

A PROPOSAL
FROM
THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
STATE OF CONNECTICUT
TO
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
TO
DEMONSTRATE AN EXPANDED STATE ROLE
IN THE
MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

A PROPOSAL
TO DEMONSTRATE
AN EXPANDED STATE ROLE IN THE
MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

Introduction	page 1
Expanded State Role in Model Cities	page 4
Relationship of Model Cities to CDAP	page 7
Relationship of Model Cities to Community Relations Team	page 8
Relationship of Model Cities Program to CDA, to Municipal Government to Neighborhood	page 10
State Program Implications	page 14
a. Communications	page 14
b. Origination of Programs	page 16
c. Economic Development Team	page 16
d. Discretionary Funds	page 19
Administration	page 21

A PROPOSAL
TO DEMONSTRATE
AN EXPANDED STATE ROLE IN THE
MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

Introduction

Early indications seem to point to a new prominence for the Model Cities concept in the new administration's approach to federal participation in urban oriented programs. Since such a change may require extensive administrative and policy restructuring on the federal level, the Department of Housing and Urban Development will need to have before it a maximum of experience in dealing with the administration of the Model Cities program at all levels, in order to develop that structure which will most effectively achieve the objectives of the Model Cities Program. It is becoming increasingly clear that such a structure must include a greater role for state governments in effectuating the program; however, outside of Connecticut there is a paucity of hard information concerning possible constructive roles states can play.

To help provide such information, we propose that the Connecticut Department of Community Affairs (DCA) be designated to carry out a demonstration program intended to test the thesis that an integral role for state governments with the full cooperation of the federal government can greatly increase the effectiveness of the Model Cities Program, and enhance the degree to which its objectives are actually realized in the local municipalities.

There are several reasons why Connecticut is uniquely prepared to execute such a demonstration with maximum results. Connecticut now has operative an extensively developed Department of Community Affairs, an Agency with ability and experience and charged with the responsibility of dealing with a wide spectrum of urban life. The Community Development Action Plan (CDAP), through which DCA affects the total comprehensive planning and execution functions in Connecticut communities, is a Program with important relationships to the Model Cities Program. Each of Connecticut's Model

Cities Communities is also engaged in CDAP planning.

Geographically, Connecticut is a compact state and therefore conducive for a centralized state agency to decentralize when necessary in order to maintain close contact and coordinate developments in local communities. Since Connecticut's model cities range from small to medium in size, they constitute a manageable laboratory for experiment in urban change. The number of these cities, five, is large enough and the problems in each varied enough to provide a productive sample for the demonstration; yet their size and variety certainly fall within DCA's demonstrated capacity. The whole complement of urban ills exists in Connecticut, but in a magnitude which is not overwhelming and which will yield to creative planning and judicious administration more readily than in larger cities where conditions are more desperate. Consequently DHUD should anticipate early reports, preliminary evaluations, and the necessary flexibility of DCA to adjust to possible federal policy changes within a reasonable demonstration period.

Connecticut's already advantageous situation should become even better during the present session of the legislature, since that session is expected to adopt legislation codifying the state's role in Model Cities, providing discretionary Program funds, and offering new possibilities for community development.

Finally, and of most importance, Connecticut has amassed valuable experience in ways in which state government can promote and enhance the Model Cities Program, through the activities since June of 1968 of its four Model Cities Coordinators. This Demonstration was made possible when Connecticut received the initial 701 grant to demonstrate potential state coordination of the Model Cities Program. The coordinators, working under and through the Governor's Inter-Agency Committee on Model Cities, has sought ways by which the resources of federal and state, public and private agencies

can be most effectively mobilized to the benefit of the State's model cities

One significant result of the team's work has been to demonstrate that a state agency can maintain a much closer relationship to a local program (and thus be more able to appraise it accurately) than can a federal regional office. Most significantly, this proximity to the local program can be seen in the fact that the coordinators have developed a close rapport with Model Neighborhood residents and groups. They are thus in a position to evaluate and influence programs from a perspective not often achieved by government agencies. Our proposal not only calls for the team's present functions to continue but for them to be expanded and intensified.

