1-1-1975

Cleveland Policy Planning Report, Volume 1

unknown

The Cleveland Policy Planning Report

Volume I, 1975

Daniel Webster: *"Our ancestors began their system of government here under a condition of comparative equality . . . and their early views were of a nature to favor and continue this equality . . . 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 masses of the population poor and dependent."*

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

Theodore Roosevelt: *"In every wise struggle for human betterment one of the main objects and often the only object, has been to achieve in large measure equality of opportunity. The conflict between the men who possess more than they have earned and the men who have earned 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."*

Woodrow Wilson: *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."*

Lyndon B. Johnson: *"One's on the hill, one's in the holler. One's on the road, one's in the ditch."*

Policy Planning Report
Introduction

The pages that follow outline the Cleveland City Planning Commission's recommendations for resolving or ameliorating some of the most pressing problems confronting the City of Cleveland and its people.

It is not a plan, at least not in the traditional sense. It is not a series of colored maps and designs describing an ideal future in terms of land uses, public facilities and transportation routes.

Rather, it is a catalog of objectives, policies and action programs which recognizes that the urban crisis in Cleveland has little to do with land uses, zoning or urban designs and much to do with personal and municipal poverty, deteriorated housing, inadequate public transportation, and declining neighborhoods. It addresses these issues as problems to which city planners, as well as other serious public administrators, owe their time and attention.

This first edition of the *Policy Planning Report* excludes topics such as education, crime, health and recreation. While recognizing their importance, the Commission has devoted priority attention to analyses of income, housing, transportation and community development. In these areas, the Commission feels it has the best chance to affect decisions.

One goal underlies the policy recommendations in this *Report*:

> In a context of limited resources, the Cleveland City Planning Commission will give priority attention to the task of promoting a wider range of choices for those individuals and groups who have few, if any, choices.

Given the disparities in income and power between the residents of the City of Cleveland and those of the surrounding region, this goal, in part, simply reflects our responsibility and commitment to serve the people of the City.

The members of the City Planning Commission have provided the support needed to re-direct the planning process in Cleveland. They have given freely of their valuable time and expertise. They have insured that this *Report* is not the staff's final product but rather a reflection of an on-going effort to influence decision making.

Major responsibility and credit for preparation of this *Report* must go to the Commission's entire Policy Analysis Division. Ernest Bonner, who until October, 1973, supervised this Division, inspired and directed much of this work. Without Ernie's tireless efforts in conceptualizing this unique work, in directing his staff's analytical efforts, in thinking through and writing numerous drafts, this document would not be a reality. Janice Cogger made a major contribution in sharpening the focus of the work. Staff members John Linner, Doug Wright, Susan Olson and Joanne Lazarz also made important contributors.

Finally, to the unheralded contributors--the secretarial staff, capably led by Rosetta Boyd--go my sincere thanks.

Norman Krumholz
Director
September, 1974

THE GOAL

The Goal of the Planning Commission

Each day important decisions are made by Cleveland entrepreneurs, political leaders and residents. Some are public decisions; some are private. Some decisions 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 decisions not to decide.

Some are made in the offices of the Mayor and City Council; some are made in the living rooms of City residents or at suburban cocktail parties. Some are decisions made locally; others are decisions made in Columbus or in Washington.

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 by tradition, is responsible for providing information, constructive criticism and advice to those who make decisions affecting the interests of Cleveland residents. The Commission takes upon itself a special role with respect to that audience of decision-makers. The guidance offered by the Commission is informed by a vision the Comm8ission holds for the City and its people. This vision is not utopian. It points in a dir3ection the City can choose and can follow, a direction that distinguishes between desirable and undesirable actions taken yesterday, and today, and to be taken tomorrow.

The Commission's vision:

> Individuals choose their own goals and the means to pursue those goals.
>
> Institutions are established to assist individuals in the pursuit of their goals. In the process, institutions themselves establish goals--some of which are aimed at insuring their own survival.
>
> Nevertheless, those institutional goals which are self-serving must be clearly secondary to those which further the pursuit of individuals' goals.
>
> Individuals and institutions pursue their respective goals through decision and action. Decisions must be made from among those choices which the individual or institution perceives.
>
> Individuals are better off with more choices in any decision.
>
> Institutions serve individuals' goals most effectively when they provide a wider range of choices to individuals.
>
> *In a context of limited resources, institutions should give priority attention to the task of promoting more choices for those individuals who have few, if any, choices.*

Thus, the Commission's efforts are directed toward the accomplishment of this single, simply-stated goal:

> **Equity requires that locally-responsible government institutions give priority attention to the goal of promoting a wider range of choices for those Cleveland residents who have few, if any, choices.**

Five important points should be made about this goal.

