

The Resident Looks at Community Values

PAUL N. YLVISAKER, Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Community Affairs

This session is not going to be an easy one in which to satisfy all the things that you would like to talk about, all the things the panelists would like to say, and all the things I would like to get to. The subject matter is infinite, the questions are infinite, and I thought it might not be a bad idea for me, in the introductory statement, to become a little bit more abstract, because we are going to have at least three people here who are going to bring the discussion down very quickly and very hard to the here and now.

We would not have conflicts of values having to do with transportation facilities if the following conditions applied: (a) if a transportation facility were built on open land that is otherwise unusable; (b) if that land were sold at half the price the public expects to pay and twice what the sellers expected to get; (c) if the facility extended between two points where everybody wants to go, at twice the former speed and half the former traffic; (d) if it is built by contractors who have no political involvement and by engineers who are trained as sociologists on budgets that provide for all the extras and the amenities and do not require tolls or taxes; and (e) finally, if it insures that both the incumbents and the opponents are going to win in the next election. Now, since these conditions do not always apply, we have been asked to attend this conference, and for some of us, to write some papers.

My assignment and my predisposition is to be on the side of the people in those situations where human values and transportation facilities collide. I will never forget the politician who, when asked what side he was on, always said, "When the vote comes, I'm on the side of the people." Now the question is, Which people? Whose values?

My answer begins with two values that all of us seem to hold, and with an ambivalence that all of us seem to feel. The first value is that of mobility. We all want to be free to go where we want, to come and go as we choose from anyplace and to anywhere. The second value is that of stability. We all want the assurance of knowing that our home is our castle and that our turf is secure. (By the way, I find that African Genesis explains more human behavior, including my own, than I care to admit.) Now the ambivalence lies between these values and, frankly, it lies within ourselves. If we are blind to that ambivalence within ourselves, we blame the other guy when the roads and trucks and tracks and runways are bulldozed through our homes and our neighborhoods. If we are more honest, we admit that, in this battle, we have met the enemy and "they is us," because it is our roads, our cars, and our convenience as well. If, indeed, we were dealing fairly and squarely with citizens of equal power, struggling equally with these two contending values, I for one would not have any problem at all accepting democracy's classic formulation, which is: Let the majority rule and every man fend for himself. But the circumstances and the times we live in are not that simple and the formulas are not that easy. Let us look at two of these conditions that suggest the danger and perhaps the disaster that follows from too simple-minded an application of majority rule. First, the urban poor. The power to fend for oneself is not equally distributed in our society. Worse than that, those citizens who have lesser power and lesser fortunes are concentrated where they are exposed more to the costs than to the benefits of transportation development.

Over the last half century, by mechanizing agriculture without industrializing housing, without rebuilding cities, and without modernizing our systems of social security and social services, we have herded the poor and the more dependent into the unstable environment of deteriorating urban ghettos and gray areas. More than half these migrants are too young to vote. Newark is 54 percent black; the median age of that population is 16. And probably, I would guess, up to 60 or 65 percent of that population is not eligible

to vote. They are too young to vote so they do not easily acquire their fair share of political power. Half the urban poor are in households that can never expect to become self-supporting. For the rest, jobs and skills are hard to come by, so they do not easily acquire their fair share of economic power. The tax jurisdictions they reside in are cut off from a fair share of public revenues. Religious, cultural, and educational institutions shrivel up or are transplanted elsewhere and, therefore, social and cultural equality are not going to be had. Finding a home, much less a castle, in this environment is difficult enough. Achieving stability, in the sense of security, has been all but impossible.

When, for understandable reasons, the rest of us—the nation's suburban majority—decide to improve transportation facilities into, outside, and within the city, it further displaces the already displaced; makes less secure those already insecure; further depletes the already depleted housing supply; further inflates the already inflated cost of shelter; further diminishes the already diminishing tax base; makes easier the exodus of those more fortunate who already have too easy an escape; further breaks up neighborhoods already disrupted; drives out businesses, the small shops and services that are already operating too close to the margin.

Having got the worst of the cost, these citizens also get the least of the benefits. Construction jobs do not go to the local unemployed. Contracts are beyond reach of the indigenous entrepreneurs. Bus routes are scheduled to other people's conveniences. Local parking is limited. Insurance is absent or too costly. And so it gets to be the other people's cars, for the most part, that use those highways; the other people who ride those new commuter cars; the other people who fly in and out of those new airports. Not only that, but, given the imminence of demolition and displacement, houses do not get repaired. Given the shortage of low-income housing, codes do not get enforced. Given the failure to enforce codes, there is a general cynicism all around. By the way, it is the responsibility of my department to inspect all multi-family dwellings in New Jersey, and I have felt the pull of that cynicism: not the funds to hire the necessary inspectors; not the enforcement machinery to make penalties stick; not the housing supply to rehouse those evicted. Given that cynicism, everybody turns to despair and a few, and perhaps more and more, turn to violence. This has been the reality of life among the urban poor. Transportation built to other peoples' advantage and specifications, their stability sacrificed to others' mobility, and their own immobility the cost that is paid for others achieving stability.

No small wonder, the hostility and the explosiveness that greet the announcement of yet another highway boring through this neighborhood of the old town. Particularly when the recurrent pattern is seen to have been designed with political and social malice aforethought: the road that became the dividing line between white and black, between rich and poor, or that device to extrude a growing electorate from town and, thus, ward off a shift in political power. This is the tragedy of this collision of systems—the system by which the poor are trying to achieve a modicum of stability while others already secure try to perfect their mobility each with its own logic and each with its own urgencies.

The tragedy is that it may not have been necessary. Certainly it need not have been so harsh if some of us had bothered to do a proper job of systems engineering. For we are dealing with systems, but we are dealing with them provincially and inadequately. There is an agricultural system, which we mechanized without taking thought of those who were going to be forced off the land. There is a migration system which we have let flow into areas that could not, and still cannot, healthily absorb that migration. And that migration has gone into another system, which is the economic death trap of the deteriorating central city.

If you do not believe it is a system, watch how the Robin Hoods of Boston ran a declining community for nearly a century as a system. The job that Ed Logue and others have had is to try to reshape that system from one of decline to one of growth. That system in turn is caught within a set of other systems: the decentralization of manufacturing toward open land and horizontal layout; a property tax system; a public revenue system that discriminates against low-income citizens (as a matter of fact, it discriminates against about every kind of citizen and it discriminates also against regional

development); a social system that builds prejudice into suburbia and a class barrier around the central city; a housing system that has resisted mass production and industrial techniques with the result that costs are rising and housing supply lags disastrously behind demand; and a social welfare and service system that puts the consumer at the mercy of the professional guilds, that bogs him down in bureaucracy and mires him even deeper in dependency.

