the areawide patterns. What is more, the metropolitan area's development must fit into the broader growth patterns of the state or interstate environment within which it is located; it is, of course, up to the states to take the initiative for planning this environment. In both instances, the prerequisite to effective metropolitan planning is proper coordination with development plans of the other areas.

Metropolitan plan formulation, thus, becomes a process of coordinating and integrating functional and areal developmental factors. Given appropriate consideration to these factors and utilization of modern planning techniques, an effective planning process can now be established to deal with metropolitan development.

Criteria of Effective Metropolitan Planning

Given the fact that planning is a primary means of directing and coordinating metropolitan development, it can be used by the Federal government to achieve its objectives in metropolitan areas - strengthening metropolitan organization and development processes, aiding the attainment of local goals, and assuring effective program execution to avoid waste and dissipation of effort. But if the Federal government is to exercise its capacity for influencing the direction of metropolitan development, by what criteria should it judge the effectiveness of the metropolitan planning process? This question and the criteria that follow are premised on the Federal government's willingness to actively encourage comprehensive metropolitan planning and to stimulate it in directions deemed necessary for achievement of national and local purposes in urban regions.

Before embarking on the delineation of planning criteria, it must be emphasized that only general guidelines can be established. The variety of metropolitan areas, ranging from single county units to multigovernmental, interstate complexes, precludes establishment of minute, definitive standards. The proper approach is to outline the principles and inclusiveness of metropolitan planning, with specific evaluations of plans and planning processes being made on an area-by-area basis, taking into account pertinent local conditions

and capacity for planning and development. Within these limitations, the following criteria emerge as to what should constitute effective metropolitan planning:

1. Organization for planning

- a. The planning agency should be a legal, permanent and representative entity, possessing some of the basic characteristics suggested in the preceding chapter.
- b. Interests of local, state and Federal governments should be adequately represented, as should those of functional and other groups operative in the metropolitan area, through membership in the planning agency or advisory committees or other means.
- c. Adequate budgets and professional staff must be available to carry out the programmed workload on a continuing basis. Budgets must be commensurate with the scope of responsibility and the job ahead. Basic planning programs should be formulated and carried out by agency staff, with consultant services utilized for specialized phases of the planning program.
- d. Financing of metropolitan planning should be provided by parties interested in areawide planning and development - Federal, state and local governments.

- e. Planning agency jurisdiction should cover the entire metropolitan area, subject to limitations of state boundaries. Planning should also concern itself with areas of potential future metropolitan implications.

2. Planning process

- a. The planning program should include the four principal activities: research and information, goal and policy formulation, comprehensive planning and development programming.
- b. The substantive content of planning should include the four major components: urban land development, open space, transportation and regional facilities. All elements relevant to metropolitan development or requiring areawide consideration must be covered by the planning process - urban and rural land uses, highways, mass transit, airports, water and sewerage facilities, and others that may be pertinent to the particular area.
- c. Plan formulation must fully take into cognizance the interrelationships ~~betw~~ between these elements of metropolitan development.

- d. Planning for the metropolitan area must be related to local, state and, as applicable, interstate regional considerations and plans.
 - e. Planning technique and methodology must be related to the scope and intensity of the planning program. No specific techniques can be prescribed in advance, but evidence must exist that adequate methodology was used to provide a proper basis for developing individual plan elements and balancing them within the comprehensive plan. In addition, studies of the economy, population, land use and other areawide factors should be so designed as to also make them broadly useful to decision-makers and developers not directly concerned with areawide planning.
3. The comprehensive metropolitan plan
- a. The planning process must, at least in large part, be directed towards formulation of a comprehensive plan for the metropolitan area. Timing of plan completion must be related to local conditions; however, specific timetables should be established for each area striving for the completion of a comprehensive plan in the shortest possible time. Generally, Federal program requirements would mandate the availability of a plan of at least some degree of refinement within a period of two or three years.

- b. Initial effort should be directed towards preparation of a comprehensive plan that can serve to guide current development decisions for the area. The first plan may, thus, be generalized in nature and subject to subsequent refinement; it may include only the major functional elements of regional development, with others being added during the continuing planning process.
- c. The general objective should be availability of a comprehensive plan at all times. The plan should reflect social and economic policies and objectives for the region, and should present the various factors affecting metropolitan development on an integrated and balanced basis.

4. Development programming

- a. Development programming is going on all the time. The main initial orientation must be towards relating functional programming to comprehensive planning and achieving interrelationship between separate programs.
- b. As soon as feasible, an integrated development program, covering the pertinent areawide functions, should be prepared for the metropolitan area. It should relate governmental activities to private sector development and to social needs of the area.

- c. A coordinated capital improvement program should be developed as part of or in conjunction with the metropolitan development program. Initially, such a capital improvement program would consist primarily of a compilation of capital projects in the area; subsequently, it should develop into a tool for relating projects to fiscal, economic and human resources of the urban region.
- d. Within, or in addition to, the development program, delineation of responsibility for various functional developments should be made, appropriate organizational structures proposed, and interagency relationships established.

5. Other activities

- a. Public education should be carried on to alert responsible officials and citizens to the critical problems facing the region and to build support for local planning as well as areawide development programs.
- b. Liaison should be maintained with constituent local governments to insure their conformance to metropolitan development policies. Assistance to these units should be provided as required; cities and counties should be encouraged to undertake planning programs, since their plans will facilitate more effective areawide planning, even though the structure of functional elements will vary between metropolitan and local plans.

- c. The many divergent and parallel research efforts for and within the area should be brought together and coordinated.
- d. Generally, the planning agency should work towards the coordination of all developmental activities within the metropolitan area and strive for the achievement of organizational structures and citizen participation to enhance the region's developmental potentials.

CHAPTER V

FEDERAL APPROACHES TO METROPOLITAN ACTION

If the time is ripe for action in metropolitan areas and if metropolitan planning can provide techniques for development programming, what courses of action should the Agency adopt to meet its new metropolitan and national objectives?

The principal Federal instrument available is the extension and refinement of the workable program concept, to be applied now in metropolitan areas and designed to reinforce the evolutionary processes for metropolitan development action discussed in Chapter III. This approach is well geared to gradual and long term improvements in metropolitan structure and institutions. It employs Federal activities to buttress present efforts to achieve scope and comprehensiveness in metropolitan programs. At the same time, it emphasizes procedural, rather than substantive adjustments.

To make clear how the workable program concept can be applied to metropolitan areas, a review of the existing local program is in order.

The Workable Program for Community Improvement

In 1954 Congress established the first formal requirement for broad community action as a prerequisite for obtaining urban renewal assistance. The provision had its antecedents in the statement of "Local Responsibilities" included in the Housing Act of 1949, which first authorized the slum clearance and urban redevelopment program. This specified that in extending financial assistance under this Title I, the Administrator shall -

"give consideration to the extent to which appropriate local public bodies have undertaken positive programs... for preventing the spread or recurrence in the community of slums and blighted areas...through the adoption, improvement, modernization, administration, and enforcement, of...local laws, codes and regulations relating to land use and adequate standards of health, sanitation, and safety for buildings..."