First, the goal is to provide as wide a range of alternatives and opportunities as possible, leaving individuals free to define their own needs and priorities. Government efforts to alleviate poverty have frequently emphasized a 'service strategy.' The government has provided, or has subsidized the private provision of, particular goods and services. Unfortunately, these efforts have often failed to satisfy the needs of those whom they supposedly serve. Low-income families have no choice but to accept benefits on the terms offered by the suppliers, or forego assistance.

In the interest of maximizing choices, the Commission supports expanded reliance upon an 'income strategy.' The Commission seeks to provide individuals with the means and the opportunity to obtain those goods and services which they perceive as best fulfilling their needs. The commission recognizes that an effective 'income strategy' must include measures to eliminate legal, administrative and technical restraints upon choice.

Second, the goal calls for a more *equitable* society, not for a more *efficient* political or economic system. This does not mean that policies serving the goal of equity should no also serve the objective of efficiency. The Commission recognizes the need to allocate the City's limited resources as efficiently as possible and to collect revenues in the same way. However, efficiency is not an end in itself; it is a means. The rationale for seeking more efficient collection and expenditure of public funds is to assure maximum resources for the promotion of a more equitable society.

Third, the focus upon institutions recognizes the crucial role played by legal, political, economic and social institutions in promoting and sustaining inequities. Necessary changes will not be achieved merely through the righteous rhetoric and good deeds of unselfish men. In many, if not all, cases these changes will require alterations in the laws, customs and practices of our institutions.

Fourth, the goal directs all of the Commission's efforts. It enables the Commission to identify those issues to which it devotes priority attention--issues involving equity considerations. The goal gives clarity and power to the staff's analyses. In evaluating proposals set before the Commission, and in developing the Commission's policy and program recommendations, the question of 'Who pays?' and 'Who benefits?' are key elements in the staff's analytic framework. The goal also aids the Commission in identifying clients for its work.

Finally, the Commission's emphasis upon promoting more choices for those who have few choices places it in an advocacy position on behalf of those less favored by present conditions. Obviously, the less favored are neither the more powerful nor, in many cases, the more numerous. The Commission does not expect that its recommendations will be accepted in all cases. Neither does the Commission, by its advocacy on behalf of those less favored, intend to ignore or demean the interests of more favored individuals or groups. Conflicts in interests and ideas are not to be avoided. They must be understood, clearly articulated, and submitted to the relevant executive, legislative or judicial body for resolution. Thus, the Commission does not seek consensus but strives to identify and to clarify the often opposing interests of the more and the less favored.

The Goal Justified--by Tradition

Justification for the Commission's goal must, in the end, rest upon the moral commitment of the commission itself. However, this body of seven citizens does not stand alone. The Commission merely affirms what has been advocated consistently throughout history: that equity in the social, economic and political relationships among men is a requisite condition for a just and lasting society.

This has been an overriding theme in the philosophical and religious teaching underlying Western culture.

In his remarks on the 'Perfect City,' Plato warned:

> *"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."*

Similarly, Jesus of Nazareth asked:

> *'Think ye that building shall endure, which shelters the noble and crushes the poor?"*[1]

Political leaders of this nation have frequently expressed the same concern. Sometimes, promotion of a more equitable society has been viewed as a moral imperative. Thomas Jefferson reflected:

> *". . . that an equal distribution 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."*[2]

Sometimes, it has been viewed as a political imperative. Throughout U.S. history, statesmen have recognized that obvious and pervasive inequalities pose the gravest threat to the survival of our democratic political union. Andrew Jackson, in the summer of the election year of 1832, vetoed a bill renewing the National Bank Charter. His veto message included this:

> *"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."*

Similarly, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his third inaugural address, said:

> *'There is nothing mysterious about the foundation of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political system 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 inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations."*

Most religious, philosophical and political leaders have agreed that the important causes of inequality lie in the laws and institutions of our political and economic systems, not in the failings of individuals. They have sought to change those laws and institutions rather than to provide palliatives to those adversely affected. Tom Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland from 1901 to 1909, carried on a vigorous campaign against 'Privilege.' 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 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 in. It is in this way that I would answer those who would ask us to help the poor. Let us help them, that they may at least 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."*

---

[1] Walter Rauscheubusch, American Theologist, 1861-1918.

