

CONFIDENTIAL

Memorandum

November 2, 1966

To: Paul Ylvisaker
From: Stuart Chapin

This is to set down a few ideas for the TF agenda. Some of them spell out further the ideas I listed at the end of our meeting in Washington on October 28. The first proposal could be considered in the short-range category, whereas the other two fall mainly in the longer range category. They are in rough form and need "debugging," and I leave it to you to judge whether any of them have utility for the December 1 assignment.

1. A Program for Easing the Situation of Trapped Minority Groups. Let me first state what is quite obvious to most members of the TF, simply to underscore the urgency of finding solutions. Two statistics about Washington, D. C., dramatize the gravity of the situation and provide clear testimony of the necessity of action -- (1) the fact that approximately 65 percent of the population of the District are nonwhite, and (2) the fact that approximately 95 percent of the school children are nonwhite. Only Federal employment opportunities and constant work by concerned community service groups appear to be keeping this tinderbox from bursting into flame. Though the figures for other central cities have probably not yet reached these dramatic proportions, the indications are that similar buildups are in process in most large central cities.

Reports from studies of these areas are clear enough that those trapped see no relief in sight and that problems involving education, employment, housing, health and opportunities for upward mobility have reached a critical mass. As brought out in our session on October 28, a total program is urgently needed to bring this segment of the population into the Great Society. Assuming that very strong recommendations in this respect are presented to the President and become operative, I would urge inclusion in the total Administration package a new HUD program -- call it a "Program for Humanizing Metropolitan Areas" or a "Program for Urban Development," or some other positive-sounding substitute title for "urban renewal." Two features would distinguish it from earlier emphases: first, it would set up renewal and housing programs on a metropolitan-wide basis as the new Title II type of emphasis in the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act has achieved for other federal grant and loan programs, and second, it would expand on the "workable program" concept to require certain steps for humanizing metropolitan areas as a basis for qualifying for loan and grant assistance.

More particularly, under such a program current statutory provisions for the array of different grants-in-aid, loan, and rent supplement authorizations would be amended so that the eligible LPA's would be new-type Metropolitan

Area Development Commissions.^{1/} In addition to the jurisdictional change, the key feature of these new Commissions would be an entire new philosophy in the execution of the traditional renewal, public housing, rehabilitation housing, cooperative housing and middle income housing programs, and the new rent supplement program. While the Demonstration Cities Program would become the major central city program, it would be required to meet the workable-program-type criteria developed by the Metropolitan Area Development Commission.

Under the new philosophy an emphasis on "community enclaves" would be featured in contrast to the old massive area-wide clearance and redevelopment or rehabilitation emphasis. The essential objective of this new approach would be dual -- (1) it would seek to humanize the city environment by an across-the-boards effort for the improvement of facilities and services in these enclaves,^{2/} each sensitively attuned to the mosaic of living patterns in its environs, and (2) it would develop and utilize workable programs that would progressively put into effect voluntary open housing guarantees and introduce various services and improvements in all enclaves. Enclaves would be small in scale, sometimes one block in extent, sometimes two or three, and perhaps affecting no more than a dozen structures in a four or five block area. They would be identified on the basis of a wide range of criteria, including structural conditions in the area, housing vacancies, vacant land, type of existing land use, the proposed transportation and land uses in city plans, the pattern of community organizations in the area, social interaction characteristics in the area, and attitudes of residents about their neighborhood. The proposal for humanizing an enclave would vary with the characteristics, opportunities, and needs of each. Program emphases would probably differ in close-in areas from those in suburban areas. Experimentation in ways of securing community participation in enclave areas would be an important part of attaining responsible involvement of residents in such an effort.