This injunction proved of less value than anticipated, despite administrative recognition of the need for adequate local action.

A review of the slum clearance program was undertaken in 1953 by the President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs. A subcommittee dealing with redevelopment concluded that there was no justification for Federal assistance except to cities that would face up to their problems and undertake long-range programs to prevent urban decay, stating that:

"The objective of the Federal assistance program should be to help the cities help themselves eliminate their slums. It therefore should be geared to require cities to face up to the whole process of urban decay. It should encourage the widest possible ingenuity, initiative, and discretion at the local level, but it should require clear and certain evidences as a pre-condition to Federal Aid that the city is realistically addressing itself to the processes by which slums are formed and is not simply engaged in the superficial, piecemeal approaches which will waste both Federal and local funds and fail to accomplish the objective."

Subsequently, the Housing Act of 1954 established as a prerequisite to urban renewal, public housing and mortgage insurance on renewal and relocation housing the submission to and approval by the Administrator

of a "workable program for community improvement" including "an official plan of action...for effectively dealing with the problems of slums and blight within the community and for the establishment and preservation of a well-planned community with well-organized residential neighborhoods of decent homes and suitable living environment...(and) for utilizing appropriate private and public resources...to achieve the objectives of such a program..."

The workable program has been going through a process of evolution ever since. Flexible administration proved essential to the implementation of the program. From the beginning, emphasis has been placed less on actual realization of specific objectives than on a program for continuous improvement, with evidence of progress towards this end. The approach has varied between small and large cities, between those that had experience and those that newly came under the program. Consistent with this approach, annual resubmission and recertification of the workable program have been required, coupled with a progressive tightening and strengthening of performance standards for each community at the time of recertification. The program has been taken more and more seriously by communities as the Agency has become committed to the concept of community action towards self-improvement. Recent procedural and organizational changes designed to further improve the effectiveness of the program are but a part of the continuing process of requiring appropriate community responses as a prerequisite for Federal aids.

The reasonable and flexible approach to the workable program concept has provoked a minimum amount of local resentment or resistance. The gradualness of its implementation has permitted communities to adapt their own outlook and procedures to the philosophy underlying the program. And the basic concept and approach have favor with Congress.

Application of Workable Program Concept to Metropolitan Problems

The existing workable program and its elements are, of course, designed to create conditions conducive to the success of urban renewal programs in individual cities and urban counties. There is no reason or basis for their extension to metropolitan areas. The concept itself, however, has real potentials for such areas.

The workable program is premised on the idea that Federal aid alone cannot solve local problems, that a concerted local effort is required to achieve real and lasting solutions. As a pre-condition to Federal assistance, it is a means for encouraging a community into a positive course of action. This idea is not new in Federal-local or Federal-state relations. It follows the classical exchange of substantive benefits on the part of the national government for procedural requirements accepted by state and local institutions (see Chapter III).

6

The logic of applying this approach to metropolitan areas is clear and requires little amplification. On the other hand, there exists a need for facilities and services that cannot or will not be provided without Federal support. On the other hand, the metropolitan community is only slowly moving to solve its own problems, especially in terms of appropriate organization for action. Federal impetus through a workable program can speed the strengthening of metropolitan capacity for effective action.

The primary reasons for Federal establishment of a program for metropolitan area development are:

1. From the standpoint of its programs, the Federal Government requires assurance that facilities and services it provides or assists will not be in conflict with each other. Such considerations have led to recent HHFA-BPR arrangements to coordinate some of their urban activities. But in many other fields of Federal endeavor, no such common outlook has developed. Thus, Federally-assisted airports are usually provided without careful regard for highway, community facilities or housing considerations; however, the recent establishment of an HHFA-FAA task force to review problems of blight in areas near airports promises a broader outlook in the future. The coordination of these and other activities among the agencies themselves is necessary to prevent waste, duplication and conflicts. But an appropriate solution can be found only within the context of individual metropolitan areas.

2. Maximization of benefit from individual Federal projects calls for their execution within the framework of developmental policies and programs established in a given area. A project standing alone will, of course, meet specific local needs; but developing it in relation to a whole program for metropolitan action will give such individual projects greater meaning and result in more beneficial returns. There is wasteful effort in attempting to solve a single segment of an area's problems or do some patchwork here and there. Only a total program - utilizing every available means - has promise of generating a major positive developmental effect on the region.
3. An objective of Federal assistance programs should be stimulation of local action for solving local problems.
4. To the Agency, a program of this type can be a major step towards achieving goals and objectives outlined in the first chapters. For the program and the processes it entails could be an important element in moving toward the type of institutions and activities that are required to bring about a concerted effort for metropolitan development.
5. Action toward achieving a solution to "the metropolitan problem" is a Federal responsibility in and of itself; it is also the direct responsibility of other levels of

government - state and local. This was the major point of last year's report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The recent Council of State Governments' publication on "State Responsibility in Urban Regional Development" also calls for a more coordinated and constructive Federal approach to metropolitan problems, through concerted action of governments at all levels. The program for metropolitan area development can achieve these purposes with the maximum degree of local determination.

Elements of the Program for Metropolitan Development

The workable program concept applied to metropolitan areas would require the establishment of criteria suited to the needs of such areas. Criteria should be concerned primarily with process and procedures for metropolitan goal and decision-making and with integration and coordination of developmental programs. Elements of the program for metropolitan development are developed accordingly.

The basic approach to the metropolitan program will have to be the same as for the local workable program - reasonableness, flexibility, gradual tightening of requirements as progress permits, all determined on a pragmatic basis. It aims at the formulation of guidelines for developmental actions of all governments involved. The elements as set forth below, are, therefore, delineated with a

certain degree of specificity to show the possible scope of the program; but the coverage here should not imply that these must be established as the initial or subsequent standards.

Three categories of metropolitan program elements can be established: (1) organization, (2) planning and (3) development coordination.

1. Organizational elements

A primary objective of the program for metropolitan development is stimulation of a metropolitan organizational structure that will permit politically responsive and responsible decision-making. The key factors, therefore, deal with the nature of governmental organization and its representative character. Qualifications of the metropolitan program agency would be determined by:

a. Legal and governmental adequacy

Only an official, governmental entity would have the qualifications and the capacity to provide cohesion necessary to a metropolitan area. Subject to this qualification, it is basic to this analysis that Federal Government not take a position in favor of any type of instrumentality to prepare the program. The stage of evolution of metropolitan organization does not permit at present selection of any preferred form as being the one that can meet the needs of urban regions (see Chapter III).