Let me explain what I mean if it is not obvious. What we have done, really, is to change the nature of our society and the drift of our society from mass production, distribution, and consumption of material goods as the basis of planning our communities and cities. Now we are getting to what, I would call, is a service city. Where we are, or have to get to shortly, is to the mass production, distribution, and consumption of services—critically needed services. The housewife no longer wants to measure her poverty, or other living standard, in terms of how much money the breadwinner brings home. She wants to know what her access is to a market basket of critical services—doctors, schools, or whatever.

Frankly, the need to mass-produce services in our democracy is meeting up with an older system, a medieval system by which the suppliers supply these services. Guilds of doctors, guilds of lawyers, guilds of philanthropoids, and guilds of educators who operate on the presumption that they will determine the quality of the service, the conditions of its delivery, and the price of its delivery. The new system that we are running into, and is best expressed by the militants in the central city right now, is that these services must go into the modern era and the production and the supply of them must be on a mass basis. Also, we discover that the welfare system has its own guild and its own medieval practices. And again we are trying to break through that. The result of not being able to break through is this dependency that has been built deeper and deeper into the central city.

I sympathize with one person here who said that Altshuler was beating a dead horse. To a degree, I am beating a dead horse. We have already gone through the most critical of these 20 years... in which the migration was the most voluminous and was mostly tracked into the central city. Also, during this period of time, we broke into highway production at an unprecedented scale. Now we are at the point where, I understand from Commissioner Goldberg and others, most of our highway building will be in the outlying areas, not the central cities.

Also, if you have noticed, since the riots the Census Bureau is reporting that the migration into the central city is sharply diminishing. Blacks have heard about the riots and they just are not coming in. Average income of the male worker in the south is coming up toward parity and the net migration out of the TVA area is now nil. Also, black middle-income people are getting out of the city. In Newark, they are going up to East Orange and other places as fast as they can. The whites are pulling out and, ironically, we may finally get some expression on what Ray Vernon (The New York Regional Study) called for, or said was going to happen, which is areas of undersized housing in most of our central cities.

However, do not get too quickly optimistic. The natural rate of increase in the central cities is high. The dependency and social conditions of those who remain are aggravating. More and more kids in the central city are being raised without parents or with only a single parent. The percentage of those dependent probably is going to remain constant or increase despite the general drift toward affluence.

The interplay of the systems I have talked about is terribly complicated. Some of us sometimes wonder whether the complications have gone beyond the capacity of the best of us to understand or to manipulate. That doubt has produced a temptation in each of us, working within our individual systems, to try all the harder to achieve autonomy and unilateral control. But the growing spirit of the times for citizen participation and militant expression forces us to do our highway and social engineering out in the open.

As a bureaucrat responsible for increasing the housing supply in New Jersey, I feel that urge for autonomy. There are days when I begin to appreciate Bob Moses—days when I am set to tramp over everybody else's system, everybody else's jurisdiction, every bloody committee of jealous bureaucrats and complaining citizens that seems to

stand in the way of getting the houses built where they should, when they should. You may say, "Yes, that's familiar, we've known all that." The one thing I wanted to point out, using the urban poor and the urban core to illustrate, is the fact that as you come in with transportation you have, clearly, run into and run afoul of other systems, each with its own urgencies and its own logic.

Therefore, move toward the second condition that I would like to talk about, which I could title, "Is Anybody in Charge?" I have deliberately touched on the emotions, the hostility of two groups: the hostility of the urban core, who with good reason feel now after 20 or more years that they have been kicked around enough by what they call the system; and the anxiety shared by some of those citizens and technocrats alike, who have begun to sense that we are all being moved by a complex of forces that we cannot get hold of and that we have not mastered.

Transportation planning, the kind that brought in the higher critics and the higher, more sophisticated, techniques, began with the optimism of simple objectives. Witness that decision we all made in the 1950's; I will never forget the conference at Connecticut General when we decided to build a vast network of highways, and in the process we were going to work out the salvation of modern man. Similarly, the urban revolution of the early 1960's began ebulliently and with those same simple objectives—simple objectives that were to stop the bulldozer and take over control from the guys who were sending it in.

But now an uneasy feeling is growing that something more fundamental is wrong that neither the speed-up nor the slow-down of highway construction nor the strengthening nor the overthrow of established authority is likely to correct. I have seen that uneasiness in the faces of both the establishment and those who are attacking the established order.

If such apprehensions are right, we may be trying to work at a set of systems that will not or do not jibe. And even if they were maybe made to jibe, they will not work. That apprehension helps account for the restiveness of all our kids who, even when they are affluent, are carrying the rebel flags of the poor and others in revolt. It helps account for the question being asked in many places and among the Young Turks of the church, among the Young Turks on campus, and among the Young Turks of business: whether a society bent on material gain and made, perhaps, too mobile for its own good is fast losing its soul in the name of progress. It also helps account for so many who are cutting out from the governmental process. Their instinct tells them that government cannot do it even if it tried and, in most places, it is not even trying. It also helps account for the consternation of the most advanced systems engineers and social scientists, who have tried matching their techniques against the complexities and come away with their hopes and their lances broken.

Pat Moynihan, before he accepted his new job, went down with Dave Reisman to be the brain trust for Eugene McCarthy, as I recall. They had spent all day arguing about what program McCarthy ought to have and when they held their press conference they told the press: "Forget it, things have become too complicated, and the intellectual doesn't have all that much to say." Well, it does not keep the intellectual from going to Washington, but it does introduce a bit of modesty! It helps account for the self-doubting even among revolutionaries who have discovered now how to blow the system but cannot really figure out how to put it together to work differently or at all.

There are a lot of other complexities that I could talk about and they will emerge in the discussions here that follow. They all have to do with values—values that are not easily priced on the market; values that are not measured by desire lines in the most sophisticated computations, or weighted in elections. These are, for example, natural beauty, privacy, the balance of nature and the rest, none of which I have talked about. Though, if you like, I can talk about jet ports and swamps and meadows and natural preserves. I can talk about my son's concern as to why, when our civilization of bulldozers comes along, nature takes such a beating. But that is more familiar ground. We cannot forever pause, either with some of these complexities or some of these self-doubts. So I would like to try a few guidelines out on you, and a few rules and probably a few recommendations to see whether they make any kind of sense.

First, certainly we have to strengthen our capacity both to relate to larger complex systems and simultaneously to relate to the individual and to small groups. Unless national policy and local experience coincide, something is wrong. Unless we can make aggregate policy come together with individual experience, something is basically wrong. We have to move, I think, from an emphasis on technical planning within specific functions to coordinate planning among functions.

Let me put a few particulars to you. We did, during the 1950's under the massive appropriations and amounts of money that were released, begin creating sophisticated studies within the province of transportation. I have a feeling, after 10 or 12 or 15 years of such studies, that we have reached the point of diminishing returns from investment in that kind of technical planning. (Interestingly enough, the most beautiful people in that business can be put down with two martinis and a fireplace and they will philosophically conclude that maybe it is not in a description of how things do operate but in the will of the men who say how things should operate that the real answer lies.)