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

To seek a more equitable society is not a new path for the Commission to chart. Many of our greatest leaders have warned that gross inequalities in the distribution of wealth and power are inconsistent with the preservation of democratic institutions.

The Goal Justified--by Reason

Pursuit of a more equitable society can also be justified by reason. It is the kind of society that free, equal and rational men would agree to establish in order to protect their own self-interests.[3]

Suppose a group of individuals gather together to determine the principles under which they will enter into association. These individuals are equal in the sense that none knows how to design these principles so as to favor himself: ". . . no one knows his place in [this proposed] 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 the basic principles are fair.

It can then be argued that persons so situated would rationally agree to two basic principles for a just society:

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 such inequalities materially improve the lot of those least advantaged and 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 open to all."

It would be rational for each individual to seek a society where, if he should become the least favored member, his position would not be seriously inequitable and where any social and economic inequalities would, to some measure, benefit him. In devotion to their own interests, individuals would choose to associate with others only if there existed safeguards against others benefiting inordinately at their expense.

The Goal Justified--by Necessity

The Commission's goal is not only in keeping with the dictates of tradition and reason, but also with the realities of life in an older central city such as Cleveland. Compared to surrounding areas the City of Cleveland is increasingly becoming the home of those with few choices: the poor, aged, disabled, and racial minorities. Thus, in providing consistent support for the interests of those with few choices, the Commission is simply providing appropriate service to a large and growing proportion of the City's population.

In American society, income is the fundamental generator of choice. The Commission recognizes that income alone cannot eliminate all restraints upon choice. However, access to income is a prerequisite to the exercise of such fundamental choices as those of sufficient food and clothing, decent housing, necessary transportation and adequate health care.

As a whole, residents of the City of Cleveland have far less income with which to exercise such choices than to other segments of the population.[4] In 1969, the per capita income in Cleveland ($2,840) was approximately 27% below the State of Ohio ($3,965) and national ($3,920) averages.

---

[3] The argument that follows is taken from John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press, 1971.

[4] Unless otherwise noted, the following statistics are taken from the U.S. Census, 1970.

The differential is even more pronounced when the income of City residents are compared with those of suburban Cuyahoga County residents. While City residents constitute almost half of the County population, they receive only a third of the County's total income. In 1969, the per capital income in the City was 35% lower than in the suburbs ($4,937). Moreover, the gap has increased in recent years. Between 1959 and 1969, the real median family income in the suburbs increased by 29%. In the City, the increase was only 23%.

The Cleveland area, like most of the nation's older urban areas, is economically segregated. By and large, the richer families of the County live in the suburbs; the poorer families live in the City. In 1969, 77% of those families with incomes over $15,000 resided in the suburbs; 76% of those families with incomes below the poverty level were City residents. The unemployment rate among City residents is more than twice that for the suburban population. Only 2% of the suburban population is dependent upon public assistance, but almost 20% of the City's residents must rely upon some form of welfare payments.[5]

A host of inequalities can be shows as following from this basic income inequality. For example, 78,000 or 32% of Cleveland's households lack regular access to an automobile. Only 9% of the suburban households confront similar limitations on their mobility. A large and growing proportion of Cleveland's households cannot pay rents sufficient to maintain dwelling units in standard condition. Similarly, low incomes threaten the viability of neighborhood shopping districts everywhere in the City. These and other problems associated with the limited income accruing to City residents are discussed in detail in Section III of this volume and in the research papers included in *Volumes II-V*.

Not all segments of the City's population are equally subject to restricted choices. The relationship between age and income restraints is clearly demonstrated in Cleveland. While 11% of those under age 65 are supported by incomes below the poverty level, 26% of the City's elderly live in poverty.

The relationship between race and income limitations is equally pronounced. Black residents constitute almost 40% of the City's population, but receive only 30% of the City's total income. In 1969, the per capita income for blacks ($2,290) was 28% lower than for whites ($3,216). Of the Cleveland families with incomes below the poverty level, 63% were black. It is not surprising that those areas of the City with the lowest income levels, the weakest housing and commercial markets, and the highest proportion of transit-dependent households are east side, predominantly black, neighborhoods.

In an environment characterized by deteriorating inner city neighborhoods and burgeoning suburban subdivisions, by vastly expanded mobility for those with automobiles and significantly diminished mobility for the transit-dependent–an environment characterized by massive inequalities in the distribution of income and power–there is no more appropriate goal which the Commission could adopt than the goal of promoting greater equity. The Commission is committed to the belief that:

In a context of limited resource and pervasive inequalities, priority attention must be given to the task of promoting a wider range of choices for those who have few, if any, choices.