So far as the Agency is concerned action by a state agency, refurbished council of local officials or a new organization under specified conditions would be equally appropriate. The critical point is to assure that the program not be the product of a private group, however well motivated, and that neither state nor Federal constitutional issues are raised.

Under these circumstances, the Agency could be prepared to accept any one of three types of assurances: (1) that the instrumentality preparing the metropolitan program has statutory authority for that duty, (2) that legislative or executive delegation of such powers has been made to a state or local agency under appropriate and specified conditions, or (3) that an instrumentality has been especially established for the purpose of preparing a metropolitan program.

Thus, an existing multijurisdiction planning commission or a council whose legislative mandate has been broadly conceived could become the instrument, or the Administrator could find that an agency designated by a governor or state legislature can fulfill the role, or he could accept the establishment of an entirely new body. The important point is that the first requirement as to the characteristic of any of these instruments be that it have legal standing as a public enterprise.

b. Representative character

Given such a flexible basis for the designation of the metropolitan program agency, the Administrator needs assurance that it function so as to comprehend the wide diversity of interests involved in a metropolitan political system. He is not concerned as to whether any metropolitan program represents unanimity of opinion; indeed, one of the major effects of the program should be to encourage the system to evolve beyond the confederate stage. He does have to make sure that it does not represent a single interest or point of view and that both representation from governmental and community interests is maintained. Conceivably, for example, a governor might designate a state highway department to develop the metropolitan program. In this case, it would be necessary to provide for an elaborate structure of interest representation, consultation and review in order to maintain the main purposes of the activity.

Thus, there needs to be a requirement along the following lines: that in the preparation of the program for metropolitan development, the responsible agency (referred to as the "metropolitan agency") has provided for the participation of public officials and private citizens with responsibilities and interests with respect to the program through: (1) direct

representation of local officials and citizens at the policy-making level of the agency; (2) the establishment of advisory bodies representative of local governments in the metropolitan area, of major state and local agencies with operating responsibilities affected by the program, and of business, labor, private developers and civic organizations operating within the area; (3) public hearings concerning the components of the program throughout the stages of its preparation; and (4) other appropriate expressions of public attitudes with respect to the program.

Each of these provisions could be spelled out in detail with respect to number and characteristics of representation to ensure that no single interest be in a position of predominant influence, that widespread public consideration take place, and that technical and specialist views would not predominate. In effect, the aim would be toward a mixing of local governmental officials, private parties in interest and citizens disposed to public activity at the metropolitan level.

c. Area coverage

A delineation of geographical jurisdiction for the metropolitan program is required. Limits may be legally established or they can be related to the extent and

character of metropolitan and directly related development. Determinations here would be primarily concerned with insuring that full area coverage is provided. Provision may be made for flexibility of jurisdiction to adapt to changing needs. But if Federal and other agencies are to coordinate their activities with and through the metropolitan agency, a general understanding of current boundaries would have to exist at any given time for at least formal intergovernmental dealings.

d. Operating relationships

Representativeness of decision-making is required for the formulation of development policies. However, effectuation of these policies will usually be outside the operating scope of the metropolitan agency. It will, therefore, be necessary for the metropolitan agency to maintain close ties with those governmental organizations, such as highway departments and special authorities or districts, that do have jurisdiction over functional programs that play a role in metropolitan development.

The program for metropolitan development program should, therefore, be designed so as to enhance the ties between policy making and operating units. At the very least, reporting requirements should be established to clearly identify existing relationships and to pinpoint areas where increased correlation of capital and operating activities is required to achieve areawide development programs.

2. Planning elements

Planning gives substantive cohesion to areawide development programming. Provision must, therefore, be made to insure that metropolitan area development is solidly based on effective planning. The criteria, set forth in Chapter IV, would provide that:

- a. The metropolitan planning program should include research and information, goal and policy formulation, comprehensive planning and development programming as its principal activities.
- b. The substantive content of planning should include all elements relevant to metropolitan development or requiring areawide consideration and should cover these major components: urban land development, rural development and open space, transportation and regional facilities. Planning is to be based on appropriate techniques and methodology and must take full cognizance of functional and areal inter-relationships.

- c. The planning process should be directed towards formulation of a comprehensive plan for the metropolitan area, even if the initial plan is generalized and must be subsequently refined.
- d. A coordinated development program, together with an areawide capital improvement program, should be prepared as soon as feasible. In addition to outlining functional program activities, it should delineate developmental responsibilities and provide for interagency operational relationships.

These criteria relate to planning activities that should be performed within the metropolitan area. Planning must be viewed as a continuing and ever-evolving process, and each metropolitan area should be expected to strive towards performance of the general scope of planning as outlined in Chapter IV.

3. Development coordination

In addition to broad policy making and areawide planning and programming, a metropolitan agency must concern itself with coordinating actual programs and projects being carried out in the metropolitan area. These may relate to activities of local governments or special authorities operating in the area, or to projects falling under state or Federal jurisdiction. Program and project review provides the most immediate instrument for areawide coordination. Additionally, wide opportunity exists for correlating the many local

regulations and developmental activities not subject to review. And, finally, the metropolitan agency can perform an important developmental function through provision of technical advice and services to constituent local units.

a. Minimum review functions

As soon as the agency certified under the program for metropolitan development has established minimum capability, it should begin to perform the minimum review functions specified below. These are designed (1) to coordinate specific areas of activity within the metropolitan area, (2) assist HHFA and other Federal agencies in evaluation of local programs and projects as to their conformance to metropolitan policies and plans, and (3) establish recognition of the metropolitan agency as a focus for developmental programs in the area and thus raise its status within the metropolitan community. Initial review could be of a strictly advisory nature and would cover:

(1) Local planning coordination

Review of local plans prepared within the metropolitan area will establish interrelationship between adjacent or related localities and with metropolitan plans. Local plans prepared under the Section 701 planning assistance program would be referred to metropolitan agency for review and comment.

(2) Workable program review

Local workable programs for community improvement should be routed to the metropolitan agency prior to certification or recertification. Metropolitan agency review would be from the

standpoint of interrelationship between local workable programs and their relation to area as a whole. This review would assist the Agency in evaluating adequacy of local workable programs, due to greater familiarity with local conditions on the part of the metropolitan agency than of HHFA field staffs. Final approval would, of course, remain with HHFA.

(3) Community renewal program review

CRP is "part of the process of making and managing a general plan program for the total development and renewal of the community." Though the program is designed to meet the needs of a given community, it has broad metropolitan implications and elements:

- (a) economic and market analysis;
- (b) relocation requirements and effects of relocation;
- (c) financing requirements, both public and private;
- (d) public facility requirements, such as access and egress, route changes and related programming;
- (e) CRP conformance to comprehensive plan of locality.

All of these relate--directly or indirectly--to metropolitanwide considerations and planning elements.