In summary, we propose that Connecticut's Department of Community Affairs be designated HUD's agent in managing the Model Cities programs in the State, and be granted adequate funding to provide additional staff and equipment necessitated by this expanded role. The proposal which follows will explain in detail how this can be done, and why Connecticut is in a particularly advantageous position to carry out such a demonstration. It will also examine some implications for specific programs.

An Expanded State Role In Model Cities

That the Model Cities team has accomplished since its inception nine months ago is a matter of record, and appears in the two quarterly reports which have been submitted to HUD. It is now perfectly clear that those accomplishments could have been more significant had certain problems been more clearly foreseen and more adequate provisions been made to deal with them. These shortcomings are corrected in the present proposal. Some are dealt with later in the section on program implications, but the most serious inability which the staff experienced arose from the State's anomalous position in the Model Cities Program. Lacking both authority and responsibility in the federal Program, the State was nevertheless asked to exert a constructive influence on that Program's reception in the cities. The inescapable conclusion, after nine months experience, is that productive state participation requires that the state be given a full share of authority and responsibility in the federal Model Cities structure.

Connecticut is particularly well prepared to demonstrate such a new role, not only by its unmatched experience with Model Cities, but also by its own State programs in the cities, the most important of which is CDAP. The Model Cities Program and the CDAP Program are inextricably tied together in the Connecticut model cities. Both programs have a five year time schedule; both demand citizen participation; both call for comprehensive planning and execution; both focus on the social aspects of physical renewal. In fact, the primary differences between the two Programs are that CDAP encompasses the entire community instead of designated target areas, has a possible two year planning period instead of one, and evaluates twelve municipal functions rather than the ten suggested in the Model Cities program.¹

Since the two Programs are compatible and mutually supportive, it is desirable that they be administered with the maximum possible coordination. The local programs

¹Of these two, CDAP examines municipal governmental effectiveness and is therefore not directly applicable to the Model Cities Program. The other, Interpersonal Communications, might well be a part of Model Cities, since its concern certainly is a requisite of citizen participation.

must integrate planning and action undertaken in the Model Neighborhood into the design for the total community which the CDAP will accomplish, allocating priorities, staff and budgets from a perspective which takes full account of requirements of both Programs and which seeks to mesh them for the most efficient possible amelioration of the city's problems. This is a process which demands care in administration at the local level, since the inter-relatedness of the urban complex is such that a decision in either Program inevitably has immediate and far-reaching implications for the other, necessitating new adjustments and coordinations.

The review process by which the federal and state concerns in the Programs are protected, are equally complicated, and must be carefully coordinated if they are to be of maximum effectiveness in yielding information to state and federal agencies and guidance to local Model Cities and CDAP agencies. This coordination, difficult at best, will be best accomplished when DCA, which bears responsibility for leading a municipality through a successful CDAP, plays a similar role in coordination with HUD in the Model Cities Program. DCA's Model Cities staff and CDAP evaluation staff are already in daily contact, and can now formulate the processes and guidelines which will most efficiently lead to optimal results in both programs.

The experience accumulated by DCA's Model Cities staff provides an excellent foundation for developing this coordination. Each coordinator has assumed primary responsibility for a particular model city, and has become extremely familiar with the realities of urban life in his city. Each has reviewed Model Cities applications, has served on local task forces, and has initiated substantive programs and followed them through to their realization. Each has attended CDAP review meetings, and has pressured and cajoled municipal officers and citizen groups to work together to expedite the two Programs in a cooperative effort. Each has attended local CDA meetings on a regular basis and has worked directly with neighborhood groups - some direct

outgrowths of the Model Cities Program. All have, in short, been directly involved in both Programs.

In both structure and function, DCA is well equipped to assume added Model Cities authority. The field offices and review staff of the CDAP Program are in daily contact with the Model Cities team, and the director of the Model Cities team is in daily contact with the Commissioner of DCA. DCA's team of urban specialists are available to both the CDAP and Model Cities teams. DCA has effective liaison with other state departments and agencies through the State Interagency Model Cities Committee, created by the Governor and established as the State's Model Cities authority. This committee is operational and includes with DCA as coordinator the respective commissioners and their delegate agents from each of the major State agencies involved in urban matters; i.e., health, education, housing, mental health, crime and delinquency, finance and control, labor and welfare.