I would agree, therefore, that there is now greater need for, and more to be gained from, analysis that aids the nation's legislatures and chief executives in determining the proper mix and allocation of resources among specific functions and competing demands, especially between housing and transportation.

Housing, which I am responsible for in New Jersey, is a "pick-up-the-pieces-after-everybody-else-has-had-their-chance" kind of operation. We have not socialized housing as we have socialized transportation; therefore, we have to wait on the spontaneous operations of the market. We do not feed capital into it with a perseverance that is found in transportation. As a result, the flow of capital into housing is disastrously erratic. We have not ensured that all people can live in houses, as we have ensured that everybody can ride on freeways. A house has to be purchased by some very clumsy instruments.

Not only that, but relocation gets to be the after-game, the deceptive manipulation of numbers with even the honest administrators caught in such a housing shortage that they cannot possibly add up as many decent accommodations as there are displaced families to be rehoused. We cannot play this numbers game any more—calculating houses where there are none. Nor can we keep assuming that central cities, even when refurbished, will absorb all the urban poor. Not even black nationalism will accomplish that. The densities that the black mother requires for good living are not the densities of high-rise public housing, and land is short. What she really wants, despite what the militants are saying, is a single-family house to raise her kid in so that there can be two walls and probably a stretch of lawn between herself and her neighbor's arguments. Even the densities that the militants are willing to take in their rehousing are going to extrude part of their own population, which they would like to keep for voting purposes. And if one adds the highways and the rest, it is going to be impossible, really, to rehouse present densities in those areas.

Central cities are, therefore, caught. They cannot afford to say they cannot meet state and federal relocation requirements—if they did, they would not get urban renewal, highway, and other monies. So they say they can, even when they cannot—and the urban poor suffer the consequences. Frankly, I would like to see the relocation costs and the responsibility for rehousing placed within transportation. The cost of a highway should be the cost, not just of displacement grants, but also of supplying housing in alternative sites for those who are displaced by the condemnation powers of the Highway Department. We, in the housing business, have a heck of a time obtaining these condemnation or acquisition powers. The result is that we cannot get the land, and, what is really worse, even if we could, we come along after the highway or the transportation facility has been built.

I would also like to see transportation not only involved but probably responsible for the development of national policy of new towns or major large-scale developments. There is no question but that we have to house the net growth of our population on open land. The business of trying to do it in the central cities is almost impossible. It is too long, it is too costly, and the land just is not there. Furthermore, the trap of the central city is that, by continuously housing a heavily dependent population, it sinks even deeper into economic depression and bitterness tending toward revolution. You

have such utter dependency that the kids who grow up inside it are going to have to be beat by the time they are born. We are going to have to break out of the iron noose around the central city, and allow the diffusion of this captive population and their rehousing on open land. But the problem is not limited to the poor. The rest of us are also involved. The cost of housing now has reached the point where half the population cannot afford to buy or rent a new housing unit built by the conventional method. To achieve economics in building, we will have to turn to industrialized housing, and that in turn can be achieved only when we have assembled a market of sufficient scale—obviously on open land, which means the building of new towns. And that in turn will force us to confront the values those new towns will have to express if they are to be places people will want to live in.

Generalizing these national goals and policy is going to test all our capacities. Recently, a group of state people went down, at the invitation of the federal government, and talked with members of the cabinet and their aids. The exchange was a very interesting one. I had the feeling, and it was a sinking feeling, that officialdom has not yet developed the capacity to handle the complexities inherent in developing a national urban policy and sorting through the values implicit in all our categorical urban programs. I noticed that Model Cities—almost as a straw—was being grasped for as national urban policy. But Model Cities is not in itself a policy; it requires one. By itself, it is a program and quickly becoming just another categorical program.

What we need is, at the level of the National Security Council, to take on the problems of mobility nationally, of housing nationally, of community building and migration and settlement patterns as more than fragments. And within that to do some extraordinary things.

One innovation that I think we need is income maintenance. It is a radical solution produced by conservatives—Barry Goldwater and Milton Friedman—and yet it makes sense. I challenge anyone to lick the problems of the central city without income maintenance. If you were to employ all the hard-core black unemployed in this country you would only add 1 or 2 percent to the black income in this country. If you were to hire and train all those in the metropolitan area eligible for employment but unemployed, you would be dealing with only 15 percent of the urban poor. About 85 percent of the metropolitan poor are poor because they are too young to work, mothers who should not work, or people who are too old to work. And then there is another great bunch—about 34 percent of the urban poor—who are working full time and living stable family lives who just do not bring home a paycheck that is enough to bring them above the poverty line. Until the urban poor have enough disposable income to move freely into the market for their essential goods and services, we bureaucrats are going to keep stumbling into inadequate programs, clumsy mechanisms, and citizen complaints that will stymie us absolutely.

Another "radical" suggestion: I think it is about time we re-examine and maybe cut back the regional planning that we have developed in the form of technical operations around this country. It has grown larger than its accomplishments; and now we have saddled it with another dubious job—grant review under Section 204. Regional planning has been doing little more than to confirm the trends of majority welfare of a suburban variety. The ten categories of grants that are put through the process of metropolitan review under Section 204 do not include housing and urban renewal. And I challenge you to take a look at the metropolitan plans developing, with the best of technical competence; they only confirm the isolating and prejudicial patterns of suburbanized America. The zoning game cannot go on much longer. We in New Jersey this year are going to try to call an end to that game, and will place before the legislature a proposed revision of land-use regulation. We will ask that no master plan be valid unless it makes provision for housing and employment and clearly does not discriminate.

Finally, let us be honest. What we have gained most from black protest is a mirror held up to our own inadequacies. That is protest at its best. At its worst, they too are humans, playing a political game, a game of self-advantage. But at its best they are really saying, "We have watched for 20 years while you people with all the funding and

technical knowledge have made a mess of the communities in which we live." And then they add, "We might escape from the mess of the central city only to find that in the next stage of 20 years you're going into other areas and make a mess of them." This may be an overstatement, but it puts the needle to us and holds the mirror up to us.

It would be honesty at this point to say, "I am not sure we are so right that we can continue massively with transportation." In Newark, recently, New Jersey's state officials, under some pressure, stopped Route 75 until the housing supply of Newark is adequate and can absorb the displacement that highway would produce. I am not sure that we have not reached a point in our eastern seaboard civilization where some "stop planning" may also not be in order. Any of us with public jobs to do and pressures to get them done will boggle at the thought of a slowdown. Still, after listening to the voices of those who have paid the cost of other people's benefits, there is a part of me that is ready to have long talks about other people's values before concretizing my own.

