

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Ernie Bonner Collection

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

9-1-1973

First Draft of Volume I of Cleveland Policy Plan Report

unknown

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_bonner



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

unknown, "First Draft of Volume I of Cleveland Policy Plan Report" (1973). *Ernie Bonner Collection*. 112.
https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_bonner/112

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ernie Bonner Collection by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

FIRST DRAFT OF
VOLUME I

OF Cleveland Policy Plan Report
~~Policy Planning Document~~

probably completed in Sept. 1973 — just
before I left.

(Compare to final published document)

INTRODUCTION

A Role for the Planning Commission

Important decisions are made by Cleveland entrepreneurs, political leaders and residents each day. Some are public, some are private. Some are reached only after searching inquiry, others are reached quickly by necessity or design. Some are decisions to act, some are decisions not to act, some are even decisions not to decide. Some are made in the offices of the Mayor or City Council, some are made in the living rooms of local residents or at suburban cocktail parties. Others are made in Columbus or Washington, D. C. a few at even more remote places. Many are decisions without choice. The outcome of these many decisions is the future of the City of Cleveland.

The Cleveland City Planning Commission, by charter authority as well as tradition, is responsible for providing information, constructive criticism and advice to those who make decisions -- in particular those decisions which affect the short- and long-run interests of the residents of the City of Cleveland. The Commission

takes upon itself a special role with respect to that audience of decision-makers. The information, constructive criticism, and advice we offer will be informed by a vision we have for the City of Cleveland and its people. This vision is not utopian. It points in a direction the City can choose and can follow, a direction that distinguishes among desirable and undesirable actions taken yesterday and today, and to be taken tomorrow.

A Goal of the Planning Commission

Our vision (in outline) is as follows:

- Individuals choose their own goals and means to pursue those goals.
- Institutions are established to serve individuals in their pursuit of their own goals. In the process institutions, themselves, establish goals -- some of which must be self-serving to assure their survival.
- Institutional goals which are self-serving, however, must be clearly secondary to those which further the pursuit of individual goals.
- Both individuals and institutions pursue their respective goals through decision and action. Decisions to act must be made from among those choices of action which the individual or institution perceives.
- Individuals are better off with more choices in any decision.
- Institutions serve individual goals most when they provide wider choices in decisions made by individuals.

--- The primary goal of institutions must be to provide wider choices to individuals through institutional decisions and actions.

--- In a context of limited resources, institutions should give first and priority attention to the task of promoting wider choices for those individuals and groups who have few, if any choices.

In short, the advice, information and counsel which is offered in the following pages is primarily directed toward the accomplishment of this single, simply-stated goal:

Simple equity requires that locally-responsible government institutions -- with limited powers and resources -- should give first and priority attention to the goal of promoting wider choices (more alternatives and opportunities) for those individuals and groups in the City of Cleveland who have few, if any choices.

Four important points should be made about this goal. First the goal is not to provide what, in our or others' opinion, people need. The goal is to provide as wide a range of alternatives as is possible, leaving the decision as to what individuals or families need to each of them, not us. This is an important distinction. To assert that

families need a particular kind of "standard" housing, that children need a certain kind and number of recreational facilities, that some groups need a feeling of community, is to disregard the rich variety of needs and wants inherent in any collection of individuals. To then use this misleading conception of standard needs in designing standards for public (or private) offers of goods and services is to standardize individuals themselves.

Second, pursuit of this goal is pursuit of a more equitable society, not a more efficient political or economic system. This does not mean that policies serving the goal of equity cannot also serve the ends of efficiency, only that the goal of equity is primary. The Commission recognizes the need to allocate the city's limited public resources as efficiently as possible, and the value in collecting revenues in the same effective way. But the basic rationale for achieving efficient collection and expenditure of public funds remains:

To assure maximum resources for the promotion of a more equitable society.

Third, the focus on institutions recognizes the important -- in fact, crucial-role that the legal, political and social institutions devised by man play in creating the conditions which plague the Commission's every-day decisions. Tom Johnson was perfectly correct. Profound and necessary changes will not come about through righteous rhetoric or good deeds by unselfish men. In many, if not all, cases, these changes will be accomplished only by selective and informed changes in the laws, customs, and practices of our institutions.

Fourth, it establishes a set of priorities which pervades all our efforts in analysis, design, recommendation and implementation. In so few cases has this been evident in other goal statements. In few ways has anything been more helpful, in discriminating between what the Commission favors and what it does not, in what the staff pursues and what it does not, in what is important and what is not.

Finally, the Commission's emphasis on promoting choices for those who have few, places us in a clear advocate position on be-

half of those less favored by present conditions. It is obvious that the less favored are neither the more powerful nor in many cases the more numerous of this City, region or country. The Commission does not, therefore, expect to carry the day for those interests in every case. Neither does the Commission, by its advocacy on behalf of the less favored, intend to ignore or otherwise demean the interests of more favored individuals or groups. Rather, the Commission and its staff will constantly strive to sharpen and clarify the often opposing interests of the more or less favored in line with its view that truly professional practice deserves no less and that this service to the relevant executive, legislative or judicial tribunals is our fundamental duty to the citizenry we ultimately serve.

The Goal Justified -- by Tradition, Reason and Necessity

Justification for the goal of a more equitable society must, in the end, rest on the moral commitment of the Commission itself. But this body of seven citizens does not stand alone with its vision. It stands with that long tradition established by philosophical,

religious and political leaders of man. The goal of a more equitable society is not a new one. It only affirms what has been advocated consistently throughout recorded history -- that equity in the social, political and economic relationships among men is a requisite condition to a just and lasting society.