The Goal and the Planning Process

This goal provides direction to the Commission and its staff. It is 'comprehensive' in that it provides the foundation for all of the objectives, policies and programs supported by the Commission.

---

[5] Welfare statistics obtained from the Department of Welfare, Cuyahoga County, Mnarch, 1973.

However, the Commission makes no pretense of having developed a full list of objectives or a comprehensive set of policies.

The Commission's success is not dependent upon the publication of a formal 'comprehensive plan,' but upon the clarity of direction which it provides to decision makers, upon the professional diligence with which it pursues the development of policies and programs leading in that direction, and upon the influence which it exerts on the decision-making process.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

Selection of a Goal

The first requirement of a planning process is a goal. The Cleveland Planning Commission has a goal which provides needed direction for its activities--the goal of promoting more choices for those who have few.

This goal is one that the Commission and its staff have defined for themselves. It is the Commission's belief that planners cannot look to political leaders for clear statements of goals or objectives.[6] The political process is a decision process, not a process of goal development or analysis. Government officials avoid detailed identification of goals or objectives. They must. The motives behind some programs are cynical; the objectives of many are multiple; the maintenance of disparate sources of support require ambiguity. Moreover, those who run for public office know the odds against achieving basic change. They know that large promises made with specificity today may become proof of failure in two or four years.

Thus, while the planning process demands that goals be clearly specified, the political process demands that goals remain ambiguous. The Commission's first and most important initiative was to develop a clear goal-oriented perspective.

The goal selected by the Commission is one to which its members and staff are both personally and professionally committed. It is a clearly ideological goal. But being ideological hardly constitutes a radical departure from traditional planning practice. Some ideological commitment is implicit in every planning perspective. It is often a commitment to beauty, or to efficiency, or to the value of real property. However, the profession's propensity for focusing upon techniques has obscured such ideological biases. In contrast, the Cleveland Planning Commission has made its commitment explicit.

Development of Policies

Establishment of a goal is not enough. A process is needed to influence decisions in such a way as to insure progress toward that goal.

The Commission cannot rely upon the exercise of power as a means of affecting decisions. Its formal powers are limited. Other public bodies can easily over-ride its recommendations. Neither law, nor custom, nor political instinct compels decision-makers to search out the advice of the City's planners. So the Commission must rely upon the exercise of influence. Such influence is a function of both the Commission's institutional role and the aggressive activities of its staff.

The Commission has traditionally sought to influence events by applying established policy to decisions submitted for its review. In accordance with the City's Charter those decisions generally relate to public improvements, subsidized private development and changes in zoning. However, in a city like Cleveland--where 97% of the land is already developed and where a strong market demand for redevelopment simply does not exist in many locations--matters formally submitted for review are not the only ones of concern to the Commission.

To date, the Commission has given priority attention to the development of policies in the areas of income, housing, transportation and community development. Meaningful policies are not quickly

---

[6] Alan A. Altschuler states the matter most succinctly: "Local politicians in many American cities have elevated their inability to give detailed guidance to a principle of political expediency." *The City Planning Process: A Political Analysis*, 1965, pg. 5

nor easily designed in these problem areas. The problem must be defined; the restraints upon choice must be identified; the legal, administrative and financial framework must be understood; the nature of competing interests must be considered. Because staff resources are limited, the development of policies in some areas must wait until attention has been paid to areas of highest priority.

In determining priorities the Commission is guided by practical rather than theoretical considerations. Why focus upon housing rather than health? Why transportation rather than education? Such determinations are based upon the probability of the Commission's affecting important decisions. That probability is conditioned by two factors: (1) pressures for change are greater and more immediate in some areas than in others; and (2) the Commission is recognized as possessing greater credibility in some areas than in others.

For example, in housing, the 1973 moratorium on Federal housing programs created a demand for re-evaluating local housing needs and an opportunity for influencing national housing policy. This situation, combined with the fact that the Commission is recognized as having considerable responsibility for dealing with the City's housing problems, has led the Commission to place a high priority upon the development of housing policies.

However, even in those areas where detailed policy analysis has not yet been undertaken, the Commission often provides advice to decision-makers. The Commission's goal provides a perspective--a particular way of viewing problems, a specific set of questions to be raised about proposed solutions. Information generated by the staff in their analysis of priority areas is often useful in analyzing problems in other areas as well.