In light of the above, DCA proposes the following: by contract, HUD shall delegate to the Commissioner of DCA for a period of no less than twelve months joint authority over the Connecticut Model Cities Program. This authority will include joint federal-state review of applications and requests for release of funds; the negotiation of planning grant contracts; the review of work programs and revised work programs; the authority to recommend terminating a city's Model Cities status; and other authority incidental to and logically flowing from these functions.²

²This would involve joint HUD-DCA staff meetings on Model Cities matters, inclusion of DCA in federal policy making meetings, attendance of DCA staff at regular conferences, etc.

Relationship of Model Cities to CDAP

It has earlier been stated that in Connecticut's Model Cities there is inevitably a close relationship between the Model Cities Program and the CDAP Program. This was noted as requiring coordination in overseeing the two Programs, which, it was said, could best be accomplished if DCA were to enjoy a partnership role with HUD in managing this State's Model Cities Programs.

Now it is important to note certain benefits which can be expected to accrue to both Programs as a result of their being carried out in concert. Administratively, this would have the obvious advantage of preventing duplication of effort, sharing costs of overlapping programs, sharing staff capabilities, preventing conflicting planning, efficiently providing information developed by each program to the other, and expediting early action programs. But, more important than this, CDAP is a comprehensive program in which successful Model Cities innovations can immediately be implemented in a city's other problem areas. Discretionary administrative control exercised by the Commissioner will require that joint Model Cities-CDAP guidelines be prepared, and techniques of joint review developed, at both state and local levels so that the coordination will be guaranteed.

Relationship of Model Cities to Community Relations Team

What happens in a central city affects every community contiguous to the city, and many which are farther removed from the city itself. In the same way, the good or ill health of the city favorably or unfavorably influences the fortunes of every business and commercial or industrial enterprise in the region. It follows, then, that any concentrated attack on urban problems (such as is envisioned in the Model Cities Program) and any mobilization of available resources to meet such problems can ill afford to overlook resources existing in suburban and exurban communities, and also must endeavor most assiduously to enlist all possible help from the private business and industrial communities. This, the Connecticut Model Cities staff, will seek to accomplish.

One important reason for the relative failure of such attempts in the past has been a break-down of communication. Suburban governments, representing residents who are in the suburb precisely because they sought to escape being plagued with urban problems, are not likely to respond to appeals to help the cities until and unless their constituents are fully convinced that they have an urgent concern with the well-being of the core-city which is the heart of the region which they inhabit. In the same way, businesses and industries in the region have in their accounting procedures no easy indicator of what blighted human existence in the ghetto costs them each year in lost production, theft, vandalism, restricted market, etc. Someone must tell them, if they are to have a significant role in bettering the conditions of life in our cities.

The Connecticut Model Cities team will have at its disposal important assistance as it seeks to overcome this communications barrier. DCA has under way a community relations project, in which a five-man team are seeking to develop ways to make residents of non-urban regions more aware of their dependence on the city, and to

bring them to accept a more proper share of responsibility for improving urban life. This demonstration program is being undertaken pursuant to a grant from HUD (Title IX of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Act of 1966). Interestingly, this is the only program of its kind in the country and offers DCA a unique opportunity to study under laboratory conditions the complex and perhaps undefinable action-reaction relationship existing between urban and suburban communities throughout this country. The same team could carry out a similar communicating function with the business and industrial communities.

The increasing centrality of the Model Cities Program on the urban scene will mean that the Model Cities coordinators will be an indispensable resource for this Community Relations team, while the Community Relations team will in turn be valuable to the coordinators' efforts to enlist the widest possible assistance in urban improvement.