Religious and philosophical writings set the tone centuries before the birth of the United States.

Plato's remarks on "The Perfect City" written over 300 years before the birth of Christ, included the following:

"We have, it seems, discovered other things, which our guardians must by all means watch against, that they may nowise escape their notice and steal into the city.

What kinds of things are these?

Riches, said I, and poverty."

Clement of Alexandria, a voice of the early Greek Church, notes that:

"It is absurd and disgraceful for one to live magnificently and luxuriously when so many are hungry."

Jesus of Nazareth was a clear advocate of the poor and outcast, promising an ideal society which involved "...the abolition of rank

and the extinction of those badges of rank in which inequality was incrustated."* But Jesus did not rely solely upon moral grounds for his justification of equity among all:

"...think ye that building shall endure, which shelters the noble and crushes the poor"?

Political leaders of this country have promoted an equitable society because of the dangers to a democratic political union they see in obvious and pervasive inequality.

Thomas Jefferson, whose contribution to the basic documents of this nation was matched by no other single man, is known to reflect:

"...that an equal division of property is impracticable, but (because of) the consequences of enormous inequality producing so much misery to the bulk of mankind, legislators cannot invent too many devices for subdividing property..."**

Daniel Webster, in an address celebrating the 200th anniversary of the landing at Plymouth Rock noted that:

"Our ancestors began their system of government here under a condition of comparative equality in regard to wealth, and their early views were of a nature to favor and continue this equality..."

*Walter Rauschebusch, American theologian, 1861 - 1918.

**Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Reverend James Madison, President of William and Mary, First Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia, October 28, 1785.

"...The freest government would not be long acceptable, if the tendency of the law were to create a rapid accumulation of property in few hands, and to render the great mass of the population poor and dependent."

James Madison, one of the authors of the Federalist Papers, argued that:

"...the most common and durable source of...instability, injustice and confusion...has been the various and unequal distribution of property..."*

Andrew Jackson, in the summer of the election year of 1832, vetoed a bill renewing the National Bank Charter. His veto message included the following comments:

"Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions...but when the laws undertake to add to natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of our society -- the farmers, mechanics and laborers -- who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves have a right to complain of the injustice of their government. **

Theodore Roosevelt championed the cause of equity in his presidential campaign in 1912:

"In every wise struggle for human betterment one of the main objects and often the only object, has been to achieve a large measure equality of opportunity.

...the conflict between the men who possess more than they have earned and the men who have earned

*James Madison, "The Union a Check on Faction", Federalist Paper No. 10, New York Daily Advertiser, November 22, 1787.

**"Andrew Jackson's Bank Veto Message", Washington, D. C., July 10, 1832.

more than they possess is the central condition of progress...the essence of the struggle is to equalize opportunity, destroy privilege, and give to the life of every individual the highest possible value both to himself and to the commonwealth."*

In the same Presidential campaign of 1912, Woodrow Wilson offered similar comments:

"...the laws of this country do not prevent the strong from crushing the weak.

There has come over the land that un-American set of conditions which enables a small number of men who control the government to get favors from the government; by those favors to exclude their fellows from equal opportunity."**

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in this third inauguration address, noted that:

"There is nothing mysterious about the foundation of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are:

Equality of Opportunity.
Jobs for those who can work.
Security for those who need it.
The ending of special privilege for the few.
The preservation of civil liberties for all.
...The inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations."

President Lyndon B. Johnson said it most succinctly a few days before his death when he noted the basic inequity between individuals

*Theodore Roosevelt, New Nationalism, a collection of speeches which comprised his platform in 1912.

**Woodrow Wilson, The New Freedom, 1913.

today:

"One's on the hill, one's in the holler.
One's on the road, one's in the ditch."

A common theme runs through the comments of all these men, over all that time:

Great inequities in wealth and power are inconsistent with a just and enduring society.

Furthermore, each saw the important cause of inequity in the manmade laws and institutions of our political and economic system, not with some natural failing of individuals. Their solutions were unfailingly to changes in those laws and institutions rather than palliatives to those who were adversely affected. Tom Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland from 1901 to 1909, carried on an unflinching campaign against "Privilege" and his comments on the proper strategy for change are instructive:

"...There was a certain river and many human beings were in it, struggling to get to the shore. Some succeeded, some were pulled ashore by kind-hearted people on the banks. But many were carried down the stream and drowned. It is no doubt a wise thing, it is noble that under those conditions charitable people devote themselves to helping the victims out of the water. But...it would be better if some of those kindly people on the shore engaged in rescue work, would go up the stream and find out who was pushing the people into it.

It is in this way that I would answer those who ask us to help the poor. Let us help them, that they may at the last fight the battle (against) Privilege with more strength and courage; but let us never lose sight of our mission up the river to see who is pushing the people in."

Tom L. Johnson
Mayor, Cleveland, 1901-1909

To seek a more equitable society, to guard against great social, economic and political inequalities, is not a new path, then, for the Planning Commission to chart. This direction has been a guiding light through the ages for many of our greatest leaders and statesmen and the rationale for this course has been clear to them -- the lasting health of our democratic political and economic institutions.

But a more equitable society serves more than the interests of a democratic society at large. It is the kind of just society that free, equal and rational men would agree to in their own individual self-interest.* In short, a less inequitable society can be justified by reason.

Suppose a group of individuals gather together to determine the principles under which they will enter into association. These

*The arguments following are in some instances direct quotes, in other instances paraphrases from John Rawls, A Theory of Justice, Harvard University Press, 1971.

principles will guide all future development of the laws and institutions of their association. Suppose, further, that they are equal in the sense that they have no knowledge of the ways in which they might design the basic principles for their mutual association in such a way as to favor themselves as individuals.