Finally, it should be noted that policy formulation is a dynamic, not a static, process. While the Commission's goal will remain constant, the policies supported by the Commission may, and undoubtedly will, change. Policies are derived from the application of values to an assessment of existing conditions. As the Commission's understanding of current conditions is enhanced through analysis, policies will be refined. Where necessary they will be made more specific. Moreover, while values may remain relatively constant, conditions do not. The Commission must frequently reassess those policies which it has already adopted, abandon those which are no longer applicable, alter those which are in conflict with emerging needs, and design new policies which address issues of concern to local decision-makers.

Application of Policies

Of course, the Commission's policies are not necessarily the policies of those who must decide or of those who have powerful influence over decision-makers. They are not necessarily the policies of the Mayor, of the City Council, or the Chamber of Commerce, or the news media, or a host of other individuals and groups who are important in the decision-making process. They are only the policies of the Commission.

In seeking to influence decision-making, the Commission must do more than adopt and publicize its policies. It is committed to an active advocacy role. The Commission's efforts to secure progress toward its goal and to gain acceptance for its policies take many forms.

The Commission and its staff analyze and make recommendations on proposals set forth by others. These include proposals dealing with the specification of public policies, the development of private and public programs, the administration of City government and changes in legal codes. These proposals are made by the Mayor, members of City Council, City department heads, State and Federal legislators, civic associations and others concerned with influencing and directing public affairs. Staff analyses of those proposals focus upon the extent to which the Commission's goals and policies are served. The Commission's recommendations are then brought to the attention of the public at large.

The Commission also formulates its own program proposals and works to secure their implementation. When proposals are made by others conflict with the Commission's policies, the staff accepts responsibility for designing alternative approaches. When problems or opportunities are not addressed by others, the staff takes the initiative in developing program recommendations. These are recommendations for allocations of specific fund to specific purposes, or for changes in specific laws and administrative practices. In the design of both alternative proposals and original recommendations, emphasis is placed upon insuring that clear benefits go to those most in need and that those least able to pay do not bear a disproportionate share of the costs. The Commission presents proposed programs to decision-makers and lobbies for their acceptance. In many cases, the staff pursues this process a step further. During various stages of program development, staff members often work with the agencies or departments responsible for program implementation.

Policy Planning Report

Because the Commission is concerned with having an impact upon public decisions, the development of program recommendations does not always await the development of policies. Neither does the Commission defer action until all conceivable program options and interdependencies have been considered. Rather, policy formulation, program development and efforts to secure policy and program implementation are pursued simultaneously and continuously.

The decision-making process does not wait for the completion of detailed, 'comprehensive' plans. Decisions are made constantly; changes occur in conditions, attitudes and institutions. The Commission must be prepared to provide its analyses and recommendations when decisions are being made; it must be prepared to respond to change.

These realities are reflected not only in the process by which the Commission discharges its responsibilities, but also in the form of this document. This first volume contains three sections--one establishing and justifying the Commission's goal, one describing the process by which the Commission seeks progress toward that goal, and one discussing the objectives and policies adopted by the Commission.

In a context of limited resources, equity requires that priority attention be given to the task of promoting choices and opportunities for those individuals and groups who have few, if any, choices.

Volumes II through *V* include research reports related to the Commission's priority areas. These volumes contain the questioning and analysis which have preceded policy adoption and program recommendations. This work accounts for much of the staff's time and effort. Some of the reports were completed years ago. Others were only recently completed.

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 by the Commission and changes in existing policies; one section describing the Commission's work in program development, and the success (or failure) of its efforts to secure program implementation; and a third section including all research documents prepared during the preceding year.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Introduction

INCOME

Definition of Problem and Statement of Objectives

6 paragraphs of problem definition.

The absence of an adequate number of employment opportunities is only part of the problem. Having a job does not necessarily guarantee an end to poverty. Those persons employed in the goods-producing sectors of the economy enjoy relatively high wages. However, since the industries in which they work are extremely sensitive to cyclical fluctuations in the national economy, job security is low, and lay-offs are common. In contrast, workers in the services sector enjoy greater job stability and growing employment opportunities. But they receive relatively low wages.

In summary, jobs are scarce, and employment does not always provide adequate income. In 1969, more than 5,000 male heads of households were members of the labor force but did not earn enough to raise their families out of the Census poverty classification. Recognizing that employment is viewed as the most acceptable means to income for the majority of the City's residents, the Commission establishes this objective:

> **To assure all City residents who are willing and able to work an opportunity for employment at wages adequate to rise and remain above the poverty level.**

In order to meet the income needs of those who cannot work, those who cannot find work, and those who work at wages beneath the poverty level, an income maintenance program is needed. The Commission recognizes that the resources required to sustain an adequate income maintenance program will not be available locally. Only a Federal program of considerable magnitude could accomplish such a goal.