The housing aspect of the program might involve public land acquisition of scattered properties a few at a time and the replacement of outworn structures with new ones; some might involve rehabilitation by private groups

^{1/} The title "Metropolitan Area Development Commission" is intended to convey emphasis on building and development functions, and might be consolidated with the metropolitan planning and programming functions that are emphasized under Title II of the 1966 Act. Whether it is politically feasible to phase out the present-day municipal programs in renewal and public housing, I would defer to others on the TF on this question, but under any circumstances, the new metropolitan emphasis, after allowing for a transition period, should receive the lion's share of loan and grant authorization.

^{2/} This would mean introducing some of the same coordinative mechanisms provided for under the Demonstration Cities Program into this Program.

or cooperatives and be planned variably, some with and some without rent supplements. The key concept in the development of plans for these enclaves would be voluntary open housing guarantees.^{3/} Enclaves in outlying suburban areas would be encouraged to receive small numbers of deprived families from the central city, and those in central areas would be designed to receive families of varying socio-economic circumstances seeking close-in locations. For success of such a Program a great deal depends on developing responsible participation by residents of enclave communities and in keeping the scale of adjustment at a low key.

To achieve the full leverage of a program of this kind, special related efforts in local services, education, employment, health, social work, and recreation would be developed, especially in the central city areas. By and large schools would be found in interstitial areas between enclaves and depended upon to help supply a cementing force to the efforts in surrounding enclaves. In short the Program for Humanizing Metropolitan Areas is based on a philosophy of responsible involvement of small groups in making their block or locale a "foster home" for a few new families. A backup effort in special education, employment and other services would be an essential feature of the Program. In effect, in the large metropolitan areas this Program in a metropolitan-wide framework would become a complement to the Demonstration Cities Program which centers on the central city problem.

2. A Stepped-Up Effort in Research on Inter-Group Relations and Livability in the City. The several recent crises in central cities of large metropolitan areas and the groping action efforts to alleviate these situations clearly indicate a failure in backup research. In some respects more serious, there is a lack of an evaluation effort on action taken which would enable conclusions to be drawn on the relative effectiveness of measures used.

In any effort to institute action programs in areas as sensitive as those of trapped populations, and certainly in any program to eliminate causes of these conditions, a major research thrust is required, one on the order of that which this country has mounted in space research or in medical research in recent years.

Certainly the social problems of today should be high in priority of attention. But in belatedly researching these problems, the big problems of tomorrow should not be overlooked. One problem rapidly descending on cities is that of adjustments to changed patterns of living which will come from shorter work week. There is a great deal of speculation on the boredom

^{3/} Obviously vigorous Administration leadership in amending the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 to eliminate Sec. 205(f) would be essential.

of urbanites and their social psychological problems of adjustment; there is speculation about two-house living arrangements becoming much more widespread with attendant changes in recreation emphases and traffic patterns; and there are all sorts of unknowns involved in new transportation and communications technologies. With all this interest and speculation, there is little systematic research going on that would enable cities to take account of these changes in the public works and service programs of a catching-up and remedial sort being launched today, much less enable them to embark on programs of a more positive kind designed for the Great Society.

A third research emphasis clearly needed is one which frontally examines the new kind of urban environment represented in the belts of urban development extending over several states. These appear to be superceding the metropolitan area as an urban environment (just at the time when metropolitan-wide approaches are receiving attention in Federal legislation for the first time to a significant extent). The qualitative aspects of living conditions in such regions of the kind noted above is one facet of this environment, but also involved is the whole area of governmental mechanisms for dealing with needs and problems in these belts.

Sec. 1011 on the Urban Environmental Studies of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 needs to be greatly broadened in concept to recognize these three areas of needed research.

3. The Wheaton Proposal for Metropolitan Area Fiscal Responsibility and Action. Although W. L. C. Wheaton's proposal is already in the public domain, it has not been widely circulated as yet. In any case, there are features of his concept of "Metropolitan Target Planning" which may have merit for consideration by the TF in the second stage of our work. Very briefly he proposes using Federal grant programs to achieve a more equitable distribution of fiscal responsibility among the municipalities of a metropolitan area, particularly in the areas of education and housing. I attach a copy of his paper.