Relationship of State Model Cities Program to CDA, to
Municipal Governmental Structure and to
Neighborhood Groups

The fact that DCA has become HUD's delegate through the process which has been suggested will immediately render DCA more effective in dealing with those local agencies which determine the course of events in a Model Neighborhood. An agency possessing neither statutory nor administrative authority must rely only on persuasion to influence the program, and this alone is too often not enough to alter a city's pre-determined plans. This can result, and has resulted, in collisions between CDAs and the federal review team, with consequent delay in the local programs. These confrontations can be clearly foreseen from the State Model Cities staff's perspective, and could be avoided were the State staff accorded an appropriate degree of influence on local planning.

The proposed DCA-HUD partnership will immediately increase DCA's impact on the local government, and will provide a new dimension in the review and evaluation process, since DCA's Model Cities staff personnel have close contact not only with the CDAs but also with neighborhood groups in the Model Neighborhoods. Through this double insight and direct personal contact, a more balanced objective and complete evaluation of the Program can be made than would be possible from even the best written reports.

The DCA-HUD partnership will also make available to CDAs and/or neighborhood groups a variety of technical assistance available from DCA's own staff³ and from the staffs of those state departments represented on the State Interagency Model Cities

³That part of DCA's organization through which services are delivered consists of two parts: District Field Operations and Supportive Services. Operating under its Director, each District staff has capability to aid local governments, CAPs or other groups in preparing proposals for state assistance, to review such programs and to recommend action on them to the Commissioner. Available through the Supporting Services staff are specialists in housing, urban renewal, civil design engineering, code enforcement, social services, human resource development, welfare education, day care, city planning, recreation and leisure and manpower development.

Committee⁴. It has been the practice of the coordinators to maintain close contact with the all Model Cities-related developments, with a view to engaging state-offered technical assistance wherever this may be useful. When a need for such assistance arises, the coordinator acts as liaison between the CDA or the neighborhood on the one hand and the appropriate state agency on the other to insure maximum effectiveness.

In the case of DCA's own staff, this means bringing District staff into contact with local agencies for program development and application processing in connection with projects in which DCA can offer support. It means similarly involving the Supportive Services staff in many evaluating, planning or training functions. In the case of other state agencies, it first means an inquiry directed to that agency's contact person on the Interagency Model Cities Committee to establish what personnel are available for the needed function, followed by negotiation to make that personnel productive on behalf of the Model Cities group.

(a) Working with City Governments

To insure smooth and prompt delivery of such services, the coordinators will likewise maintain regular in-depth contact with those officials in each city responsible for the Model Cities Program, to review the planning being developed by CDA and city staff, to encourage explanation of innovative and experimental possibilities, to offer those kinds of technical assistance available from the state, and to make sure that maximal citizen participation is included in the planning at every step. They will also regularly

⁴Represented on the Committee, or readily accessible to it and to the Model Cities staff, are the state departments of: Consumer Protection; Corrections; Connecticut Development Commission; Education (including divisions of vocational education and rehabilitation); Health; Labor (including the Connecticut State Employment Service); Mental Health; Welfare (including Social Services and Child Welfare); and the Governor's Committee on Crime and Juvenile Delinquency.

attend meetings of the councils and task forces representing residents of the neighborhood, in order to provide similar stimulation and assistance in their work.

(b) Working with Neighborhood people

One of the disadvantages under which neighborhood people labor is a lack of information about the programs of government, federal, state and local, which can be made to work on their behalf. This can lead to a reaction of hopelessness which cuts the tap-root of any possible citizen participation. Disillusionment which results when governmental promises seem to the residents not to be redeemed (even if the failure results from the residents' own ineptness in dealing with government structure) can have the same effect.

For these reasons, it is important for the coordinators as soon as possible to identify those individuals and groups in the Model Neighborhood which reflect validly the ideas and attitudes existing in the neighborhood and/or exercise or have the potential to exercise leadership. When these key persons and groups are found, continuing contact with them must be maintained, in order that the coordinator may have a realistic picture of the Model Neighborhood in all its dimensions, in order that he may inform residents of the new possibilities the Model Cities Program opens to them, and in order that he may enlist their participation in the fullest and most productive way.

Success in establishing, maintaining and using such rapport with neighborhood people has been a signal achievement of the Connecticut Model Cities staff in their first year of existence under the 701 grant.