Metropolitan review and coordination of CRP's is necessary in order to (a) make sure that the same assumptions underlie programs for localities and the metropolitan area in terms of economic, population and other assumptions and projections; (b) establish a realistic basis for determination of relocation capabilities of localities and metropolitan area, thus

*too inflexible for now
6/65-*

eliminating multiple counting of available housing; (c) relate, insofar as applicable, financing and facilities required for renewal on an intergovernmental and areawide basis; and (d) relate plans and programs of adjoining communities in the area. The review would assume that HHFA will give consideration to substantive content of CRP's and will consider their areawide implications.

(4) Program and project referral and review

In addition to these specific programs, proposals have been advanced for metropolitan agency review of Federally-assisted projects and programs. For example, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommends submission of applications for Federal grants-in-aid for airport construction, waste treatment works, urban renewal, public housing, hospital construction and urban highways for comment to the kind of metropolitan agency visualized under the program for metropolitan development. Other Federal programs, such as community facilities aids, could also be subjected to metropolitan review to assure their conformance to areawide development planning. Need also exists for metropolitan review of non-Federally supported state programs. Provision for both categories can be made through legislation or voluntary agency referrals. Short of legal authority, there is always a large potential for informal coordination of programs on an intergovernmental basis.

b. Other functions

The metropolitan organization may perform many additional review, coordinating and service functions related to area development. None of these need be mandated, but their performance can be encouraged. The following are types of subjects with which the metropolitan agency might deal:

(1) Developmental regulations, procedures, enforcement

The aggregate effect of local zoning, subdivision, building, housing and other codes significantly affects the directions and rate of areawide growth. Advice and influence can be brought to bear from the metropolitan level to achieve more rationality in local codes and to attain required degrees of standardization to assist the home building industry and others by giving them an opportunity to work under uniform standards and codes throughout the area. The general course should be towards eliminating obstacles to development and directing local actions towards attainment of both areawide and local objectives.

(2) Housing and relocation

Housing needs generated by development or redevelopment can be properly assayed only on a regionwide basis. The central function would be primarily analytical and information--conducting housing market studies of the area, providing a central clearing house and encouraging the provision of necessary housing wherever required.

*Just what
do they need
if no suburbs
to move into?*

(3) Economic development

Areawide economic growth and readjustment can be enhanced through coordination of efforts towards industrial and

commercial facilities, performance of clearing house functions for site locations throughout area, and provision of other aids to private and public sector decision-making.

c. Technical services

The metropolitan agency can, as deemed necessary, provide specialized services to localities within the urban area to assist in meeting their own needs and coordinating their efforts with those of other communities and the entire area.

Certifications under program for metropolitan development

Certifications under the metropolitan development program would be made by HHFA on application from the metropolitan area. Two types of certification will be required: agency certification and program certification.

1. Certification of agency

The first step under the program process is determination of metropolitan agency eligibility under criteria previously discussed. Metropolitan agency eligibility must be established prior to consideration of the program. An agency may be initially certified if it: (1) meets the legal, representativeness and area criteria, or (2) if conformance to the criteria can be expected in the near future and certification will assist the agency in meeting standards. In the latter case, only conditional metropolitan agency certification would be made. Recertification of agency eligibility every one or two years will insure that criteria continue to be met.

In making metropolitan agency certifications, it should be made clear that this action does not necessarily constitute a long-term contractual obligation to deal with the particular agency. In view of the evolutionary stage of metropolitan organizational development, the way must be left open to adjust the program for metropolitan development to changes in the governmental structure. At such time as a "higher" form of metropolitan

organization is achieved, HHFA should be free to deal with the new unit. Thus, initial certification may be of a representative metropolitan planning agency; as an effective council of local governments becomes established, meeting eligibility criteria, it may prove to be more appropriate for guiding the development program. As recertifications are made, HHFA should work directly with individual metropolitan areas to obtain conformance to organizational criteria and assist in progress towards greater areawide unity.

2. Certification of program for metropolitan area development

Program certification would be analagous to the process followed under the workable program for a community improvement: initial approval of a minimum program, with constant pressure towards more effective development of plans and actions in accordance with the program elements discussed above.

The state may well be given a role in review and certification or recertification of metropolitan programs. Just as the local workable program should be viewed in the context of the entire metropolitan area government, so the latter should relate to programs of the state. State review should be discretionary with the Administrator and would depend on the degree of state concern with metropolitan affairs. Where a state has established a special branch dealing with program problems or a state planning agency is so concerned, referral of programs may assist the Administrator in determining eligibility and will enhance the state's role in metropolitan affairs.

Activating the Program

To be effective, certification under the program for metropolitan development must be a prerequisite to receipt of Federal funds for projects

and programs in the metropolitan area. Without this inducement, Federal influence towards metropolitan development coordination may have relatively minor impact.

The metropolitan program prerequisite must be established either by action of Congress or through Presidential executive order. The latter could take advantage of existing program legislation and general executive authority to initiate the necessary procedural requirements. In the long run, Congressional enactment of the program for metropolitan development should be obtained to provide greater authority under the metropolitan program; without it, only limited withholding of Federal aids will be practical in cases where a metropolitan area does not conform to Federal program criteria.

Whichever course is taken to activate the metropolitan development program, its administration on behalf of the Federal Government should be lodged with HHFA. As discussed earlier, the Agency has been given primary urban development responsibility. Its present jurisdiction over the workable program for community improvement and its capacity to assist metropolitan planning and coordination under the Section 701 program provide the Agency with the know-how and facilities for supervising the metropolitan program.

Administration of the metropolitan program can, however, not be the exclusive domain of any Federal agency--each one with a stake in metropolitan planning and development should have a voice in how the program is operated, and how requirements are formulated and enforced. Therefore, while basic administration should lodge with HHFA, a Federal interagency cooperative effort will have to be maintained to provide general supervision for the program.

Immediate Action Toward Effective Planning

The workable program approach discussed so far is viewed as a general method for reinforcing evolutionary tendencies toward metropolitan organization and for strengthening metropolitan capacity to deal with development problems. There is, however, another course of action that can and should be undertaken immediately--the activation of a program to bring greater purpose and effectiveness to comprehensive metropolitan planning. This instrument can be utilized without awaiting developments under the broader metropolitan program approach.

It is true, of course, that comprehensive planning is a major component of the program for metropolitan development. The objective of the program's planning requirements, however, is the establishment of a full-fledged planning program and process in each metropolitan area, including public education as well as plan formulation, wide scale data gathering as well as development programming. While directed at the same broad objective, the purpose here is more limited--the proposal is aimed at achieving more immediate results than can be anticipated under the more gradualistic metropolitan program.