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

> **To assure all City residents with household responsibilities an annual income sufficient to avoid poverty.**

Statement of Policies

Consistent with the objectives above, and based upon an analysis of *Jobs and Income* (Dec. 1973) in the Cleveland area, the Commission has adopted the following policies. They represent necessary steps toward meeting the income needs of Cleveland residents.

> Policy: Public subsidies and incentives aimed at retaining or creating private-sector jobs in the City of Cleveland should be used primarily to support businesses and industries proving to be viable in the City. In manufacturing, these include firms located, or wishing to locate, in the viable industrial areas of the far and middle west side, the near east side, and Collinwood. Support should also be given to business services, especially those located in the downtown area.

Policy: Assistance, in the form of technical and marketing advice, management counseling and site location should be provided to those City firms which are small, newly formed or near termination. To this end, the service function of the Department of Human Resources and Economic Development should be expanded.

Policy: In all cases where the City is asked to provide support for industrial or commercial development (by assuming a share of the project cost, by granting a tax abatement or by providing other types of financial incentives), and where the benefits to the City are alleged to be the maintenance or an increase in jobs and/or tax revenues, the following information may be required for review by the Commission:
(1) Number and type of new jobs which will be created by the proposed project or the number of jobs which will be lost to the City in the absence of the proposed project.
(2) Number of those jobs (new or retained) which may be or are filled by City residents.
(3) Anticipated increase in City income tax revenues which will result from the proposed project, or the loss in income tax revenues which will occur in the absence of the proposed project.
(4) Anticipated increase in City property tax revenues which will result from the proposed project or the loss in property tax revenues which will occur in the absence of the proposed project.

Policy: A substantial reduction in unemployment among City residents cannot be achieved solely through the creation of private-sector jobs. Additional jobs in worthwhile public-sector enterprises will also be required. The City should support efforts to provide public service employment for Cleveland residents.

Policy: To assure all Cleveland residents with household responsibilities an annual income above the poverty level, the Commission supports the following Federal policies:
(1) Basic allowances (payments made to families with incomes below the poverty level) should vary by region of residencies and should be adjusted periodically as the cost of living changes.
(2) Benefits should not discriminate against the 'working poor'--those who work full time but at wages below the poverty level.

HOUSING

Definition of Problem and Statement of Objectives

The deterioration of Cleveland's neighborhoods has focused concern upon the issue of housing. One-third of the City's families live in substandard housing: housing which does not conform to those legal standards established to protect the health and safety of residents.

In the past, poor housing conditions have been blamed on such factors as absentee ownership, tenant neglect, insufficient code enforcement, unscrupulous real estate practices, and the reluctance of banks to loan money in marginal areas. All of these factors have undoubtedly played a part in creating the present situation, but they are not primarily responsible for the continuing decay of Cleveland's housing stock.

Current housing problems stem from one major source--the inability of many Cleveland residents to pay for well-maintained, standard housing. *Cleveland's housing problem is basically a problem of poverty.* The typical low-income family cannot pay prevailing rents for decent housing without imposing a severe strain upon its budget.

Inadequate income rather than an insufficient supply of housing is at the heart of the problem. Unless measures are taken to close the gap between the cost of decent housing and the amount low-9income families can afford to pay, deterioration and abandonment will continue. With this in mind, the Planning Commission has adopted two housing objectives. The primary objective is:

> **To provide all City residents the opportunity to live in housing that meets minimum legal standards of decency without spending an excessive proportion of their income.**

As a secondary and complementary objective, the Planning Commission proposes:

> **To maintain the quality of those housing units in the City that are now standard and to upgrade substandard units that are not beyond repair.**

Statement of Policies

In accordance with a careful examination of these objectives and alternative means of achieving them, the Commission has established several policies to guide decision-making in the area of housing:

> Policy: The Commission urges the initiation of Federal housing subsidies in the form of direct cash assistance to lower-income families, such as the housing allowance programs currently being studied by HUD. These subsidies should be aimed at enabling families who cannot pay market rates for standard housing to do so. The amount a family receives should depend on its size, its income (with greater support directed to those at the bottom of the income ladder), and the region of the country in which it lives.
>
> Policy: Until an adequate housing allowance program is operational, the Commission supports the reinstatement of Federal programs to subsidize rehabilitation, leasing, and new construction of low-income housing.
>
> Policy: Greater use should be made of Federal subsidies to housing suppliers to encourage rehabilitation and conservation of the City's existing housing stock.