This kind of concern with the existing viable structures in the Model Neighborhoods has in many cases led to the establishment of mutually beneficial liaison with the

Community Action Agencies, through which the CAAs and Model Cities programs have achieved an important working relationship.

This emphasis on neighborhood liaison at the state level gives to the Connecticut Model Cities operation a balance which cannot be duplicated, and which has great promise for the success of the demonstration being proposed. Important as the achievements in this regard have been to date, they can be magnified and enhanced if the items proposed are granted, since each coordinator will have more time to devote to the city which is his essential responsibility, and because he and the staff of which he is a part will have the capability to exercise a greatly intensified impact on the local program and thus to produce positive results on behalf of neighborhood residents.

State Program Implications

In the light of DCA's experience with Connecticut's Model Cities Programs, there are certain items of programming which already recommend themselves as desirable for immediate implementation. Specifically these are: improvement of the communication flow, added emphasis on innovation in Model Cities planning and a program to foster the development of indigenous economic competence. While we propose that an early start on these is necessary, we foresee that there will be others which will become important during the period covered by this proposal, so that it is necessary that there be maximum flexibility in the State's Model Cities function to allow for implementing these new high-priority items.

Communications

There are four ways in which the communication flow in our present program must be improved for maximum effectiveness to be achieved; (1) access by the Connecticut Model Cities Office to federal and other planning concerning Model Cities; (2) intra-department communications; (3) communication with other departments of state government; and (4) communication with local CDAs and neighborhood groups.

1) DCA's Model Cities office must be represented at all federal conferences dealing with Model Cities, and at many such sponsored by private agencies. This is a must if the coordinators are to be the productive, up-to-date resource which is needed by the Model Cities programs. DCA, in such conferences can have a valuable input to federal thinking because of its unique experience. Also, provision must be made for frequent field trips to visit promising experimental programs in other states which may be adaptable to meet Connecticut's needs. Likewise, DCA must develop within its Model Cities office a resource library making as much information as possible immediately available.

2) As the Model Cities programs in Connecticut move toward the execution phase, there will be an increasing need for close coordination of all DCA programs in Model Cities communities. This will be partly taken care of by the Director participating in regular meetings of the District Directors, but will also require the institution of a reporting system by which the Model Cities office regularly receives status reports of all DCA programs in Model Cities municipalities. Further, to improve intra-department communications, it will be urged that programs of sensitivity training be made mandatory for many DCA employees, aimed on the one hand to sensitizing workers to each other, and, on the other, at sensitizing field workers to the particular communications problems of residents of Model Neighborhoods and other ghetto communities.

3) Since the development of good communications with other departments of the state government will play a major role in the success of the Model Cities staff's efforts, the approach will be to make fuller use of the Inter-Agency Model Cities Committee. Their meetings must now be regularized, and the agenda must include full reports on the status of each city's program and a calendar of upcoming Model Cities events to which other departments will be expected to make a contribution.

4) Finally, though the individual efforts of the coordinators have established good relations between DCA and local Model Cities groups, there remains a need for new avenues through which communication can take place. For this reason, DCA will sponsor regular state-wide or even regional conferences for local DCAs and/or neighborhood groups, at which information can be imparted and participants in local programs can share ideas with each other. Sensitivity training may also become a major component of such conferences.

Origination of Programs

Since it will be a continuing concern of the Model Cities team in DCA to work with agencies of municipal government and with neighborhood groups to encourage them to a maximum of innovation and experimentation in developing the components of the local Model Cities Program, the team will work closely with DCA's battery of urban experts to originate new and imaginative attacks on urban problems. The team will also seek to enlist all possible federal, state, and local, public and private, assistance available, to local municipal agencies and neighborhood groups in putting such plans into execution.

The coordinators will further seek to acquaint themselves with new problem solving approaches being tried in other states, (e.g., New Jersey's guaranteed income, New York's Vest Pocket Housing, etc.) to determine whether such programs offer promise for meeting some of Connecticut's needs.