"...no one knows his place in society, his class position or social status, nor does anyone know his fortune in the distribution of natural assets and abilities, his intelligence, strength and the like."

In other words, the conditions under which they will agree to basic principles are fair.

It can then be cogently argued that the persons so situated would rationally agree to two basic principles:

1. a just society would guarantee an equal right to basic liberties for all individuals.
2. a just society would permit social and economic inequalities only to the extent that they materially improve the lot of those least advantaged and when these inequalities are attached to positions and offices open to all. In short, "...the distribution of income and wealth need not be equal but it should be to everyone's advantage, and positions of authority and offices of command must be accessible to all."

This set of principles would be the result of their joint design because it would be rational for each of them to insure a society where -- in the event they became the least favored members -- their

position would not be seriously inequitable and that the social and economic inequalities that existed would be in their benefit. In devotion to their own interest, they would individually choose to associate with others only insofar as that association did not hold out the possibility that others would benefit inordinately, and at their expense.

In summary, attempts to achieve a more equitable society are justified by both tradition and reason. The City Planning Commission, inspired by the great leaders and documents of our nation and swayed by reasonable arguments as well, thus sets forth the basic goal toward which its decisions and concern will point:

In a context of limited resources and pervasive inequities, first and priority attention should be given to the task of promoting wider choices (more opportunities, more alternatives) for those individuals and groups who have few, if any, choices.

The Design of Policies to Serve that Goal

It is one thing to harbor a comprehensive and fundamental goal directed toward the achievement of a more equitable society and quite

another thing to design policies related to that goal for guidance in the day-to-day decisions required from the Planning Commission. The bridge between a broad goal and the policies which the Commission holds as guides to achieve that goal is an important step. Policies must be developed which are consistent with achievement of the goal while directed to important decisions which the Commission is obligated to make.

From the necessarily broad and general goal must come some more specific directions as a first step. Both the design and evaluation of policy will require this. Further the Commission accepts the broadest responsibility, consistent with its charter authority, but recognizes that the development of policy in some areas must await attention to areas of highest priority. These two conditions set the stage for the following development and specification of objectives in the priority areas of housing, transportation, community development and poverty.

Housing -- Approximately ____% of all Cleveland housing units are substandard. Thousands of these units are vacant and vandalized --

a continuing eyesore and threat to the health and safety of neighboring residents. More units are reaching this ultimate stage in their deterioration every day.

This critical condition of housing in the City is understandable given the choices that confront residents and owners. Lower income households cannot choose to reside in minimally-standard housing -- if at all -- except at great sacrifice to other necessary items in their budgets. Owners can choose to offer standard housing at rents few, if any, lower-income households can afford or they can choose to offer sub-standard housing at rents most lower-income households can afford.

Both owners and resident households commonly come to a joint decision reflecting the only choice they have. Lower-income households agree to pay less rent for sub-standard housing which landlords and owners agree to supply. This lack of choice and the decisions made as a result, set in motion the process of deterioration which leads to substantial abandonment in those areas of the City where lower-income households must choose to live.

At the root of residential deterioration and abandonment is poverty -- the inability of a large and growing segment of Cleveland's households to spend an amount for housing which is adequate to maintain a dwelling unit in standard condition. Therefore, the primary objective of the Planning Commission in the area of housing follows logically:

To assure City residents -- particularly the lower-
income residents -- the opportunity for residence in
a decent home; i.e., to close the gap between the
amount low- and moderate-income households can afford
to pay for housing and the amount which is required
to create and maintain standard housing.

In achieving this objective, an important secondary objective should be served. The City of Cleveland does not have a "shortage" of housing, only a shortage of standard housing units. The decline in households has exceeded the decline in housing units for the last decade in many areas. Furthermore, over 90% of the existing housing stock of the City is now standard or in need of only minor repairs.

This substantial stock of housing units is at once an opportunity and a threat. If measures are taken now to preserve what is standard and improve to standard that which is in need of only minor repairs, an ample supply of standard housing for the projected population of the City will be assured. If these measures are not taken or taken half-heartedly, many of these units will be beyond repair or rehabilitation -- eventual candidates for abandonment and demolition. A secondary, though complementary, objective thus follows:

To maintain the quality of those dwelling units in the City which are now standard, and to return those to standard which are not seriously sub-standard.

Transportation -- In the last three decades, the mobility of the population in general has increased dramatically. Residents of the Cleveland metropolitan area are not only buying more cars (automobile ownership is increasing faster than population), they are using their cars more intensively. Along with the increased ownership and use of the car by private citizens has come an increased investment in highways and roads by public bodies -- particularly the construction

over the last decade and a half of the interstate highway system.

In truth, this society has opted in fundamental and pervasive ways for a civilization on wheels.

But the benefits of this increased mobility do not fall equally on all. Fully 35% (78,000 households) of all households in the City of Cleveland do not own a car. These households suffer twice from the effects of increased mobility for the majority. First, the mobility of the population in general has stimulated a rapid decentralization of households and activities throughout the metropolitan area -- assuring that those without the mobility of a car will be ever farther from work, shopping and recreation activities of the region. Second, this dispersal without the region has undermined in important ways the financial and operating abilities of public transportation systems -- making trips to work, shopping and recreation more difficult and costly for those who must rely on this system.