Panel Discussion

Mattie Humphrey

As a resident looking at community values, I have attempted to just forget about transportation and try to share what is my sense of community. The things that Paul Ylvisaker has said refer explicitly to transportation and if I look at transportation as simply one issue in a whole spectrum that I, as a resident, have to deal with, then I would not talk about it as transportation but as one issue among many issues. Growing up as black, as female, within the American context, one has to either become completely insane or begin to get some concentric relationship to the values that are acceptable.

Those values of the so-called larger community that are directly in conflict with the basic things I need as a human being become, to me, extraneous, unnecessary, and optional. This is why I have difficulty when someone says that the goal should be reconciliation. I belong to one community where there is a strong aspiration just to achieve some basic, minimum creature kinds of necessities. At the same time I observe other communities where the aspirations are toward, I would say, greed and idolatry. What I feel, as a resident, is that there must be a balancing in terms of our goal for the public good. Then we apply the particular goals to what we can perceive as separately aspiring communities.

When people have been compressed in terms of not being able to have choices in housing, which means that they are stabilized geographically without options, and those very same people do not have optional transportation systems, the intensity of the need to relieve that overall life situation is much more critical than somebody trying to get access to a drive-in theater. I do not think that these weights are equal. I think one represents a cumulative denial of the basic human necessities—of air to breathe and space to occupy. The other represents a constantly reinforced greed or idolatry of bodily kinds of things—entertainment, money, all those external things that do not in the end fulfill the human being.

The community in which I live has been fighting an expressway for about five years. We did not see the need for a highway because it separated my community from the high school by a six-lane thing and it interfered with five feeder patterns of elementary schools. But everything that we said to the city council was interpreted as militant or protest and as having nothing to do with the logistics of our transportation. We, on the other hand, felt that we were being frustrated in our mobility rather than aided. It must be recognized that many values are related to the invisible, intangible realities of our lives.

I am supposed to accept the notion that there are some values which I ought to have—until I begin to question the nature of those values as they relate to me. We, as the technical bureaucrats or politicians or whoever, have to face up to the fact that we have been selling something that does not exist: we have been selling it legislatively; we have been selling it locally; we have been selling it religiously, socially, internationally, and at home. We have been selling American values. And I am suggesting that, in effect, values to Americans run the whole spectrum from good to evil, and they are being highly subsidized out of the tax dollar. Which means that I feel, as a taxpayer, the middle class is oversubsidized. We talk about welfare and subsidies that poor people get. Yet, when you look at how that money is spent, I would say that 95 percent of it goes into the salaries of middle-class technical and professional people. So, the whole question of subsidization should be looked at in terms of what are our values as a nation? Is it that we want an increasingly smaller number of people to get increasingly larger shares of whatever we produce? Or, is it that we want to begin to find some balance to human life and have all of us move toward it?

The basic way I understand competition is that one person is at point X trying to move away from point X, and the other person is being moved toward point X. We ought to find a common point X that we would all want to move toward. This would mean that we are not dealing with one pole or the other, but are dealing with what our comprehensive life is as a nation. We should begin to reapproach a balanced human existence rather than simply motivate people toward affluence, material abundance, etc. As a resident of a particular community, I am willing and ready to settle for some basic human values recognizing that, as an oppressed person, I am entitled to considerably more.

Ernest J. Milano

I represent an association in Albany formed about three years ago to improve our neighborhood. About the first of February last year, the State of New York issued a feasibility study, in the form of a brochure that has very attractive drawings... to construct an arterial across the heart of Albany. [Editor's note: This arterial had also been shown in the City of Albany's comprehensive downtown plan of 1962.] This arterial would take 350 parcels of property; it would displace roughly 740 families;... and it would displace roughly 40 brownstone buildings in our neighborhood alone.... Our principal objections to this plan come mainly from the elderly and from women.

We comprise an area that is unique. It is brownstone, centrally located around the park, has easy access to shopping, to medical services, to employment. When people are forced to relocate from areas like this, regardless of the financial consideration involved, it is very difficult, especially among the elderly. Most of them fear that they will be forced to go to the suburbs, which are not designed for pedestrian-type activities. There is also the financial fear of the income property owners and businessmen who are going to be losing their buildings and be unable to get suitable replacements.

We also fear the creeping decay that will come into the area as a result of the arterial. One of the purposes of this arterial is to bring cars to a complex of office buildings being built now by the State of New York. It is estimated that 14,000 additional employees will be working there upon completion of the project. Without adequate facilities for parking even now, ... you can easily see that we expect the cars to creep out of the area and, in general, make for low-quality type ventures like parking lots, quick-lunch taverns, and so on. We feel that it will be a very short time before a slum will overtake our neighborhood.

Another factor is what we call the commotion syndrome—the fear of massive construction for two or three years. When a road was being built about 40 years ago, I can recall groups of Italian workmen working with small granite blocks, working from 8:00 to 5:00 and then going home. Now it takes bulldozers, cranes, trucks, shovels, pile-drivers, hoards of workmen all flooding into the area, each one of them with a car, noisy and dusty in dry weather, sloppy and muddy in wet weather and, in general, life is made intolerable. We feel that life is just too short to bear this when it is unnecessary. We will be unable to get our cars near our homes when we go shopping, and we feel that should be a privilege of the city dweller as well as the suburbanite.

Another matter of equal importance is the loss of tax space. We estimated that there will be \$3 million removed from the assessment roles of the City of Albany. We think it cannot afford this. It needs this money to provide services for the people that remain in the city.

We suggest that there are other forms of transit. We should like to get away from the one-man, one-car concept and have people get back into buses, perhaps with peripheral parking facilities at strategic points and funneled in with fast shuttles. We would like to see this city revert back to what it was before the exodus to the suburb—a pleasant place to work, to live, to raise a family—and not just a place for suburbanites to come in the morning and leave at night. Perhaps, if we make it attractive enough, we could even lure some of the suburbanites back and this could logically solve many of the other problems besetting this and other cities.

And then in the matter of self-interest, many times we are accused of self-interest or selfishness. We would like to point out that it is certainly self-interest to want to live in a community that you have become accustomed to, to look on the street and see a friend that you have seen for many years, and to know that he will remain there. And it is an understandable reaction. As a matter of fact, everything is a matter of self-interest. How about the self-interest of the road planners and the road builders whose very existence depends on a constant flow of road projects? That is professional self-interest at that. We would like to see a little more emphasis placed on the argument, rightfully or not, of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Daniel Schloss

About three years ago I decided to give up my lumber business and lease the parcel of property on which it was standing. I found that prospective tenants would not pay me a fair value for the property because the city papers had already indicated that this parcel would be in the pathway of an east-west expressway and, therefore, I could not give them a long lease.

Every time I bought a piece of property I have found, at a later date, that it was in the pathway of something that needed it. But being in the pathway has not helped me a bit. I still have not sold the first piece of land.

The method in which the government acquires property is most unfair. I have owned a piece of property for 15 or 20 years that I have improved. I first got notice, in about 1966, that it was going to be condemned and that the property was going to be taken for a housing development.