In particular, the team will bring to bear on such problems the technical assistance available on DCA's own staff and the staffs of Departments represented on the Inter-Agency Committee, with a view to developing the full range of possibilities open to each Model Cities Agency in meeting its own local situation. The emphasis will be on developing ideas and programs which establish new directions or concepts on an experimental basis. The team will then communicate these possibilities to the municipalities and the Model Neighborhoods, and will assist them in translating such programs into action.

Economic Development Team

It is axiomatic that the standard of living of low-income urban residents cannot be raised unless they are allowed and encouraged to share in the total economic productivity of their community. The history of urban development, however, has shown that these programs adversely affect the economic destinies of the inhabitants.

It is not atypical to find that 40% of the businesses within a renewal area subsequently fail. This mortality rate reflects poor business practices that caused the operation to be marginal, personal service operations that were geared for a particular area, and in most cases these small business ventures had no direct relationship to the larger business community and therefore were strangers to the local Chamber of Commerce, lending institutions, etc.

For these reasons, it is necessary to employ all available governmental and private resources to provide imaginative Model Cities programming designed to save, support, and improve existing businesses and industries in Model Neighborhoods. In the same way, new businesses and industries must be created that are competitive and encompass new markets, new technology, and the assistance necessary to develop sound managerial skills and practices. Likewise, these new businesses will be influenced by Model Neighborhood residents and the City Demonstration Agency by virtue of their involvement in new manpower training and employment opportunities that must be developed.

To this end, the Model Cities staff will establish an Economic Development Team possessing extensive expertise in all matters relating to economic development.

It will be this team's responsibility to provide technical assistance to Model Neighborhood groups to enable them to develop a socio-economic barometer of the neighborhood and thereby to determine the number, size and kinds of business enterprises which may be required in the redevelopment neighborhood and those which have favorable prospects for success. The team will also assist the local group in surveying and consulting with existing business in order to establish which businesses ought to remain in the neighborhood, whether some should relocate, which will become redundant, which should shift to a different type of operation, which should expand, etc. Similarly, the number and kinds of new businesses which will

be needed must be established. When such determination has been made, the team will provide technical assistance to aid potential entrepreneurs through the problems of establishing, funding and organizing new enterprises consonant with the community's socio-economic plan. In the same way, the team will assist with the reorganizing, relocation, expansion or conversion process which existing businesses will have to undergo.

In addition to the full-time economic development person, who will be director of the team, personnel for this team will be co-opted on a part-time basis from the staff of DCA and other relevant state departments, some will be available from private enterprise, some can be enlisted from federal agencies, and when necessary, because of highly technical situations, consultants will be engaged.

DCA has already taken the legislative steps necessary to effectuate this proposed program. They fall into two categories. First, in 1967, the Connecticut Legislature established a state funding program for small business development centers (P. A. 524). Under this Act, the Connecticut Development Commission was empowered to make grants to an SBA defined small business development center or a municipally designated agency or organization approved by the CDC which "has as its function in whole or in part the developing of local entrepreneurship through rendering of consultive, technical, educational, and financial assistance".

The stated purpose of this Act was to establish and stimulate the growth of small business enterprises particularly as related to the low-income groups within the community. The 1969 Legislature has before it a DCA sponsored Bill (S.B.383), which proposes that the CDC's function be transferred to the Commissioner of DCA. It is anticipated that this Bill will be passed into law.

The second DCA sponsored Bill empowers municipally designated non-stock corporations, composed of neighborhood residents, to undertake programs for small

business development, inter alia (S.B.424).

These two bills tie in directly with existing programs administered by the federal Small Business Association. The Economic Opportunity Loans to Small Business Program (Title IV; 42 USC 2901-05); Loans to State and Local Development Companies Program (15 USC 661, 695 and 696); and the Procurement and Management Assistance to Small Businesses (78 Stat 526; Title IV; 42 USC 2901-07) all provide for financial and technical assistance to low-income persons, whether they be members of a corporation, community organization or acting independently, interested in becoming involved in private entrepreneurship. Further, there is the Department of Commerce administered Program (Public Works and Economic Development Program, 79 Stat. 552), which aims at developing private enterprises in economically distressed areas.