In addition to reinforcing metropolitan area planning and achieving other objectives of the metropolitan program, the new and immediate planning emphasis is needed to meet current Federal needs. As has been brought out earlier, the Federal Government has a direct substantive interest in metropolitan planning and decision-making--the creation of a frame of reference for Federal activities or Federally-assisted local and state programs. Airports, highways, sewage treatment plants, mass transit, open space and other programs

must, if Federal funds are not to be wasted, be related to each other and to local development. The comprehensive plan and development program provide a means of relating such programs and individual projects to each other within the framework of Federal criteria and local decision-making.

The Federal interest is more than hypothetical--planning requirements have on a number of occasions been incorporated in Congressional enactments. Pertinent to metropolitan areas are the following existing and proposed planning requirements:

1. Open Space (Housing Act of 1961)

The Administrator may enter into grant contracts only if he finds that "(1) the proposed use of the land for permanent open space is important to the execution of a comprehensive plan for the urban area meeting criteria he has established for such plans, and (2) a program of comprehensive planning (as defined in section 701(d) of the Housing Act of 1954) is being actively carried on for the urban area." The Administrator is further given broad authority to establish additional terms and conditions.

2. Mass Transportation Loans (Housing Act of 1961)

Loans may be made only if the Administrator determines that "there is being actively developed (or has been developed) for the urban or other metropolitan area served by the applicant a program, meeting criteria established by him, for the development of a comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation system."

3. Proposed Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962 (H.R. 11158, July 3, 1962)

Assistance under the proposed law would be made only if the Administrator determines that facilities and equipment "are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area." An emergency provision authorizes aid if the program for development of the urban transportation system is under active preparation, though not yet completed, and other criteria are met; this proposed exemption would be effective only to July 1, 1965.

4. Proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 (H.R. 12135, as passed by House of Representatives)

Section 7 provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall cooperate with states "in the development of long-range highway plans and programs which are properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation and which are formulated with due consideration to their probable effect on the future development of urban areas of more than fifty thousand population." **After July 1, 1965, highway** funds for projects in any such urban area may not be made unless the Secretary finds "that such projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by States and local communities..."

The House Committee report on this bill (Report No. 1948, June 28, 1962) stated that "this section would encourage transportation planning and improve the quality of urban planning generally." It points out that the provision would not delay the current highway program, as reasonable time would be allowed for establishment of the continuing planning process. The committee also points out "that transportation planning is almost invariably a continuing process; hence, this section has been drawn in such a way as to make it clear that a completed comprehensive plan, as such, is not necessary to meet its requirements."

These provisions cover comprehensive planning either in total, as in the case of open space and proposed mass transit, or along functional lines, as in the case of highways. While there is an apparent divergence in approach among these programs, they all relate to comprehensive planning as discussed in Chapter IV. Transportation planning studies sponsored in recent years by the Bureau of Public Roads have usually involved as comprehensive an undertaking as general, non-transportation planning activities in metropolitan areas. Thus, provisions under these functional programs would all lead to an acceptable approach to comprehensive planning.

The other two important programs affecting metropolitan areas are aid to airports (FAA) and waste treatment grants (HEW-PHS). Neither currently has a formal planning requirement. Both

agencies, however, are becoming metropolitan area and planning conscious and are concerned about conformity of their projects to regionwide development. Planning prerequisites for these programs could be established through legislative or administrative action.

A coordinated planning approach for all of these programs could have a major beneficial effect on comprehensive planning in metropolitan areas. If not coordinated, however, such planning prerequisites can cause confusion on the metropolitan level. If each Federal agency goes its own way and develops its own criteria as to what constitutes a comprehensive plan or a continuing planning process, the result would be a proliferation of specialized planning agencies and overlapping, inconsistent sets of metropolitan plans. Avoidance of such conditions requires actions on both Federal and metropolitan levels.

Unity of approach and criteria can be attained on the Federal level by voluntary cooperation or through executive direction. Most affected Federal units are now engaged in some degree of planning activity or sponsorship of areawide planning. Some working relationships have already been established; HHFA and BPR have worked out a common approach to metropolitan transportation planning, although no standard criteria have been developed as yet. The Public Health Service is now engaged in environmental planning studies for metropolitan areas, and a

formally established branch of metropolitan planning and development has existed in that agency for years. PHS officials working on this program have evinced a strong interest in developing a joint planning approach with HHFA.

A coordinated Federal approach to metropolitan planning can lead directly to integrated action on the metropolitan level. Common criteria meeting needs of the various Federal programs should be developed along the following lines:

1. Determination of characteristics of single planning agency that is qualified to undertake basic planning common to all programs. ✓
2. Determination of the extent of planning required to meet needs of each program. ✓
3. Delineation of plan elements, including their nature and methodology, common to all programs. ✓
4. Determination of specialized program planning needs not containing common characteristics. ✓
5. Development of joint criteria for single planning agency, common plan features and for carrying out specialized plan requirements. ✓
6. Provision for coordinated administration of planning requirements. ✓

Joint criteria can be so designed as to result in general metropolitan programs and plans that will provide the basis for more detailed functional program planning to meet the needs of individual agencies or their local correspondents.

For example, acceptable standards could be agreed upon for economic base studies, existing use surveys and population projections, and for land use, open space, transportation and metropolitan facility plans that would meet the minimum needs of each and all programs. Given a basic comprehensive metropolitan plan developed in accordance with such criteria, functional program plans could be built on this basic metropolitan plan. Thus, the basic comprehensive plan should provide a sufficient framework for developing an open space acquisition program or providing a point of departure for the development of a coordinated mass transportation or highway program; it would form the basis for determining airport locations or sewage treatment facilities.

The joint Federal planning approach should fully recognize the ongoing nature of individual programs. Common planning criteria must be so implemented as to not impede program execution. The language in the House-passed highway bill is pertinent in this respect--comprehensive planning can be required without stopping progress. The most effective approach, therefore, would be to develop common planning criteria, establish the coordinated planning effort, and then base individual program **and** project planning on the results of jointly-sponsored comprehensive planning. Individual Federal activities would thus not be delayed, but subsequent actions will be based on a more solid foundation.

The long-range effect of the proposed Federal planning appi- will be speedier and better-based implementation of Federal programs, together with a more efficient use of Federal and local resources.

Coordinated administration of planning requirements is the key to such a common approach to metropolitan areas. In its operation, it must give full cognizance to special requirements of each Federal program. All agencies have different methods of operation and generally deal with different clientele on state or local levels. The job of following through on plan prerequisites can, therefore, not be completely delegated to a single Federal agency. The supervision of common requirements and coordination on behalf of Federal agencies can, however, be lodged in a single agency.

Since HHFA has already been given primary responsibility for assisting metropolitan planning and has been recognized as the Federal arm in metropolitan areas, it is the logical entity to lead the joint Federal effort toward more effective metropolitan planning. Through appropriate use of the Section 701 planning assistance program, the Agency can directly influence the directions in content of metropolitan planning activities. In the event of such a joint Federal approach, 701 metropolitan and other planning grants can be predicated on the conformance to joint criteria and completion schedules could be established in accordance with Federal program requirements.