I own a home where I had 100 acres of land purchased 13 or 14 years ago. I retained one parcel of land for myself and sold the rest to a builder for \$4,000 an acre. That land is now worth \$10,000 an acre only because the state has decided to put a beltway in close proximity to it.

The movement of people is an extremely difficult problem. I have lost some tenants because they could not plan their improvements. Since nobody knows when the ax will fall, I have found it extremely difficult to get proper tenants. It is a sword that is always hanging over your head and makes everybody who owns a piece of property, or anybody who is a tenant, simply afraid to make a move.

If you wish to help these people who are having these problems, you should set aside land before you take away land. You should establish rent policies if you are going to complete substitute buildings for them and they should know that, when the time comes that they will lose their particular building or their tenancy, they have land to go to.

Discussion

Paul Ylvisaker

You have now got the measure of us. I have tried to understand and reform the system. There are two here who are trying to beat it. And one who decided if he could not lick it he would join it. So we have variety here. I would prefer that we now spend the rest of the time for questions.

Ali F. Sevin

I would like to address my question to Mr. Ylvisaker. You started talking about the different systems—systems of housing or systems of economic postures. When you got into the urban transportation planning process, you said that perhaps we should move away from the technologically or technically oriented processes. I would like to suggest that the state of the art in urban transportation planning is the best systems analysis tool yet devised to deal with human behavior rather than physical systems behavior such as space vehicles and what have you. So I detected a sort of ambivalence, shall we say, in your statement. I thought you were going toward more system-wide approaches, more systems techniques. Then you rejected what, in my opinion, is the best systems approach to transportation. Could you elaborate on that?

Paul Ylvisaker

Well, there is something of an ambivalence, because I do not want to be completely destructive on the present technology. I have watched this technology now for 15 years. I have had to help support it, help understand it, probably help work with it and, now, tried to extract from it something of use. I am not extracting much of use, as a net product, from much of the technical work that is going out, except an elaboration and a redescription of past trends and conditions that we cannot live with anymore. On net, I think that another kind of planning system is what is emerging in the rough and the ready. And I do not say we now go back from the mind to the stomach or the gut reaction. But there is a wholeness of response that comes through the very hearing processes that we are going through. Advocacy planning and this kind of work has a real role to play and I have come to respect the political process. I really think that the state of the art, as I have seen it in its matrix, still has not included many of the items with the weightings that have to be included. And when you finally push the machine and out comes the answer, it is not providing us with the things that we need to keep this society together. As a matter of fact, I have found sometimes that there is a bit of Gresham's Law applying to the present technical work. The cheap drives out the dear.

Gene E. Willeke

I would like to ask Miss Humphrey what her response is to Mr. Milano's presentation here. Any aspect of it that you would like.

Mattie Humphrey

To the extent that he has a family himself—as a human being with some kind of integrity that speaks to a sense of community which he holds very dear and which grows out of a particular context—to that extent I identify with him. He is on the trail of developing a sense of community. I feel that I am a part of a community that already realized its separate existence as a community completely outside of the value systems of the decision-making community, which is to say, opposed in many fundamental ways to the present apparatus. So I take no issue with him except that I hope he continues to grow. If what you are doing here reverses the experience I have had as a citizen trying to evolve in a community, then he may never feel the way I do. But I cannot identify with his position.

Ernest Milano

I think that essentially some of my aims and views on this are the same, except that Miss Humphrey's are much more acute. Mine are not vital to me. I can be moved. I can be pushed around a little bit and it will not destroy me completely. But I do not think you can do this to Miss Humphrey.

Mattie Humphrey

Right. He still has options, and I am in a survival struggle.

Lewis Hill

As Miss Humphrey concluded, she said she was ready to settle for basic human values. I would like to know what those are.

Mattie Humphrey

Well, a certain amount of air with a certain amount of oxygen in it. And already the automobile, you know, mitigates against that. A certain amount of opportunity to harmonize my aspirations, my intellect and my physical being. This get frustrating when I am given imperatives about an American way of life that negates me as a physical entity and represses me as a member of a particular group and then makes my aspirations something completely outside my realm. If I want justice and kinship and love in my community, this is frustrated in the American context because I am told these aspirations have to follow something else called order.

Andrew Euston

I thought that your point, Mr. Ylvisaker, about the need for compensation for other than those within the alignment, is the critical point of a conference like this, and certainly in the context of the three witnesses you have for impact. I know a lot of people here are concerned about it. It is my concern, too, that what we are talking about is

a problem for which none of the federal agencies have answers at the moment. We are talking about an order of compensation and an order of new programs that do not exist now. We cannot deal with this problem in terms of joint development funding, which the Department of Transportation is legally permitted to exercise. We cannot deal with it in terms of their concepts of compensation, even though they are better than the Department of Housing and Urban Development's compensation provisions. We need to have an order of problem-solving that takes into account interim use of land on a very sophisticated basis, that provides businessmen and home-owners with mortgage guarantees and funding for home improvement even while the threat of decision-making goes on. We have to have programs that provide for upgrading the sense of a community, that it is getting better even while construction is about to happen or is going on. I think that your point is the central one and no one here can really address the theme of this conference without talking about the new legislation that is needed. I wonder if you could address that question.

Paul Ylvisaker

The new legislation has to go much broader than the games we have so far structured for bureaucrats to play. It certainly has to be, I think, a clear statement about where we are going to build all this housing. It has to be outside the central cities if you are going to go into mass basis. First, I would like to see a new town policy that is really a new town policy and not a subordinate paragraph in some major legislation. Second, it is not just a matter of legislation, it is also a matter of funding. The funding levels this year, as "Fortune" magazine points out, are ridiculously below where we will have to be. Third, we are dealing with an apparatus. In New Jersey, one of the more progressive states, we have not changed our land-use legislation. We do not allow what New York does, which is site acquisition. There is no such thing as a declaration of a housing emergency area where one can work over other jurisdictions than just the limited one of the central city.

I know that Secretary Romney right now is anxious to move model cities from the neighborhood to the total city area. We all voted for model cities, much against our own minor bureaucrats because we wanted that perspective even though Secretary Romney was not offering a larger budget to go with it. I just do not see how you can handle one neighborhood without working in a larger part of the city. But model cities would still stop at the city boundary and, within that framework, you are not going to solve it.

This is why I go to income maintenance programs. I have a basic skepticism that the public bureaucracies are ever going to get structured so that they can deliver as effectively and as fast as a citizen on his own. Here I complete the circle, starting as a New Deal-Keynesian liberal and go all the way around to a touch of Adam Smith—that a free dollar in the hands of the consumer means an awful lot. And, frankly, if we could get all of Mattie Humphrey's people up to where they have a decent income, freely disposable in their own hands, then they can go in the market.