Policy: Subsidized housing should not be concentrated in the City's most deteriorated neighborhoods. Much more attention should be given to building and leasing low-income housing in good residential areas, particularly in the suburbs.

Policy: Housing for low-income families should not be developed in large projects built specifically for the poor. Whether leased, rehabilitated or newly constructed, low-income family housing should be in small-scale, scattered-site developments.

Policy: The City should use local programs and subsidies to encourage conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock.

Policy: The City should provide public support for the construction of new housing for middle and upper-income groups only if: (1) The returns to the City in the form of lease revenues or increased property taxes justify the investment; and (2) The returns to the City are earmarked to assist in the rehabilitation and conservation of existing housing in the City.

Policy: The City must take all appropriate steps to eliminate racial discrimination in housing.

TRANSPORTATION

Definition of Problem and Statement of Objectives

The most pressing transportation issues confronting the City and its residents have traditionally been viewed as questions of freeway access, downtown congestion, parking needs and transit deficits. However, in keeping with its goal, the Commission believes that Cleveland's most critical transportation problem must be defined in another way.

During the past three decades, the automobile has become the dominant mode of transportation in this country. Increased ownership and more int3ensive use of the automobile have been accompanied by massive public investments in roads and highways. As a result, the majority of the population has enjoyed a dramatic increase in mobility.

However, a large segment of the City's population has not shared in this expanded mobility. In 1969, 32% (78,000 households) of all Cleveland households did not own automobiles. These were primarily the households of the poor, the elderly and the disabled.

Those who cannot drive or who cannot afford an automobile have not only failed to share in the expanded mobility of the majority; they have actually suffered a loss of mobility. In very real ways, the transit-dependent have paid for the expanded mobility enjoyed by the rest of the population.

As a result of the decentralization of development and the decline in transit service, an increasing number of activities, especially employment opportunities, are totally inaccessible to the transit-dependent population. Moreover, due to service reductions and fare increases, reliance upon public transportation has become more time consuming and more expensive. In short, people who lack an automobile have fewer and fewer places which they can reach by public transit and can reach those remaining destinations only at higher prices. Obviously such restraints upon mobility lead to, or support, the narrowing of choices in employment, housing, recreation, health care, etc.

Those who have been the victims of transportation; policies emphasizing reliance upon the automobile deserve compensation. Therefore, the Commission accepts as its primary objective in the area of transportation:

> **To enhance the mobility of those residents who cannot drive or cannot afford an automobile and are, therefore, dependent upon public transportation.**

The City of Cleveland has also been a victim of the decision to opt for an automotive civilization. Construction of the Interstate Highway System has imposed both direct and indirect costs upon the City. The city has incurred, and is being asked to continue to incur, substantial costs in order to further enhance the mobility of automobile users. At the same time, the City lacks the resources needed to maintain an adequate public transit system.

Recognizing the need to correct such imbalance, the Commission poses as its secondary objective:

> **To improve the mobility of the non-transit-dependent population but under the condition that no such transportation improvement leaves the City or its residents in worse condition than prior to the improvement.**

Statement of Policies

Based upon its analysis of transportation issues, the Commission has adopted the following transportation policies:

Policy: Transfer of the Cleveland Transit System (CTS) to a regional transit authority should be approved only if: (1) A suitable level of service is established for City residents who are dependent upon public transit for their mobility throughout the metropolitan area. (2) Such service is maintained by providing subsidized fares for those City r3esidents who lack regular access to automobiles. (3) Transit subsidies are collected in such a way as to avoid placing an additional burden upon those who are least able to pay.

Policy: Construction of freeways and expressways in the City of Cleveland should be approved only if: (1) the local (City) share of the cost is waived. (2) Annual payments are made to compensate the City for all losses in property and income tax revenues resulting from the improvement. These payments should continue until such time as new tax sources, of similar size, have been created by the improvement. (3) Prior to highway development, additional housing units--equal in number to those removed--are provided within the City (preferably through rehabilitation of the existing housing stock). These replacement units should be of approximately the same price or rent level as those being displaced.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Definition of Problem and Statement of Objectives

During the past two decades, the City's neighborhoods have suffered widespread physical deterioration. In some areas, property ownership is no longer an asset but an economic liability. The causes are many: limited accessibility to many central city locations, changes in regional land use patterns, the migration of population from the City to the suburbs. However, the prime cause is the generally low incomes of City residents and the resulting lack of effective demand for standard housing, consumer goods, and neighborhood oriented services.