Thus, the household without an automobile has truly been the unconscious victim of our emphasis on the automobile and the mobility

that engenders on the majority of the population. These households are clearly without choice. Trips must be made by public transportation or not at all. And trips which can be made by public transportation will have to be longer and more costly. The City Planning Commission poses as its primary objective in the area of transportation:

To enhance the mobility of those residents who cannot
drive or cannot afford the use of an automobile or
do not have regular access to a car.

The City of Cleveland has also been a victim of the decision to opt for a automotive civilization. The construction of the interstate highway system has imposed both direct and indirect costs upon the City.

Indirectly, the City suffers the loss of economic and tax base through the shifts in location of households and firms as a result of the increased mobility offered by the highway system. Most of those households and firms do not go far -- usually to a suburban location in the county. But their removal from the income and

property tax rolls of the City has been significant over the last decade.

Construction of the highway system also imposes direct costs on the City and its resident households and firms. First, the City must pay a portion of the cost of the highway. Second, roadway acquisition and construction will displace structures and people. This direct loss in the City's population and tax base can be significant. Existing interstate highways displaced an estimated 19,000 persons. A recent highway proposal threatened to cost the City over \$10 million as its share of the project cost, was planned to displace almost 1,000 housing units and over 100 non-residential structures, with a subsequent loss in City tax revenues of some \$400,000 annually.

Thus, improving the mobility of the population at large is often costly to the City. The City Planning Commission poses as a secondary objective in the area of transportation:

To improve the mobility of the population in general through the construction of auto-user facilities, but

under the condition that no transportation improvement leave the City or its residents in worse condition than prior to the improvement.

Community Development -- In some areas of the City large blocs of vacant land lay waiting for development which cannot proceed profitably without substantial public investment and subsidy. In other areas, pockets of vacant land and scattered vacant structures pre-
sage eventual deterioration to these conditions of the worst areas. In these same areas, violations of minimum legal codes protecting the health and safety of residents (condemned structures, rat infestation and littered vacant lots) are numerous, and responsibility for correction of these violations is avoided.

Maintaining private property at standards set by legal codes to protect health and safety is, by law, the responsibility of the property owner. Under existing conditions in those areas, faithful discharge of that responsibility is not rational -- it will assure costs to owners that cannot be recovered from the use of the property. In short, property in some areas of the City is no longer

an asset, it is a liability.

Experience dictates that improvement and maintenance of private property in these areas of the City to minimum legal standards of health and safety will be largely the responsibility of the City or it will not be done. As a consequence, attaining minimum legal standards of health and safety throughout the City -- a task with both legal and moral justification -- will be an important and necessary drain on City resources.

The Planning Commission, in response to these conditions, has no choice but to establish as its primary objective:

To assure the improvement to, or the maintenance of, minimum legal standards of health and safety throughout the City; and to assure that those who are legally responsible for maintaining these conditions do so, in tact.

To accomplish this objective is clearly consistent with the goal established at the outset. Those city residents who must live in areas where even minimum legal standards are not met, have few choices indeed.

Steps to achieve the priority objective must be first in line for City resources. But right behind must be effective and concerted efforts to stop the process of neighborhood deterioration before the area reaches conditions below the minimum legal standards. Avoiding a future where vast areas of the City must be maintained at minimum codes with the ever-increasing burden on City resources that such a future suggests, would be justification along, for such an objective. In addition, though, stopping the process of neighborhood deterioration holds forth the promise of maintaining large areas of the City with what will undoubtedly be a severely limited budget.

As a secondary objective, then, the Planning Commission takes as its challenge the development of policies and programs designed to:

Stop the process of deterioration (of both public and private property) in those areas of the City which are in the initial, not final, stages of that deterioration.

Clearly, this objective is related -- in fact, subsequent -- to the secondary objective in housing. Areas where the process of deterioration is in its initial stages are also the areas in which housing

units in need of minor repair are more likely concentrated. But more than housing rehabilitation will be required. New and rehabilitated public facilities (streets, parks, sewers, etc.) will be needed. Some selective redevelopment will likely be needed. In short, to stop the process of deterioration at its inception is an objective that will be served best by some combination of public and private rehabilitation and redevelopment. The specification of this combination is the challenge accepted by the City Planning Commission with the adoption of the secondary objective.

In any case, creating and maintaining those minimum legal conditions throughout the City and stopping the process of deterioration in its initial stages will be an enormous task itself. Measured against objectives to completely redevelop or revitalize the City, the two objectives chosen may seem insignificant, even unworthy. But measured against the legal and financial resources of the City, the two objectives may appear utopian. In fact, the resources to be devoted to community development objectives will not be great.

In order to enhance that body of resources available for the two fundamental task outlined, the City Planning Commission will support the investment of public resources in the downtown area of Cleveland for redevelopment, or in other areas where investment promises monetary return, if the city is assured some monetary return and if the returns generated from that investment can be allocated to accomplishment of the primary and secondary objectives outlined above. Thus, the third objective:

To invest in redevelopment of the downtown area
insofar as monetary returns from that investment
are assured and can be allocated to accomplishment
of the two priority objectives.

Income -- A good many of the difficult problems besetting the Planning Commission do not have complicated origins. Certainly the problems noted in establishing objectives in the housing, transportation and community development areas have common and simple origins. The origin common to those problems and others is the relative lack of income among a large and growing body of City residents. To

improve the incomes of these residents is to strike at the very base of many problems. Poverty must clearly be a major concern of the City Planning Commission.

The gap in incomes between the poor of Cuyahoga County and the rich is wide and getting wider. In 1959, the poorest 20% of County families (28% of Cleveland families were in this group) reported an average income of \$3,219 while the richest 20% of the County families reported an estimated average income of \$12,355. During the ten years between 1959 and 1969, the average income of the poorest families rose by \$481. The average income of the richest families grew by a startling \$4,045. Thus the gap between the richest and the poorest incomes grew from \$9,136 in 1959 to \$12,700 in 1969.