I have listened to the two other gentlemen here and I like them, but I do not bleed for them. I have a feeling that, within the accidents of a major system operating as it must by democracy's majority rule, they can make their way. There are going to be some real pains, hardships, and things done that we regret. But, basically, we have to get our citizenry to the point of free choice—and universally—so that if this administration does no more than to listen to Pat Moynihan and he gets up there and says, "Let's make this one an income maintenance jump," then, change the social security system and that is it. I think we will have done a great deal to alleviate your problems and all the other bureaucratic restrictions.

First Workshop Reports

Conference participants were divided into six workshop groups. The first workshop session was devoted to value identification, measurement and trade-offs, and the legal and social constraints relating to the development of transportation facilities.

The workshops developed tentative lists of transportation-associated values, lists of interest groups that might be important in considering community values, and possible methods that might be employed in measuring values, and suggested legislative modifications that might be desirable for more effective and equitable implementation of transportation plans. The workshop groups further provided some theoretical frameworks in which community values could be determined and some working definitions of concepts related to valuation.

Only brief extracts of the workshop chairmen's reports are presented here. The bulk of their reports either has been summarized in Part I of this volume or has served as a working basis for subsequent discussions and workshop proceedings.

Allan Feldt

Values may be vaguely said to reflect the needs and interests of various groups and to be relatively stable over time. Different values are possessed by different groups and different values occur at different levels of group identity and organization. That is, conceivably the same person may hold different and even possibly conflicting values with reference to several groups he may belong to. . . .

In our workshop, we drew up a tentative list of 20 values. Another workshop has a list of 25 or more. There appears to be some similarity between the lists. I will simply go over the list of what interests seem to operate as values in the micro-communities on the level of the neighborhood and possibly on the level of the individual within the neighborhood. This list was broken down into those values which probably were most critical to two different classes of population—one essentially white and middle-class and the other comprising any significant minority, such as the black community within our society.

The first set of values consists of those that appear to be very important to the black community and other minority groups within the society. These are (1) a sense of community, (2) personal identity, and (3) territoriality and local boundaries. By the sense of community is implied the ability to recognize persons living near you as being fellow residents with whom you are mutually dependent for facing the larger society and whose resources you can use in a group fashion to improve your life chances and cope with problems such as, for instance, a freeway proposal.

The sense of community has apparently been neglected in much work in planning urban renewal, and so forth, and is probably the single most important development of the current struggle for black rights in our society. The sense of black community, for example, is a very strong element. We also agreed that there are other kinds of communities that exist in society that tend to be more relevant for middle-class whites—communities based on common professions, common church groups, and so forth. These usually do not arise in any particular locality within a city and therefore we decided to ignore them since they would usually not be reflected in a freeway development situation.

Linked to the sense of community are the related questions of personal identity and territoriality. Personal identity embodies the ability to recognize one's worth as an individual human being and the ability to relate oneself as an individual to the larger

society in a meaningful and personally satisfying fashion. Territoriality refers to the value attached to the recognition and proprietorship over some portion of urban space that may be readily identified as belonging to some individual or small group of persons. In this regard, the importance attached to local neighborhoods and the pride of home ownership and family efforts at home improvement are often overlooked in relocation efforts. Many studies have clearly documented a surprising attachment to particular spaces within the urban area regardless of their more obvious physical and economic properties.

Another value of particular importance in a black community is control over their own destinies—some ability to exercise influence over how decisions are made and who makes the decisions. This can go all the way down toward old ward political machines most currently reflected in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville School decentralization issues—the desire and necessity to exercise control over the local neighborhood.

Also of great importance to working-class and black communities and underprivileged groups is accessibility to employment, either localized or within the larger society. Accessibility to employment is especially important to these groups because they do not have excess money to spend on additional travel costs.

Finally, a value of particular importance to the black community is that of stability and the security of an area. Too often the most significant incursions of the larger society upon a local black community appear to come in a totally uncontrollable and destructive fashion in terms of slum clearance, urban renewal, and highway development projects. Some ability to understand, anticipate, and perhaps divert such developments in order to provide a stronger sense of local security seems of great importance to localized black communities.

Important values shared by both the black community and the white middle-class community include, of course, the basic environmental elements: reasonable levels of purity for air and water, relative lack of congestion, and a suppressed noise level. There are a whole range of values of this type. Both of these societies would be especially concerned with protection against financial loss or the possibility of financial gain in their home investments or in any local businesses.

That completes the list of seven or eight values crucial to the black community. Only two of these, I must point out, are also likely to be of equivalent concern to the white community.

Other values important to the white community include general accessibility to the city—general mobility. The accessibility needs of the middle class are seen to be different from those of the lower class. This group is concerned with being able to get out into the city with some ease for a general range of purposes; employment is not the crucial element.

The middle class responds to the problem of historical preservation and to architectural factors within their area, whereas there is a relatively low response by working-class groups. Questions of child safety—whether the streets are busy, whether the sidewalks are protected, whether the area is safe for kids to play in—are very important to the middle class and they would react strongly against changes in levels of safety.

The middle class responds to whether or not the area is homogeneous or heterogeneous. Which way they respond, however, is not as clear as might be thought at first. Not all middle-class persons want homogeneous areas. Finally, many members of the middle class attach considerable importance to questions of social status. A high value is attached to having a "good address".

There are five additional values held by both groups which did not seem to be generally as important at this particular moment in time. One is the ability to become involved in local activities, in government affairs, and so forth. Another is the question of the quality of the neighbors; whether they are friendly or unfriendly, either alternative possibly being desirable. The availability of localized facilities within the neighborhood—parks, shopping, schools, churches, and so forth—was considered important but not crucial except by the working class. The capacity of the area to provide adult socialization—societal integration—was another perceived value. Also, the functional compatibility and efficiency of different kinds of elements within an area is generally of value, although not critical.

In conclusion, I must point out that our group tended to agree that virtually all of these values are held to some extent by both white and black communities. The important consideration is rather the extent to which one group or another places greater importance upon one set of values as opposed to some other set.

Joseph Schofer

A variety of communities, defined not only in a spatial sense, but considering socio-economic characteristics and roles, have to be considered in decision-making. It was a consensus of the workshop that pretty much the same set of basic values ought to be considered at all levels, although their relative importance might change as the level shifts.

Our group concentrated specifically on transportation-associated values relating to things like mobility, opportunity, and variety. We came up with two categories of values: those associated specifically with transportation systems and those associated with the environment, the neighborhood and the community. We recognized that there would be trade-offs—the primary ones taking place between these two sets of values, if we have categorized them in a reasonable fashion. In addition, trade-offs would occur within each set.