All these programs must be coordinated with the CDAP and Model Cities Programs to develop a comprehensive plan for redeveloping target areas. In this context, the Economic Development Team will seek to develop all possible ways in which the local Model Cities Program itself can be made to benefit local entrepreneurs, existing or potential. These might include funding neighborhood development corporations, giving preference to local developers, and according preference in bidding procedures to entrepreneurs based in the neighborhood and/or incorporating training procedures intended to upgrade local skills. The team will then work with local CDAs and Task Forces to implement such possibilities as fully as possible.

Discretionary Funds

As has already been noted, it is not possible to foresee all the program items which developing circumstances may render desirable, or even necessary, during the grant period. The final value of the demonstration which is proposed depends largely on the program being designed with enough flexibility to allow the staff to respond quickly and positively to unforeseen needs or newly emerging opportunities. Thus it is expected that there will be added during the grant period a number of new program

items beyond those which have been mentioned.

For this reason, the grant should provide for certain flexible funds which the Commissioner, at his discretion, could use for any Model Cities related function to enhance the success of Connecticut's Model Cities Program.

... and technical assistance to the local level...
... community organization...
... private and public...
... Economic Development...
... local Model Cities Program...
... giving preference to local developers...
... to entrepreneurs based in the neighborhood...
... intended to upgrade local skills...
... forces to implement such possibilities as fully as possible...
Discretionary Funds
... as has already been noted, it is not possible to foresee all the program items...
... which developing circumstances may render desirable, or even necessary, during the...
... grant period. The total value of the budget item which is proposed depends largely...
... on the program being designed with enough flexibility to allow the staff to respond...
... quickly and partially to unforeseen needs or newly emerging opportunities. It is...
... expected that there will be added during the grant period a number of new program

Administrative Procedures

The ability of the Department of Community Affairs to administer the federal Model Cities Grant Program and supervise the activities allowed therein would enable the Department to maximize utilization of resources and manpower now existing as part of the agency's over-all program. At the present time the 701 Urban Planning Assistance Program, 701 State Advisory Program, the Title VIII program and Title IX program as well as a number of other innovative type activities being funded through federal and state grants are housed under one administrative office within the Department's organizational structure. It is proposed that the Model Cities Grant Program be added to the office to assure not only coordinative activities but more importantly that the activities of the various programs are supportive to one another and will contribute largely to a comprehensive approach to community development in all of Connecticut's municipalities.

It is felt that the Model Cities Program and the expansion of technical assistance to municipalities on all total staff levels will afford the state the opportunity to provide advice, counsel, and resources to municipalities qualifying for such assistance on a specific problem solving level. The combining of these activities will, on the most part, provide the coordinated services in keeping with the philosophy of the Department of Community Affairs, that is an outreach and community-oriented program.

To demonstrate the practicality and feasibility of this effort it is estimated that we will require a considerable expansion of the present Model Cities Coordination Program staff. The current coordination study terminates on May 30, 1969. The four coordinators now functioning as a Model Cities Coordination Team would be retained and will become a part of the proposed ten person staff which is outlined as

follows:

Professional Positions

1 Director	15,530.	
5 Coordinators:		
1 Assistant Director	12,760	
4 Coordinators @11,960 ea	47,840.	
1 Economic Development Specialist	11,560.	
1 Communication Specialist	9,680.	
2 Municipal Services Coordinators II @10,380 ea	<u>20,760.</u>	
		118,130.

Clerical Staff

4 Stenographers and typists @5,040.ea		20,560.
---------------------------------------	--	---------

STAFF SALARIES

Administrative Staff

1 Accountant	7,500.	
1 Clerk and/or machine operator	<u>5,040.</u>	
Total Administrative Staff		12,540.

Salary Related Costs		<u>15,117.</u>
----------------------	--	----------------

TOTAL MODEL CITIES PROGRAM STAFF		166,347.
----------------------------------	--	----------

Staff Responsibilities

The administration of the new Model Cities Program will be assigned to the Department's Office of Supporting Programs for the reasons as explained above. The major responsibilities of the Director will be to supervise the functions of all members of the Model Cities staff. He will be directly responsible to the Commissioner in the latter's function as Coordinator for Model Cities and Chairman of the Governor's Inter-Agency Committee for Model Cities. He will establish such working relationships