This significant difference in incomes of Cleveland area families is even more pronounced when Cleveland families are compared to families residing in the suburban areas of Cuyahoga County. Average income for all City families (\$9,717) is almost \$6,000 below that of suburban families (\$15,259). With the richest families of the County in the suburbs and the poorest families of the County in

Est. Average Income 1959

12,355

9,558

7,082

5,489

3,219

(School)

4th Quarter

5th Quarter

3rd Quarter

2nd Quarter

1st Quarter

(Home 4)

16,400

12,131

8,876

6,605

3,700

Est. Average Income 1969

1959

1969

County TABLE
Family Income By Rank, City of Cleveland, 1959 and 1969

Quintile	1959				1969				Change in Avg Income 1959-1969
	County Income Range	Est Average County Income *	No. of Cleveland Families	% of All Cleveland Families	County Income Range	Est Average County Income *	No. of Cleveland Families	% of All Cleveland Families	
(Poorest)	0 -				0 -				
1 st	\$4,292	3,219	62,564	28	4,933	3,700	57,204	31	\$481
2 nd	4,292 - 6,133	5,459	53,618	24	4,933 - 7,506	6,605	46,312	25	\$1,116
3 rd	6,133 - 7,859	7,082	43,630	20	7,506 - 9,997	8,876	34,869	19	\$1,794
4 th	7,859 - 10,856	9,358	36,053	16	9,997 - 14,266	12,131	27,282	15	\$2,773
(Richest)									
5 th	10,856 +	12,355	24,673	11	14,266 +	16,400	18,978	10	\$4,045

* 75% of 1st quintile upper bound, 65% of difference between upper & lower bounds of 2nd quintile, 55% of difference between upper and lower bounds of 3rd quintile, ~~50%~~ half-way between upper and lower bounds of 4th quintile, and the same rise from the lower bounds of the 5th quintile as the average in the 4th quintile from its lower bound.

the City, it is not suprising that City residents, comprising almost half of the population of the County, enjoy only a third of the County's total income.

The distribution of income in the Cleveland area, as well as in the nation, is clearly inequitable. But the distribution of income-producing wealth is even more inequitable. Wealth is much more concentrated than income, and the income accruing to wealth is, thus, just as concentrated. In 1969, total income from wealth accruing to families in the Cleveland SMSA came to a reported \$430,000,000. One-third of this total income went to less than 1/3 of 1% of the total families in the metropolitan area. And while City of Cleveland families received one-third of all income to County residents, they received only one-fifth of County income accruing to wealth. In the City of Cleveland, one-third of all income from wealth went to residents of just three census tracts. (There are over 200 in the City).

To many, the problem of poverty could be eliminated with the creation and maintenance of a sound, growing economy in the Cleve-

land area. In fact, the Cleveland area is a sound growing area in all terms including employment. But it is not growing fast enough in employment terms to produce productive slots in its work force for all those looking for work. The unemployed continue, some with long periods between jobs. Many more would look for work but have left the labor force or avoided entering it. Among the employed, those employed in goods-producing sectors of the economy enjoy relatively high incomes but suffer serious fluctuations in employment. Those in the services-producing sectors enjoy stable and growing employment but suffer relatively low wages. In short, jobs for all those who are able and willing to work are scarce, and those who do have jobs are not always successful in climbing out of poverty. But employment remains the chief acceptable means to income for the great majority of City residents. The City Planning Commission therefore, establishes the following priority objective with regard to income:

To assure all City residents who are able and willing

to work an opportunity for employment at the minimum legal wage.

But programs and policies designed to serve an employment objective, however successful, will leave a significant number of City residents still in poverty.

Many residents are now working full-time but do not gain from that employment sufficient income to lift their dependents from poverty. Further, some City residents cannot work. The aged, disabled, handicapped and blind are in this category. Finally, there are some City residents who society maintains should not work. In this category are mothers of young, dependent children.

The number of adult City residents in these groups is substantial. In 1969, just over 5,000 male family heads in the labor force earned insufficient income to raise their families out of poverty status as defined by the Census of Population.* In the same year, over 7,500 female heads of families with children under six years of age were living in poverty -- even though a fourth of these female heads were in the labor force. The County Welfare Department reports _____ cases of aid to the disabled and blind in _____,

*Census poverty definition:

probably not the total number of such disabled or handicapped actually living in the City.

For these residents, an income maintenance program is required. Clearly, the resources required to sustain an adequate income maintenance program for City residents will not be available at the local level. Only a federal program of considerable magnitude will accomplish the goal of guaranteeing a minimum subsistence level of living for those who are now employed but under paid, those who cannot work and those who should not work.

The City Planning Commission thus establishes the following objective, with priority equal to the employment objective:

To assure all City residents with household responsibilities an annual income sufficient to avoid poverty as defined by the Social Security Administration.

The consistency between the two income objectives and the goal of promoting choices for those with few, is complete. Individuals with abundant income of their own to spend certainly have a wide variety of choices before them. In fact, income in one's own pocket to spend as one see fit is a fundamental generator of choice.

