

munities in these matters as against typical metropolitan development patterns.

Within the overall issue of local government and public interest in new communities, a wide range of specific problems is involved. These include the following items:

(1) How to achieve short- and long-term fiscal stability for new communities within the constraints of suitable tax rates, high early costs, and initially "slim" tax base.

(2) How to provide adequate urban services including necessary utilities, schools, public safety, welfare and recreation services, given the local tax base.

(3) How to introduce a local government apparatus responsible for providing urban services and representing public interests in relation to private interests.

These questions are difficult—and thoughtful public administrators tell us that no final blanket answers as they relate to new communities are available. The key issue is the degree to which new communities inherently add to the present complexity of local government issues or simplify them in contrast to current patterns of outlying development. The full range of local government problems just listed are now applicable to typical suburban developments and new communities would not alter the nature or extent of these problems. Accordingly, this becomes a neutral issue with respect to a new-communities policy.

Social issues—segregation and diverse population characteristics—simply must be examined in terms of comparative effects of alternate development policies. I would emphasize that problems of segregation and social balance—although manifest in outlying and central city area development patterns—must be dealt with in the large context of programs aimed at eliminating poverty; narrowing income gaps; stimulating economic development; providing equal access to jobs based on equal educational opportunity; adjusting social attitudes; eliminating discrimination in housing; and broadening the reach and effectiveness of new housing programs oriented to low-income demand sectors.

The need for action within this broader framework, however, should not preclude the recognition of such specific issues related to metropolitan development patterns as:

(1) The ghettoization of low-income, minority groups within central city areas as a result of traditional patterns of job location; discrimination; and supply of dilapidated secondhand housing stock.

(2) Major impediments presently operate against suburbanization of these minority groups, despite the increasing potential for such a shift based on expansion of suitable jobs and growing incomes of minority group members.

(3) Major impediments notwithstanding, some factors are now operating to alter these patterns including specific housing programs with suburban location potential; nondiscriminatory requirements of law; and the efforts of fair-housing groups and others of good will.

It is unrealistic to expect that new communities are inherently capable of changing this pattern without energetic application in a variety of other programs. The following factors, however, could operate to help improve social balance under a new communities program:

Financial constraints on new community developers to maximum sales make it advantageous to reach the full range of housing types and markets. Balanced against these constraints, however, are the "classic" concerns, whether real or imagined, of prejudiced among suburban residents and possible loss of community acceptance as a result.

In comprehensive new community programs seeking a full range of economic activities, the need for diversified labor skills to meet requirements of varied enterprises creates another constraint for socially balanced population.

To the extent that Federal, State, and local government agencies in selected areas become involved in new community programs, realistic efforts for social balance could be promoted or, alternatively, required as a condition of involvement.

POSSIBLE APPROACH

Many proposals have been advanced for implementing new communities policy in metropolitan regions. Approaches include:

(1) Substantially independent private operations, with minimum Government involvement. Essentially this is a status quo approach. Further "encouragement," as appropriate, by use of Government powers to control and spend—including zoning, utilities and municipal services extension, highway and access development, open space acquisition—might also be involved.