with other divisions of the Department as are called for in the proposal, particularly the meshing of Model Cities and CDAP functions and coordinating District functions into the over-all Model Cities effort in Model Cities communities. For this purpose, he will participate in the regular meetings of the District Directors. He will negotiate with the CDAP Design and Review staff the policies and procedures which will most effectively assure that the two programs complement each other, and achieve maximum effectiveness. He will employ the talents of the Community Relations team in those ways which will best insure the greatest communication and the most response in support of Model Cities and other urban efforts. He will sit as chairman in all reviews of Model Cities programs in Connecticut.

The Coordinators will each have responsibility for liaison with all Model Cities functions in one of Connecticut's first and second round Model Cities programs, but will also have other responsibilities as well. They will be chosen for their broad-guage qualities and experience, enabling them to respond effectively in a wide variety of situations, but they should also possess real expertise in one or more of the following categories: interpersonal relations, community organization, municipal government, and federal and state urban programs.

The Coordinator named Assistant Director will supervise the work of all five Coordinators, to insure maximum effectiveness of the state's efforts, and to use the individual abilities and expertise of each coordinator wherever they may be called for in any of Connecticut's Model Cities programs. He may act on behalf of the Director in circumstances to be determined by the Director.

Each coordinator will be prepared to lend that help which he can most effectively offer as part of the total Model Cities Coordinating Team in whatever city the Director and/or Assistant Director may determine needs his aid. All coordinators will participate in all Model Cities reviews, with the coordinator assigned to the liaison function with

the city under review acting as principal interrogator of CDA procedures.

The Economic Development Specialist will be chosen for his demonstrated ability to foster new or struggling business or industrial enterprises, and for his organizational ability. He will assemble from DCA, from other Connecticut state and federal agencies, and from the private sector, the Economic Development Team, whose sole purpose will be to offer every needed assistance to Model Neighborhood entrepreneurs, existing or potential, who wish to start, develop or improve their own commercial or industrial enterprise. He will ensure that this team makes available all technical assistance needed by such ventures, and will formulate guidelines by which each Model Cities program can support them.

The Communications Specialist will be chosen for his expertise in developing an efficient flow of information between government agencies and with neighborhood people as well as municipal agencies, and for organizational abilities. He will develop procedures and mechanisms by which the Model Cities office in DCA can most efficiently transmit relevant information to other divisions of the Department and, in turn, receive such information from them. He will also develop similar mechanisms and procedures for communication with local Model Cities groups. He will develop the Model Cities Resource Library, and will organize whatever conferences or meetings the team may decide will be beneficial.

The Municipal Service Coordinators will be chosen for their knowledge of and experience in federal, state and local fiscal processes. It will be their responsibility to facilitate the flow of Model Cities funds into the local Model Cities programs and to administer state and federal discretionary funds available to the Model Cities Team. They will function only within policy defined by the Inter-agency Model Cities Committee and/or the Director, and will be directly responsible to the Director.

The four Clerical positions should include one person with some bookkeeping ability,

to assist the Financial Administrators, and one person with some knowlege of library science, to aid in the formation of the resource library. All should be proficient in the usual secretarial skills.

Space needs will include: one private office (for the Director) with adjacent secretarial space; office space for five coordinators, with some provisions for privacy, with one adjacent secretarial space, and with a small conference room nearby and available; sufficient office space for the Economic Development Specialist and the two Financial Administrators, with two adjacent secretarial spaces.

The total cost of equipment required to make the program operational totals \$16,840. This figure includes office space as well as transportation costs for the field operations segment of the program as well as a variety of furniture and equipment.

As described and for the reasons stated above, the discretionary fund is a necessary item to keep the program on an action oriented basis. It is requested that \$50,000 be allocated for this purpose.

Total Operating Funds Required

Based on the above projects, the estimated total funds required to make the program operational is a minimum of \$233,187.