Other agencies and the Bureau of the Budget have indicated that HHFA is expected to provide guidance in comprehensive metropolitan planning. It is, therefore, incumbent on the Agency to initiate and pursue the common Federal effort to achieve more effective and coordinated comprehensive planning. Congress has already provided a directive for Agency initiative in coordinating Federal interests in planning--Section 701(e) states that:

In the exercise of his function of encouraging comprehensive planning by the States, the Administrator shall consult with those officials of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of programs of Federal assistance to the State and municipalities for various categories of public facilities.

This provision already applies in part to metropolitan planning; it can be extended to have full effect through executive action. The steps, including organization requirements, for undertaking this unified Federal approach to metropolitan planning are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VI

AGENCY ADJUSTMENTS FOR METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

A decision to reorient HHFA's mission to acknowledge the emerging metropolitan community and to establish a comprehensive program for metropolitan development carries with it the responsibility to make suitable policy, administrative and organizational adjustments. This does not mean that major Agency reorganization is anticipated or required at this time. We do not propose at either the Federal or the metropolitan level to implement at once the entire array of program responsibilities in planning techniques outlined in the earlier chapters.

At the present time, the objective would be simply to secure explicit recognition of the Agency's new directions and then to obtain the gradual revision of structure and practices to implement the new objectives. Indeed, the last chapter made clear that first priority be given to implementing the planning component of the new metropolitan workable program.

Even though gradualism is the hallmark of the Agency's new approach, some immediate changes in operations and procedures are necessary. First of all, Agency programs should be directed to serve the positive and constructive purpose of strengthening the metropolitan development process. Rather than making programs and funds available to anyone who submits an application and meets minimum program requirements, Agency policy should actively encourage utilization of programs which strengthen metropolitan activities. This policy includes the obligation

all 2/17/77
HHFA

to evaluate the substantive results of projects carried out under Agency programs and their relation to broader metropolitan development policies. Second, steps have to be taken within the Agency to insure the proper coordination of programs, with particular emphasis on planning as a means of relating transportation and other physical development activities. Third, the promising beginnings in interagency collaboration have to be expanded and accelerated, and HHFA should take the lead in achieving this objective as part of meeting its urban development responsibilities within the Federal Government.

These steps will require adjustments both in Washington and in the field. They entail recognition that responsibility for program coordination rests with the Administrator. He must see to it that programs operated by constituents and OA are appropriately interrelated and are directed towards the attainment of Agency metropolitan objectives. A parallel coordinating responsibility rests with regional administrators. The specific adjustments required are discussed in the following sections.

Approach to Metropolitan Organization

The first step in making effective use of Agency programs for metropolitan development is a determination of the counterpart institutions in each metropolitan area. Because of the policy implications which these selections entail and the fact that each such metropolitan body will become the focus of various Agency programs, this responsibility of identification must rest with the Administrator. As a matter of fact, this function is already being performed on a

pragmatic and ad hoc basis within the Office of the Administrator and by individual constituents. What is required now is establishment of single and central responsibility for selection.

Experience to date suggests that flexibility, diplomacy and careful evaluation are necessary ingredients in making wise choices among institutions. But the specification of the criteria outlined in Chapters III, IV and V should go a long way toward improving and regularizing the methods and standards for selection. As these chapters indicated, many metropolitan areas already have agencies which display some of the essential characteristics of responsibility and representativeness in organization, comprehensiveness in coverage and professionalization of staff. Now, with the formulation and promulgation of specific standards, it should be possible to remove many of the uncertainties which have surrounded the process in the past. Moreover, it should be possible to do so without provoking widespread disagreement as to appropriateness of the choice. No objections are likely to be raised to standards which emphasize the representative character of the institution, nor to the fact that areas need broad and functional scope, nor to the desirability of competent personnel. Given such sets of standards, the task of identification should be considerably simplified.

The identification of metropolitan development agencies should not be limited to those that currently exist. The potentialities of others must also be analyzed and the need for new institutions evaluated. This is particularly important in metropolitan counties

and urban states. This report has dealt largely with the large, complex metropolitan areas. However, the Agency also deals with numerous smaller metropolitan areas, many of which are exclusively or predominantly located in a single county. According to the last census, 133 of the 212 SMSA's are encompassed in one county. While county institutions are generally not so designed as to deal effectively with metropolitan development, a strong movement is underway to strengthen urban counties, and the Agency should use its resources to further this evolutionary development. Similarly, a number of states have been playing an increasingly more important role in metropolitan development. The Agency should, therefore, encourage wherever appropriate the development of county and state institutions capable of dealing with urban needs.

More is involved at the metropolitan level, however, than the simple duty of identifying appropriate developmental agencies. Another aspect of Agency responsibility here is the task of further strengthening performance. This is the so-called "evangelical" aspect of the Administrator's mission, and it should proceed by making Federal assistance, both financial and technical, available to improving the performance of these institutions where they are in being, and to helping establish them where they are not. By and large, the execution of this task requires the closest possible OA Liaison with Agency field offices throughout the country, with HHFA constituents, with other Federal operating agencies at the early review stages of their own grant programs, and with appropriate state, county and professional bodies.

Internal Adjustments

If the Administrator is to be responsible for coordinating and directing programs affecting metropolitan development, a significant degree of program initiative of necessity remains with OA. A procedure should, therefore, be established for preapplication contact with appropriate constituent agencies and for analysis and review of criteria for their grant and loan programs. Additionally, an application review procedure is appropriate to assure that individual projects are in conformance with Agency and metropolitan program requirements. More broadly, provision should be made for policy directives which bring constituent programs in line with the criteria in all stages of their processes. Finally, these central office functions should be buttressed by arrangements in the field which relate constituent programs to the work of the metropolitan development institutions.

Above all programs, Section 701 urban planning assistance must be closely related to Agency policies for metropolitan area development. As discussed in preceding chapters, planning is the primary instrument for attaining metropolitan and Federal development objectives; it is the keystone of the program for metropolitan development. While the 701 program has been largely responsible for establishment of planning programs in most metropolitan areas, it has not in most instances brought about striking changes. The fact that the full potentials of the program have not been achieved is recognized by those responsible for its administration and by others in the Agency; indeed, this acknowledgment is already reflected in the new 701.

regulations being promulgated. The success of 701-sponsored planning will in the end be measured by its effect on development policies and activities. Therefore, metropolitan planning project criteria should be established along the lines earlier outlined, and plans prepared under the program should be reviewed as to conformance with these criteria.