Goals, Objectives and the Planning Process

The goal of the City Planning Commission is meant to provide some overall direction to the Commission and the staff. It presumes to be comprehensive in that it presumes all functional area objectives, policies and programs must be consistent with that goal. But the claim to comprehensive stops there. While the Commission's efforts to date have established objectives in some areas, policy and programs in other areas, it is not intent upon a full list of objectives and a comprehensive set of policies. It is insistent upon the development of objectives in areas where important decisions must be made and the demonstrated consistency between those objectives and the larger goal of the Commission. It is intent upon the development of policies designed to further the stated objectives and, thereby, the large goal. As such, a "comprehensive plan" is not the ultimate end of our efforts. The measure of Commission success will lie with the clarity of direction it proposes to decision makers, the professional diligence with which it pursues the development of policies and programs designed to lead the city in the direction

proposed, and the influence it can exert on the decisions which are being made and will be made.

So we come full circle. In the original paragraphs of this section, the role of the Planning Commission was stated as "... providing information, constructive criticism and advice to those who make decisions." In the foregoing pages, an attempt was made to spell out in some detail the larger goal which will ultimately guide the Commission in its information, constructive criticism and advice. In areas of importance, more specific objectives were stated -- all consistent with the Commission's larger goal. In a later section the policies designed by the Commission to serve the stated objectives will be presented. In the interim section, some comments about the process of planning in Cleveland are included.

Section II - The Process of Planning in Cleveland

The overall goal of promoting choices for those who have few given direction and discrimination over all areas of Planning Commission concern. The objectives established in high priority functional areas provide a more specific direction for Commission efforts; consistent with the overall goal. Where does a planning agency go from there? What process will best assure progress toward the established goal and objectives?

Traditionally, planning agencies have set about the preparation of a land use, transportation and municipal facilities plan. This plan set forth the physical "future" of the City, the way things fit together on the landscape and the way they related to one another. It was a visual image of the outcome of land use and development decisions made over a period of years by both public and private agencies and individuals. And this plan was the basis, theoretically, of land use controls and capital improvement programs -- both instruments designed to assure the eventual realization of the physical plan.

This type of effort has one fatal flaw in a City like Cleveland. The important decisions regarding the physical environment of Cleveland have already been made; or the decisions which are important have little to do with land use and development patterns. Further-

more, the plan and instruments designed to carry it out had little influence on important development decisions -- in some cases because changes since the plan's adoption made it irrelevant.

Other cities have had similar experiences. In some their lack of success with a comprehensive land use plan led them to a new device -- the policies plan. A policies plan has several advantages over the traditional land use plan. First, it does not specify as completely as a land use plan what the distribution of activity will be. Instead of locating municipal facilities on certain turf throughout the City, it established some policies as to the location of municipal facilities. Sites consistent with these policies would be approved. Other uses could be similarly handled.

But while a policies plan approach improved in flexibility on the land use and transportation plan, it was still a set of policies directed to physical development mainly. Both the New York and Chicago plans enlarged upon this concept, including adopted policies in areas other than physical development. The immediate future will probably bring many more policies plans -- with policies included which range far afield from the fairly limited physical development policies of early policies plans.

So planners seem to be following a new course. Policies plans will establish a set of policies prepared by planning staffs to guide decisions made by Planning Commissions; and these policies

will cover areas of health, education, safety, municipal finance, poverty and economic development as well as physical development.

Clearly, a set of Planning Commission policies such as outlined would be useful. The preparation and adoption of such policies is part of the City Planning Commission's role and those which have been adopted are included in a subsequent section of this document. But policies are not enough. As instruments for judgment on matters submitted to the Commission they are well-designed. As instruments for positive and specific progress toward the objectives established, they are not always that useful -- and sometimes even dysfunctional.

To the extent that a set of policies permits a "watchdog" mentality to develop among the Commission and staff, a policies plan can be dysfunctional. This "watchdog" function is certainly an important one, but it should not be the only one.

Most important, the policies adopted are those of the Planning Commission -- not those of the Mayor, the City Council, the Growth Association, the news media or a host of others that could be mentioned. So they are not necessarily the adopted policies of those who must ultimately decide or those who have powerful influence over those who do decide. This is a crucial characteristic of Planning Commission policies. If the Commission is to have maximum influence upon decisions made locally, it cannot rest on

its accomplishment of a policies plan, as it could not rest on its accomplishment of a land use and transportation plan. The Commission must do more. Whether the Commission decides to do more and what they decide to do distinguishes one planning commission from another more than anything else.

The Cleveland City Planning Commission has decided to do more than establish policy and then judge proposals brought before it with those policies as discrimination and direction.

The Commission's staff develops and recommends more than just policy; the staff develops and recommends programs -- specific allocations of specific funds to specific purposes or specific changes to specific legislation. These proposed programs are then pushed with those who must decide. Implementation of the programs is a positive step in the direction the Commission wishes to go.

In the process of these efforts, the Planning Commission recognizes some important principles.

First, this process forces an orientation to decisions. Who is empowered to decide whether a program will be approved? When will that decision be made? What information will likely be relevant to those who decide?

In our public context, decisions as to the allocation of funds are ultimately those of political leaders -- the Mayor and City Council. Many of the important decisions they will make occur during

the annual budget review and adoption. Important information to them includes the cost of the program and how the expenditure proposed will benefit residents of the City -- particularly those who vote.

Successful program implementation -- and, thus, progress toward our goal -- requires that the Commission staff be assured a forum with those who decide, at the time they decide, and with the information and analysis about the program which will be requested. The ramifications of serious involvement in this process are many and important.

The Planning Director and senior staff must make judgments concerning issues and problems which may reach legislative form in the next six months or year. They must predict who will decide on that issue and then they must program staff time and resources for efforts designed to bring information and analysis to bear on the problem. They must develop the program that the Planning Commission will support during discussions prior to decision. They must seek support for the program among those who decide. All of this takes time and attention; it is not always successful. It always conflicts with the role of policy design and development -- also a time consuming and expensive effort.