Where the real estate market is extremely weak, entire blocks of land lie vacant. Residential and commercial structures are being abandoned by tenant and owner alike. Once vacated, these structures stand open, subject to fire and vandalism. When these structures are demolished, their sites become new pockets of vacant, unattended land.

In such areas, no land use plan, no zoning ordinance will produce private investment. Massive public subsidies would be required to stimulate development. However, in severely blighted neighborhoods, even substantial subsidies generally fail to induce industrial, commercial and middle or upper-income residential investment. Redevelopment, when it occurs, usually takes the form of new, heavily subsidized, low and moderate-income residential units. Such development imposes enormous costs upon the public while providing only limited choices and benefits to a relatively small number of people.

This does not negate the need to deal with the problem of deterioration. Rather, it suggests that the City's community development efforts should focus less upon providing massive subsidies in small, concentrated areas and more upon increasing certain types of expenditures throughout large segments of the City.

In many areas, there are numerous violations of those minimum legal standards designed to protect health and safety: specifically those codes dealing with the demolition of condemned structures, the maintenance of vacant lots and the elimination of rat infestation. Though property maintenance is legally the owner's responsibility, it is not economically rational for property owners, in some areas, to discharge these responsibilities. The demolition of a condemned structure, the maintenance of a vacant lot, or the extermination of rats will cost the owner more than he can hope to recover through use of his property. As a consequence, the City is forced to take the initiative. Those City residents who must live in areas where even such minimum standards are not met, clearly have few choices. Thus, in keeping with its goal, the Planning Commission has assigned high3est priority to this objective:

> **To assure the improvement to, and maintenance of minimum legal standards of health and safety throughout the City.**

If the City is to avoid a future in which maintenance functions consume an ever-increasing share of its resources, a future in which City residents have no choice but to live in neighborhoods conforming merely to minimum standards, efforts must also be made to halt neighborhood decay. As an important secondary objective, the Commission takes as its challenge the development of p9olicies and programs designed:

> **To stop the process of neighborhood deterioration.**

Measured against such lofty aims as completely redeveloping and revitalizing the City, the Commission's two objectives may seem conservative and unworthy. Yet, measured against the legal powers and financial resources of the City, the two objectives may be utopian. Therefore, the

Commission will support the investment of public resources in private development efforts where such efforts will contribute to its two primary objectives. Thus, the Planning Commission accepts as its third community development objective:

> **To invest in private redevelopment efforts where it can be shown that such investment will provide a return to the City either in the form of jobs for City residents, revenues for the City, or services for City residents.**

Statement of Policies

Based upon analyses in the areas of community development, housing and income, the Planning Commission has adopted the following community development policies:

Policy: Programs, throughout the City, to demolish condemned structures, to clear and maintain vacant lots, and to control rat infestation should be adequately funded before the City's community development resources are committed to any other program.

Policy: State law, and City and County administrative practices should be alt3ered so as to: (1) Require private property owners to fulfill their legal responsibilities with regard to maintenance. (2) Insure that, where the City is forced to assume these responsibilities, it receives compensation either in the form of cash reimbursements or title to the property.

Policy: Efforts to halt neighborhood deterioration through investment in physical improvements should focus primarily upon those areas which are in the initial, not final, stages of deterioration, and should include programs aimed at the conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock.

Policy: In all cases where the City is asked to provide support for private development by providing land write-downs, capital improvements, tax abatements or other financial incentive, the following types of information may be required for review by the Planning Commission.

(1) Number and type of jobs which will be created as a result of the investment or the number and type of jobs which will be lost to the City in the absence of the proposed investment.
(2) Number of those jobs (new or retained) which may be, or are, filled by City residents.
(3) Anticipated increase in City income tax revenues that will result from the investment, or the loss in income tax revenues which will occur in the absence of the proposed investment.
(4) Anticipated increase in City property tax revenues which will result from the proposed project or the loss in property tax revenues which will occur in the absence of the proposed project.
(5) Services to be provided to City residents as a result of the proposed project, or services to be sacrificed by City residents in the absence of the proposed project.

Policy: When the returns to the City from its investment in new development take the form of lease or tax revenues, such revenues should be earmarked for improving neighborhood areas.