Under the category of transportation-related or transportation-associated values are included accessibility (Is it possible to get from A to B?); travel time (How long does it take to get from A to B?); reliability (What is the probability of completing a trip as expected?); convenience (How convenient is the alternative transportation system for a trip from A to B?); choice of location (Does the transportation system provide a choice of things like residence, employment, and industrial locations?); comfort; safety (What are the probabilities and consequences of various kinds of accidents and, also, what is being done to ensure freedom from criminal assault?); cleanliness (Can clean air be associated specifically with the transportation system?); absence of noise and absence of vibration; beauty; diversity (Is there a choice of mode for a particular trip?); flexibility (What are the costs of changing from operating policy A to operating policy B?); understandability of the transportation system (Is the transportation system designed in such a way that the user is able to visualize it and easily use it?); reallocation of resources (If transportation systems are going to have effects on the reallocation of resources, is not this something that ought to be considered as a primary value in transportation decision-making?); mental and physical health; and costs such as capital cost, maintenance cost, and operating cost.

Values associated with the general characteristics of the environment in the community are even more highly overlapping than the previous list and include protection of property investments, preservation of social stability in the community, preservation or enhancement of the cohesion of the community, convenience of access and activities, avoidance of commotion and preservation of personal privacy, institutional preservation, preservation of community services, preservation and enhancement of community safety, avoidance of disruption of emotional involvements with home, neighborhood, and community facilities, avoidance of a feeling of uncertainty (particularly in relation to concerns about proposed projects and houses that are going to be built and where and when they are going to be built), maintenance of the feeling of personal and group security, maintenance of feelings of status, the absence of noise, the absence of vibration, beauty and aesthetics, egalitarianism, preservation of social choice, provision of adequate shelter, and provision of employment.

We focused for some time on our ability to measure some of these values and the degree to which proposed systems are conforming with these values. There was some general feeling among us that measurement problems were perhaps not as difficult as we might have felt before we came to this meeting. The problem that is going to be most complex is that of trade-offs and resolution of value conflicts. Although it may be possible to measure the relationship between proposed transportation modifications,

predicting how a new system will affect a set of values is going to be much more difficult, particularly where we have to measure values and relationships between systems and values in subjective ways through use of attitude surveys.

We also drew up a list of interest groups that might be important in considering community value impacts. We were concerned with the contingency of values on the definition of community and these groups represent a set of alternative ways of defining community. In another sense, this might be called a set of roles that ought to be considered in transportation planning.

These groups include users; non-users; ethnic groups; social groups; central city dwellers; suburbanites; drivers; non-drivers; owners of cars; non-owners; displaced entities such as individuals, families, industries, commercial organizations, institutions, and others; black people; white people; the propinquists, a new word coined in our session meaning those people who are near facilities although perhaps not dislocated by them; politicians; planners; transportation engineers; special interests such as the oil industry, construction industry, the rail people, the transit people, manufacturers and suppliers, the aged, the young, the infirm, the poor, the rich, the deprived, the tourists; insurance companies; people with different levels of education; people with different levels of family status; industries in general (not necessarily those that are dislocated by a facility); commercial organizations in general; investors (perhaps we mean speculators); institutions such as schools and churches; political parties; home owners; renters; apartment dwellers; single-family dwelling unit dwellers; the automobile club; the customer of commerce; and a group that we called simply opinion leaders.

S. M. Breuning

During the first workshop our group addressed the four topics given. We decided that rather than develop long lists, it would be more useful to define value categories and to identify priorities of them. We were more concerned with delineating the breadth of the problem than with exhaustive detail.

First, we considered community values in the transportation planning process: (a) representation and participation in the decision process, (b) the sense of community, (c) equity of mobility to all, (d) provision of opportunity, (e) conservation of resources (financial, human and natural), (f) flexibility and adaptability of the transportation system, (g) alternatives available now, and (h) changes over time.

Next we talked about measurement of values. People have many values, some of which conflict. We listed the kinds of things that one should try to resolve in a transportation study: (a) do not try to make policy; (b) create alternative new facilities or new operating strategies; (c) provide information services regarding transportation; (d) suggest controls if you cannot do anything else; (e) protect certain interest groups that are otherwise not adequately considered; (f) determine non-market factors involved in the transportation process; (g) try to predict human behavior.

What is the role of values in the design process? We identified the feedback and iteration process between the client and design agent. We recognize that the two can take a variety of forms depending on the client being served. Then we discussed the use of values in transportation decisions. We identified design analysis and we looked at the hierarchy of goals that underlies the decision process. What role can transportation play in satisfying the needs of urban life? How can we physically or politically satisfy these transportation goals with a specific system? With some structure for the analysis, one should eventually be able to put the measurements and the definition of the trade-offs in context.

What research is needed to measure values better? We put everybody's pet project on a list and tried to get some sense of the breadth of the problem. We need research into adaptive planning. How does one really relate planning to the community? We have had striking examples of how this can be done. How can one predict professional

and human biases? What role do market factors play in transportation? What impact does transportation have on specific areas like the central business district? How does it affect personal values of the individual? More specifically, what is the value of relocation? What role does mobility play in providing human satisfaction?

Allan Jacobs

We started out trying to define what we meant by community. We decided that communities could be defined by interest, of course, and by geographic areas. Both descriptions or definitions would always be operative. We started from the geographic description, but are fully aware that within and without such areas there would be any number of communities that might be defined by their interests as well. Regarding values, we came up with a working definition that might take on more importance when dealing with the question of measurement: A value is something that an individual or a group holds to be important or cares about. These values would be identified and perhaps measured in a process. They would be measured and identified via human interaction. And since these values might change over time or intensify or decrease, the interaction becomes all-important and the interaction has to be continuing.

In terms of measurement, we talked of course about such things as attitudinal surveys, but the sense I got was that the more direct interaction in identifying and measuring values—call it confrontation, call it participation, or call it simply working in communities or "doing your thing"—was the better approach. These were the items or the phrases mentioned most often in a dynamic process of measuring values.

The transportation facility, especially a freeway, it was observed, would quite often be viewed as an intruder. This might be so indeed with a rapid transit facility as well. Anything like a highway that starts from a larger or broader community is likely to be perceived as an intruder in the smaller community. This almost automatically sets up the need for compensation in the smaller community.

We spoke briefly in this regard of the problem of "What does the facility or project do to me?" and "What does it do for me?" It is usually in that order that the perception occurs, at least to the primarily non-user. In most cases this will often imply something negative and if so, and if that is all it does, then the community will respond negatively. The "for me" may be something positive or it could be neutral. If what the facility does for me is greater than what it does to me then perhaps I would be for it. But just the sequence within which the "to" or "for" is perceived is critical, and may indeed imply something as to strategies, tactics and working with people toward the achievement of any kind of a facility.