The process also has ramifications with respect to the kind of staff employed. The analysis of a problem, its alleviation with a specific program, the connection between programs devised and the larger goal we seek, the presentation of this program -- often complicated, always with affects on other programs -- to the Mayor and Councilmen, requires staff with basic critical skills and abilities. Ability to deal with voluminous statistical information, familiarity with both public and private financial practices and techniques, an understanding of basic economic precepts, a working knowledge of the law and an appreciation of the rules of bureaucracies are crucial characteristics of staff engaged in this work. More often than not, the successful advocacy of a desirable program or legislative change will rely entirely upon the quality of staff work involved. Certainly the only legitimate power the Commission can count on in these matters is the power of information, analysis and insight they bring to bear.

Finally, an orientation on decisions forces the planning staff into politics -- which some consider dangerous; or management, which others consider dull. (Note to reader: Add at will, much could be said).

Second, an orientation to programs and the consequent orientation that requires to decision makes us, inherently, an implementing as much as a planning or policy-making agency. The emphasis in

planning literature on implementation as an important part of the planning process has its basis in the reality that development plans are more often violated than implemented; more often ignored than respected. This is partly so because relatively specific physical plans are easy to violate. It is partly because Planning Commissions rarely enjoy great power over the individuals or agencies whose decisions will implement the plan or violate it. But the emphasis on process -- and implementation as an important part of that process -- is mostly a call to action beyond the typical tasks of preparing plans and policies, obtaining Commission approval and then approving proposals or programs from others depending upon their consistency with the plans and policies.

This is not to say that planning agencies ignore the implementation process entirely, or that they do not prepare specific proposals consistent with the plan, and then advocate approval by political decision-makers. It is only to note that these parts of the comprehensive planning process are often secondary to the preparation and updating of the general plan or policies. And the literature, as well as experience, attests to that.

Finally, the Planning Commission will never be done in its efforts to achieve the goal and objectives established. This document should make that clear to all. The Commission has adopted some policies, it is studying options in other cases. Not only are

there further policies to adopt, but some of the policies are already adopted may not stand the test of time and change.

Changes are occurring in the institutions of this City and nation. Changes are occurring in the conditions which surround us. Further, changes are occurring in the response of men and institutions to the changes in conditions which they perceive, as attitudes and values change, too.

The one stable element in the changing panorama before the Commission is the goal established: that simple equity requires -- in a context of limited resources -- first and priority attention be given to the task of promoting wider choices and opportunities for those individuals and groups who have few, if any, choices.

The consequences of this reality are evident not just in the process we go through in discharging our responsibilities, but in the very form of this document. Included in the pages of this first volume are three sections -- one establishing and justifying direction for Commission efforts, one describing the process by which the Commission will remain pointed in that direction, and one (the last section) which lists those policies which the Commission has adopted. All sections are subject to change except the first, and it may even be added to certainly the list of adopted Commission policies in the final section will be added to and some of the adopted policies may be changed.

Volumes II through V include those published works of the Commission which document the basis of adopted policies and proposed programs. In these volumes will be found the questioning and analysis which preceded adopted policy and proposed programs and accounts for most of the staff's time and effort. Some of the reports were completed years ago. Others were only just completed. Not included are several important analytical papers not quite finished. In short, these volumes are also incomplete. When documents relevant to policy or program proposals are completed they will be added to the relevant volumes.

In order to keep this document up to date, each annual report of the Planning Commission will include three sections -- one listing new policies adopted or existing policies which may have been changed to be inserted into Volume I; one section describing the Commission's completed work in program proposals and the success (or failure) of implementing those programs; and a third section including all documents prepared during the preceding year to be inserted into the relevant appendix volumes.

So the very document, itself, is never done. If it accurately reflects the fact that our work -- the process we are involved in -- is never done either, it will be successful.

A Note on Consensus

In a world of conflicting interests, consensus is difficult to accomplish -- probably impossible to sustain. Efforts to achieve long-lived consensus are not likely to succeed. Further, consensus is not always something to be valued -- particularly where that consensus is gained at minority expense. In some cases, the development of consensus as a guiding principle for the planning process leads only to the goal of serving the "public interest."

Certainly there is such a thing as the "public intent." It is vague, often arbitrary and capable of great mischief in application. At best, it is not something to be defined by planners. It can have its only operational meaning when defined by political decision-makers -- which is to say that it will remain inherently undefined.

Thus, consensus behind the "public interest" is a poor objective to design to.

The Commission recognizes that there is a "public interest" and that political decision-makers will define it. But the Commission also recognizes that many decisions are not made in the "public interest" but on behalf of special interests and, just as important, all decisions affect different interests in different ways.

An important part of the process of the Commission is an articulation of how certain interests are served and others harmed by important decisions. Political decision-makers are particularly

anxious to receive that information (privately) as it is often the only information they get as to the potential political gains or losses from such a decision. This information is crucial to the Planning Commission in its analysis of the extent to which decisions represent progress toward the goal of promoting choices for those who have few. In any case, an understanding of the interests involved in any decision and who benefits and suffers as a result should be a common insight in all decisions.

Thus, the Commission does not seek consensus. It seeks an articulation of the interests at stake, and it advocates decisions consistent with the interests of those who have few choices.

Politicians seek consensus. That is their major function in a democratic society.