Since planning is accorded a major role in the proposed Federal interagency approach to metropolitan development, jurisdiction over policies and procedures should be lodged with the Administrator. This assignment is furthermore dictated by the relevance of planning to programs outside of the Urban Renewal Administration, within which operational responsibility for the 701 program is lodged. So long as planning is a prerequisite to programs such as transportation, appropriate means for coordination and supervision are required. As other programs concerned with metropolitan development are related to planning, the need for appropriate organizational alignment will increase.

A number of organizational approaches can be taken to metropolitan planning, including the transfer of the 701 program (with or without the community renewal program) to the Office of the Administrator. As a minimum, closer supervision and policy guidance over planning should be established in OA, without transferring program administration from URA. The Administrator, with assistance of an appropriate unit in OA, would supervise 701 policies and procedures affecting metropolitan planning and would keep close oversight over program

administration in URA and regional offices. In addition, arrangements need to be made for a comprehensive plan certification procedure, under which plans will be reviewed as to their conformance with established criteria to assure that they meet statutory or administrative planning requirements for functional programs.

In addition to review and certification of completed plans, a preapplication review procedure is required to insure that all metropolitan development and constituent program needs will be met under the proposed planning project and that appropriate metropolitan agencies are being dealt with. Preapplication review procedures should cover not only applications of metropolitan agencies, but also state planning concerned with metropolitan areas, planning for localities within a metropolitan area, and projects of significance to inter-constituent or interagency activities.

Beyond the 701 program, operations of constituent agencies should be examined and evaluated to explore the degree to which their project authorizations take into account the operations of the metropolitan institutions in the field and the feasibility of applying comprehensive planning criteria to them. In each instance, the key question is whether or not the operating program involves such an exchange of substantive benefits for procedural requirements that the incorporation of comprehensive planning standards is feasible. For FHA operations, for example, the issue is whether or not FHA assistance in the form of insurance could bring subdivision development within the purview of comprehensive planning as expressed by a metropolitan development

FHA?
of what kind?

How long of
culture?

agency. In the case of community facilities, the specific form of the question is whether or not advance planning and public facility loans can similarly be conditioned by the requirement of reference to such an institution. In short, both internal review by the OA within the Federal structure and external review by the local metropolitan development agency are ultimate objectives.

Federal Interagency Coordination

Simultaneously with intra-Agency adjustments, HHFA must take the lead in exploring the ways of accelerating promising beginnings in interagency collaboration. This can perhaps best be done by seeking agreement on methodology, on common elements of planning and on characteristics of planning agencies, as outlined in the preceding chapter. No attempt should be made to incorporate all the elements of what has been conceived in this report as a viable metropolitan development program to all Federal or other operations. Instead, the purpose is the identification of common denominators in these programs and assurance that where possible the focal point remains in the metropolitan institution deemed most appropriate to carry on various developmental responsibilities.

Beyond the common approach to metropolitan planning, continuing efforts are desirable to achieve the strengthening and coordination of all Federal agencies' efforts for metropolitan development. HHFA should stand ready to support initiation and expansion of urban assistance activities of other departments and encourage their being related to common planning and organizational criteria.

An expanded, coordinated Federal effort for metropolitan development would be enormously facilitated if it were possible to mandate a unified approach to areawide development. The possibilities of an executive order should, therefore, be actively and vigorously explored. Such an executive order could: (1) authorize establishment of and conformance to planning and other criteria for metropolitan programs of all agencies. It could also stipulate that the attainment of locally determined development objectives be a basic purpose of each Federal program related to urban development in addition to the primary missions of such programs; however, legislation may be required in some cases to establish this additional program purpose; (2) make the HHFA Administrator responsible for developing methods and procedures for improved interagency coordination in the development and carrying out of Federal metropolitan policies and programs; and (3) provide for an interagency metropolitan advisory council, chaired by the HHFA Administrator, to give broad policy advice to heads of Federal agencies on all important matters affecting metropolitan areas and to facilitate coordinated efforts among the various Federal agencies.

The executive order can be a prime vehicle for enunciating the metropolitan emphasis that should pervade all Federal programs operative in urban areas. An order of this nature would, furthermore, establish HHFA leadership in this field and would augment the Agency's capacity to carry out programs for metropolitan development.

An interagency coordinating structure can also be established at the regional level, paralleling the central council. Initial exploration of the degree of similarity among the boundaries of Federal agency regions, and especially the common metropolitan areas they include, suggests that their regional patterns are far more complementarity than has been generally presumed. This coincidence makes even more feasible the prospect for continued interagency collaboration.

New Federal Programs

Federal interagency coordination, appropriate metropolitan organization and effective planning are not enough to achieve fully effective development. Federal programs themselves must be adapted to meet current and future needs of metropolitan communities. Many existing programs were developed prior to the emergency of the large urban concentrations with which we must deal today, while others though newer are not capable of facing up to the scope and complexity of metropolitan needs. And in many functional areas, required Federal assistance is not forthcoming at all. There must, therefore, be a recognition of Federal Government responsibility to remold its programs to fit national goals and Federal objectives in metropolitan areas.

Since it is concerned with overall metropolitan area development, HHFA should interest itself in any inadequacies of existing programs, both within the Agency and among other departments. Present percentage grant provisions of the open space program, for example, raise serious questions about the program's ability to adequately fulfill its stated purposes - encouraging more economical and desirable urban

development and helping preserve essential open-space land; substantially higher Federal grants seem required to stimulate local action to implement the objectives of the program. HEW's waste treatment grants are limited to 30 percent of total cost or \$250,000, whichever is less - both limitations again seem insufficient to meet the burgeoning metropolitan needs not only for treatment facilities but also for areawide sewage systems. And while numerous Federal programs concern themselves with water resources, no direct assistance is available to meet metropolitan-wide water supply needs. Nor are there any programs that provide continuing support for planning or other metropolitan agencies, on which the whole developmental effort depends.

All of these inadequacies and others should be of concern to the Federal Government and to the Agency in particular. Constant and continuing effort is required to make sure that adequate programs are available to those areas desiring to undertake a comprehensive approach to metropolitan development.

Other Avenues of Collaboration

The Federal Government and metropolitan areas themselves are today not the only ones interested in urban regional problems. A number of states have taken on responsibility in this field, and the Council of State Governments has assumed leadership in encouraging all states towards greater urban efforts. The role of the urban county in solving metropolitan problems has been an increasingly stressed one over recent years by the National Association of County Officials. Other

organizations, both of public and private officials, have had a longstanding interest in metropolitan affairs: the American Municipal Association, National Municipal League, Conference on Metropolitan Problems, The American Society of Planning Officials and American Institute of Planners, and others. More recently, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has become a vehicle for bringing together representatives of different levels of government and has been effective in pointing to solutions for metropolitan area needs.