In the second half of our session, we spent more time on the city than at the state or national level. Values at the city level seem to be the political value of a veto or home-rule, and this was held to be of considerable importance. For the central city, its centrality or its economic base is of high value. Other values, such as identity, character, and accessibility, were noted. These seem to all come down to two basics. First is to provide for community values to be achieved; i. e., it was the value of the city to provide for community values, or to cater to the values of its members. Second is survival. Another method suggested was to categorize corporate values, standards of services, self-identity or image, and ability to deliver. We did not get too far with that. The group seemed to be a lot less firm when it came to identifying state or national values related to transportation or land development. Accessibility for accessibility's sake was questioned. State growth was raised and questioned as a value. And jobs and construction were mentioned and questioned as values.

A conclusion related to user and non-user benefits and possible trade-offs seemed to be that the users of major highways, if they wanted the facilities, would increasingly have to pay the social costs of those facilities—the social costs of public enterprise, if you will. This might increasingly be the trade-off; if one wants a facility, one will have to pay for or cater to a lot of community values related to that facility.

Kenneth Shiatte

Our definition of a value is an attitude, a concept that we hold dear. Out of this attitude come goals or objectives that we can then relate to the physical development of proposals. We tended to feel that we had to treat values in categories. We listed five categories: (a) mobility, dealing specifically with the transportation aspects themselves; (b) stability, the desire not to disturb or fragment the neighborhood; (c) the environmental aspects, the desire to minimize noise, air pollution, and other things detrimental to our living environment; (d) economic aspects from the community standpoint; and finally (e) quality. There was one value item that ran across all categories. It is the value of self-determination, not only from the community standpoint but also from the individual.

Our charge was consideration of legal constraints. Joint development has really brought out the need for having new legislation—on the state, county, or city level. More may be required at the federal level. It is not good having the authority to spend capital if we do not have proper funds made available for total involvement in the development of the plan and design of the capital projects.

We also need more permissive legislation to foster the nonprofit or public involvement in development and redevelopment of areas.

And finally, we want to ensure that we have a legal basis or authority to go back and develop or redevelop the air rights and subterranean rights on existing facilities.

Our next area of concern was administrative constraints. There is a fragmentation of responsibility among many agencies. How can we achieve a balanced transportation system when we have one agency responsible for transit, another responsible for highways? There is a narrow interpretation of regulations or policy guidelines. There is a lack of coordination between agencies. There is a real need for decision-making at appropriate levels.

We must have provision for public involvement. Some neighborhoods are organized, particularly in the instance of model cities, and have channels of communication. We must be sure that the citizen-at-large has a like chance.

There is an inconsistency of arrangements for administering programs. These vary all over the ball park. One example is the ability of a state to administer highway funds from the federal government although, in an allied area of mass transit, the city or county can go directly to the federal government.

If we are going to get into more flexible project development, we must eliminate the present dedication of funding. This builds in imbalances in programs.

The difficulty of evaluating the relative merits of transportation in relation to other public endeavors is another problem. Here, we have to get into the proportioning of total community resources based on community values. The satisfaction of all community values can go well beyond the available resources. Where do we limit the resources in relation to a particular project? And, how do we get around the problem of losses to one community, short-term or even long-term, to the benefit of a neighboring community? There must be some type of regional accounting of benefits and debits so that one community is not asked to give up everything for the benefit of the rest of the region. How far can we bend a project out of the way of certain inviolate types of neighborhood buildings or other values? We have no answer but we certainly must develop some criteria so that we do not lose project effectiveness in terms of traffic safety and service. Finally to be considered is the constraint of understanding the true implications of the project by the citizen or the community. This also holds true for the planner and engineer so that we can correctly interpret community values.

Thomas H. Roberts

The group felt that, especially at the metropolitan scale, there is a need for an articulation of metropolitan awareness, or what Father Howes called metropolitan morality. And, indeed, this might in itself be either a value or certainly have an effect on the perception of values.

We discussed different ways to approach the trade-off value questions once they are identified. First, we identified the one obvious way: Once you have a list, assign weights and strike a balance on paper, which someone in the group called the numbers game. I think the group generally felt that the better way was to identify and describe the various specific proposals and their impact as fully as possible and then to rely on the political arena of the citizens and their leaders to assign their own values and to trade them off within this process—the political process.

We tried to identify the constraints that might restrict solutions and it was quite clear that the major constraint at the metropolitan scale is the lack of a metropolitan decision process. There was a good bit of discussion about ways to overcome this. An obvious way was to set up some form of regional or metropolitan government. Where it is not available or where it does not exist, there was no consensus at all as to whether it would be desirable to try to get a metropolitan government. State government obviously is the next highest level embracing the metropolitan problem, or an interstate compact in those situations. Voluntary metropolitan councils of government were certainly no substitute for a hierarchical power mechanism. It was agreed that this kind of a loose cooperative metropolitan approach, which has been fairly common, does not work at all or works least if it is largely a technical or a professional effort; it must have serious and constant political involvement and commitment. And, even then, it is going to have some limitations—political turnover, jurisdictional rivalries, least common denominator type decisions, and so on.

In some cases metropolitan government may provide a metropolitan forum for value trade-offs through political bargaining among jurisdictions, and in order to have a bargain struck, you must have something I want and I must have something you want and we have to be willing to trade. This can be a housing problem in one area, a transportation problem in another area, solid waste sites that this area needs and that you have, and so on. It was felt that the federal government's role as a carrot and stick could certainly encourage this kind of metropolitan trade-off or bargaining process as, for example, in the potential funding of Section 205 of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966. There are other precedents that you know about—the bonus for two governments jointly developing a common solution to waste treatment plants, and so on. But whatever the mechanism was, the useful staff function is to feed information and organized analysis of metropolitan needs and options to the decision-makers in this metropolitan area.

We were then asked to examine the impact of metropolitan problems on local problems of transportation and community values. It was suggested by one that here we should look first at the three relationships of transportation and land use: namely, that transportation serves land uses; transportation is in itself a land use; and transportation shapes land use. This kind of relationship should be used more at the metropolitan area because of the leverage transportation has to shape the region. And in that way it would shape and affect local values, along with other strategic shapers like major utility systems. One impact of metropolitan problems on local values is that metropolitan problems affect the component jurisdictions differentially so that every jurisdiction is going to view these things at its own level and from its own jurisdictional viewpoint. And that is why some kind of metropolitan trade-off mechanism is needed.

There was considerable feeling that the timing of metropolitan transportation facilities has an important impact at the local level. That is, it is not only what you do, it is when you do and in what order you do it—whether you put a freeway in place early or late and before or after a residential settlement. The general feeling was that, while long-range planning should be broad and very tentative, allowing for later changes in the situation whether technological or social, short-range planning should be specific and should move rapidly into execution once it is established. What we are trying to avoid here is the old situation where you have a downtown link of a freeway that has been planned for years as a part of a freeway net but it gets built last and you have an agonizing 10 years—situations change, attitudes change, and you run into a deadlock. Therefore, long-range planning at the metropolitan level should be broad and tentative; short-range planning should be quick and positive. If it is not done quickly it may not be done at all or the whole thing may have to be re-examined.