

Before going on to governmental and social issues, an overview of the development values potentially attainable in new communities can be set forth:

Shorter work-to-home trips for a sizable portion of community residents, based on balanced community development on the appropriate location of economic activity.

Greater ease of internal movement, based on limited community size. Elimination of "sprawl" and continuous urbanization without interruption, achieved by a variety of development types and open space.

Better proximity to open space and accessibility to major recreational areas.

Improved visual environment.

Economies in land development and utilization.

Potential for a full variety of housing types and choices.

Reduced pressure for irrational rezoning and development patterns.

Opportunity to create rational service areas for local government.

Greater potential for fiscal viability based on balanced development patterns.

#### METROPOLITAN GOALS

It is sometimes argued that the present pattern of suburban squalor is advantageous to central cities, because the relative attractiveness of the central city as against new development is increased. The Macy's-Gimbel's type of competition implied in this argument is neither appropriate nor acceptable at this level of national interest. This attitude is limited, however, both in terms of its validity and supporters. It is simply not possible to settle for undesirable, unsuitable, and workable suburban development patterns any more than we can settle for slum conditions in central cities.

On the contrary, urgently needed now is a comprehensive metropolitan development system that can effectively relate all parts of the region to appropriate components of development, balancing interests of the central city with the new outlying developments. The system must be sound both technically and politically. Its creation is fundamental to responsible metropolitanism and absolutely necessary if suitable urban development is to be realized.

The beginnings of effective metropolitan development programs are now getting underway in a limited number of major metropolitan areas. Although metropolitan planning efforts carried out under section 701 and the metropolitan transportation planning process—mandatory under the Highway Act of 1962—frequently leave much to be desired, they provide a basis for extension and improvement. The participation and even commitment of local governments to coordinated metropolitan action in such fields as transportation, environmental health, and public safety justifies some optimism that overall metropolitan development and its potential role in a new communities program can be obtained.

A further issue in the relationship between central cities and new communities, identified earlier, is possible competition for Federal financial support among various urban programs. Two responses to this concern have been advanced.

First, a key to new communities development would be to effectively focus programs already available—even if on a limited basis—in metropolitan areas. These include open space and recreation programs; community facilities support; highway and rapid transit programs; urban and metropolitan planning assistance; water pollution, environmental health, and river basin development; Federal land and facilities policies; home mortgage insurance and credit policies; and airport development programs.

Second, any new Federal financial support keyed to specialized aspects of new community development—even apart from focusing already operating programs—must be directly related to need as well as effectiveness in accomplishing the full range of objectives at the local level. Vital existing programs must not be cut back to create new programs. As a matter of record this has not been the case. Rising need and increasing national financial ability to meet this need have produced growing public investment in urban development—a trend that can definitely be expected to continue.

#### GOVERNMENT AND SOCIAL ISSUES

Given a new communities policy as an appropriate response to urban growth problems, then issues of Government; public interests and finance; segregation and social balance can be analyzed in comparative terms—the effects of new com-