Direct cooperation with these and other organizations will substantially strengthen HHFA's own activities towards more effective metropolitan programs and will assist states, counties and other groups by reinforcing their capacity to achieve metropolitan solutions. Initiative for such cooperation rests with HHFA. In the long run, a mutual approach would benefit all metropolitan areas.

Organizational Arrangements Within the Office of the Administrator

The need to lodge supervisory and coordinating functions with the Administrator was outlined in our discussion of Agency approaches to metropolitan area development and related activities. It is now appropriate to indicate how the Office of the Administrator might be organized to discharge its new responsibilities. In our judgment, two specific organizational actions are required: (1) proceeding with the establishment of an office of metropolitan development within the Office of the Administrator, and (2) strengthening of regional administrators' capacity to deal with metropolitan development and planning.



1. Office of Metropolitan Development

- The purpose of the office of metropolitan development is to assist the Administrator in discharging his responsibilities towards metropolitan areas. Generally speaking, this office should serve as a central focal point on behalf of the Administrator in developing and applying the concepts discussed in the preceding sections. Specifically, its responsibilities should be these:

- 1) To formulate, refine and recommend promulgation by the Administrator of the basic criteria applicable to programs for metropolitan development already outlined in this report.
- 2) To identify, assist and strengthen those agencies, institutions and enterprises within metropolitan areas best equipped to conduct developmental programs, including planning.
- 3) To assure that the metropolitan units and their programs are recognized, accented and utilized within Agency operating programs.
- 4) To review and make recommendations to the Administrator on policies and procedures affecting planning and developmental programs of the Agency.
- 5) To review applications and assure that proposed projects *which applications* meet the requirements of all Agency programs, and to recommend plan certifications to the Administrator.
- 6) To establish and perfect close working relationships with appropriate state agencies and professional associations of state, county and local officials to assure their cooperation and participation where appropriate in

metropolitan programs and in correlating their independent activities.

- 7) To undertake such Federal interagency collaboration as appropriate to assure that national agencies with prime responsibilities for developmental activities proceed in awareness of and, so far as possible, in conformity to the work of the metropolitan units.
- 8) To make recommendations to the Administrator for any changes in organization, staffing or operating methods which will help achieve the Agency's metropolitan objectives, including changing program emphases or directions.

Implicit in all these assignments is the generic role of the office as an energizing agent, taking the lead to make plain what metropolitan development plans are, where they exist and how they can be applied inside and outside the Agency.

The responsibilities assigned to the office suggest that it possess the authority and the professional capacity to take the leadership in stimulating comprehensive planning at the metropolitan level and then to assure the closest possible coordination between this activity and the various functional programs of the Federal government. This means initial authority to require compliance with general planning criteria (and later for the other elements of the development program) by major grants programs within the Agency, in particular transportation, open space and 701 urban planning. More important, however, it

suggests that the office be assured of being "brought in" at the early stages of these programs and that it possess the authority to require appropriate referral and review procedures - not at the conclusion of project activity - but at its initial stages.

This does not imply formal transfer of responsibilities so much as it requires coordinated action, information and staff collaboration. One of the most promising avenues for securing these qualities is through the demonstration route. The office might select one or a few particular regions where governmental bodies with potential for becoming full-fledged metropolitan development agencies are in being and are highly regarded in the area. For a period of time, Federal developmental projects could be channeled through this mechanism to make a dramatic showing of the benefits of sound planning techniques and review procedures to the orderly development of a metropolitan region.

2. Regional Offices

To assist the Administrator, working through the metropolitan development office, in the execution of this program, changes in regional office organization and procedures are appropriate. The regional administrator's authority should be strengthened by the addition of direct comprehensive planning responsibilities to his present assignments under the workable program. Moreover, the staff available at the regional office should be so augmented

as to assure that personnel and other resources exist to provide direct assistance in identifying and stimulating comprehensive planning and policy-making units at the metropolitan level. This staff will, in all likelihood, need special qualifications to carry out their duties.

In effect the metropolitan development office should have a direct channel to counterpart units of personnel in each regional office so as to assure that comprehensive planning criteria are recognized and applied in operating programs and that institutions at the metropolitan level are in close liaison with the activities of the Agency. The role of the regional unit is especially crucial; in the initial stages of program development it should aid in correlating transportation, open space, community facilities, urban renewal and other project activities - whether administered centrally or in the field - with both the elemental criteria of comprehensive planning and the specific work of metropolitan development agencies. Eventually, it should carry the major administrative burden of the program for metropolitan development.

Summary

The administrative and organizational proposals outlined above are designed to establish a progressively expanding base for carrying on stimulative and regulatory activities required for an effective metropolitan development program. As conceived, the office of metropolitan development has a dual role. First, undertaking to improve the quality of metropolitan development work by emphasizing comprehensive

planning at the metropolitan level across the country. Second, by insuring that HHFA and other Federal agencies take this development program into account in discharging their own responsibilities. Comprehensive planning has been selected as the initial starting point for these activities, with the expectation that other elements of the development program will be incorporated as rapidly as possible.

On the stimulative front, the office would be empowered to identify appropriate metropolitan agencies, assist them in improving their capacities and evaluate their performance. On the regulatory front, it would be given consultative, informational and review authority to begin to bring within the purview of its operations those Agency and interagency programs that are relevant to metropolitan development. The organizational and procedural changes have been designed to make both these functions considerably more than paper activities.

Nonetheless, no one should expect that these adjustments can occur without problems. A serious one may be competition among institutions at the metropolitan level for designation as a prime instrument for the metropolitan development program; this is most likely to occur in OA's stimulative and evangelical work. One great danger is that inexperienced and maladroit handling of this aspect of the task could slow or deter the trend toward metropolitan policy-making. Initially, therefore, heavy reliance must be placed on the implementation of unambiguous policies and criteria by the new central office unit. Ultimately, however, the success of the program is likely to hinge on the skilled technical competence and energy of field representatives of regional offices staffs.

manifest

The regulatory aspect of the job offers few apparent problems in the metropolitan areas themselves. Here, the potential influence which the Federal Government possesses in its operating program should provide effective means for assuring metropolitan cooperation. However, this job may place considerable stress at the Federal level. Within the Agency, the designation of grant programs to be made conditional as to their consistency with the development program raises obvious issues of adjustments of established operating procedures. The achievement of collaboration among Federal operations outside the Agency itself may pose even more difficult problems.

But the burden of the evidence presented in the preceding chapters has been that none of these problems appear insuperable, that progress at both the metropolitan and Federal levels the last few years has been considerable, and that existing opportunities now outweigh the liabilities in moving ahead. Given characteristics of diplomacy, creativity and vigor in the office of metropolitan development, the Agency will have established goals and provided means for their accomplishment which should serve its major mission for the next decade at least.

711-583

H68t

1962.

app

c.2

711.583 H68t 1962 Appx c.2

U.S. Housing and Home Finance
Agency

Task force report on metropoli-
tan development

DATE