[POLIDOC]

Section 3 of Part I of Police Planning Document

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES TO DATE IN
HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
AND INCOME

THE GUTS OF SECTION 3, PART I

HOUSING

BASIC OBJECTIVES - HOUSING

1. THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE TO PROVIDE ALL CITY RESIDENTS THE OPPORTUNITY TO LIVE IN HOUSING THAT MEETS MINIMUM LEGAL STANDARDS OF DECENCY WITHOUT SPENDING AN INORDINATELY HIGH PROPORTION OF THEIR INCOMES.
2. THE SECONDARY OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE TO HALT THE DETERIORATION OF THE CITY'S HOUSING STOCK.

POLICIES - HOUSING

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES IN HOUSING SHOULD BE DIRECTED PRIMARILY AT THE GOAL OF INCREASING THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT LOWER-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS CAN SPEND ON HOUSING, THAT THESE SUBSIDIES SHOULD GO DIRECTLY TO LOWER-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, AND THAT THE AMOUNT OF THE SUBSIDY SHOULD VARY BY INCOME, FAMILY SIZE AND REGION OF RESIDENCE.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES DESIGNED TO REDUCE THE COSTS OF STANDARD HOUSING (AND, THUS,

THE RENTS) SHOULD BE USED TO ENCOURAGE REHABILITATION OF THE CITY'S EXISTING HOUSING STOCK.

THE CITY SHOULD USE LOCAL PROGRAMS AND SUBSIDIES IN HOUSING TO ENCOURAGE THE CONTINUED MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS.

THE CITY SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FEDERALLY - SUBSIDIZED HOUSING UNITS IN AREAS OUTSIDE THE CITY.

THE CITY SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW HOUSING UNITS WITH LOCAL SUBSIDIES ONLY IF:

- 1) THE RETURNS TO THE CITY IN THE FORM OF LEASE REVENUES OR INCREASED PROPERTY TAXES EXCEED THE AMOUNT OF THE SUBSIDY.
- 2) THE RETURNS TO THE CITY ARE USED TO ENCOURAGE REHABILITATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING HOUSING IN THE CITY.

TRANSPORTATION

~~TRANSPORTATION: SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES AND RECOMMENDED POLICIES~~

Basic Objectives - Transportation

1. The primary objective should be to enhance the mobility of those residents who cannot drive or cannot afford automobile ownership.
2. The secondary objective should be to improve the mobility of the remainder of the population but under the condition that no transportation improvement leave the City or its residents in worse condition than prior to the improvement.

POLICIES - TRANSPORTATION

~~Transportation subsidies should be provided both directly to transit system operations and to residents without automobiles in order to improve the mobility of those without automobiles.~~

~~The main source of transit subsidies should be from funds generated by highway users.~~

Freeways and expressways will be built in the City of Cleveland only if:

- 1) The local (City) share of the cost is waived.
- 2) Annual payments are made to compensate the City for all real property valuation and income taxes removed by the improvement until such time that it can be demonstrated that new tax income in a similar order of magnitude has been developed with the City as a result of the improvements.
- 3) A number of housing units are provided in the City (preferably through rehabilitation of the existing stock) equal to the number removed by the highway development prior to any removal, and in approximately the same price and rent ranges.

The transfer of the Cleveland Transit System to a regional transit authority should be approved only if:

- 1) A suitable level of transit service for City residents without automobiles is established.
- 2) Such service is maintained using subsidized fares for those City residents without automobiles.

- 3) It is assured that funds necessary to subsidize fares for those City residents without cars are not drawn from fares of other transit users.
- 4) There is no reduction of the level of transit service within the City.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIVE:

To assure the improvement to, and the maintenance of, minimum legal standards of health and safety throughout the City; and to assure that those who are legally responsible for maintaining these conditions do so, in fact.

POLICIES:

1. Programs to demolish condemned structures, clean and maintain vacant lots, and ~~p~~ control rodent infestation should be accomplished before any programs proposed for the expenditure of community development resources of the City.
2. The cost of accomplishing demolition and maintenance of vacant lots should be borne, in full, by those private property owners who are legally responsible for these ~~minimum~~ minimum efforts to protect resident health and safety.

OBJECTIVE: 0 To stop the process of deterioration (of both public and private facilities) in those areas of the City which are in the initial, not final, stages of that deterioration.

STRATEGY To invest in

OBJECTIVE: To invest (with city funds) in the redevelopment of the Downtown area insofar as monetary returns from that investment are assured and can be allocated to accomplishment of redevelopment, rehabilitation and conservation in other areas of the city.

Objective: To assure all City residents who are able and willing to work an opportunity for employment at the minimum legal wage.

Intelligo:

3. Substantial reduction in unemployment among City residents cannot be achieved through the creation of new jobs in the private sector alone. Creation of jobs in worthy enterprises of the public sector will also be required.

1. Incentives and public subsidies directed toward the retention or creation of jobs in the City of Cleveland should be used primarily to support printing and publishing, metal products and machinery manufacturing firms in (mostly industrial areas outside the city) the far- and middle-west side and the near east side, and business services jobs in the downtown.

2. Attention and resources should be devoted to the small firm, the new firm and the firm near termination of business. These firms need low-cost space, working capital and technical counsel as to financial records, production techniques and marketing opportunities.

OBJECTIVE:

To assure all City residents with household responsibilities, an annual income sufficient to avoid poverty as defined by the Social Security Administration.

POLICIES:

1. Basic allowances (payments made to families with no earned income) should vary by region of residence; and legislation establishing such allowances should provide for periodic adjustment of those allowances, in response to cost of living changes.
2. Benefits should not discriminate against the "working-poor"—those who work full-~~employment~~ time but at wages less than the poverty level.