CHART #2

METROPOLITAN AREAS	TOTAL POPULATION 1970	BLACK POPULATION 1970	GROWTH 1960-1970
GROUP #1			
New York	15,354,000	2,367,000	1,172,000
Los Angeles	9,588,000	824,000	2,036,000
TOTAL	24,942,000	3,191,000	3,208,000
GROUP #2			
Chicago	7,608,000	1,340,000	814,000
Philadelphia	4,816,000	844,000	473,000
Detroit	4,196,000	756,000	434,000
San Francisco	4,181,000	348,000	890,000
Washington	2,861,000	704,000	797,000
St. Louis	2,364,000	379,000	259,000
Baltimore	2,071,000	490,000	267,000
Houston	1,983,000	383,000	565,000
Miami	1,888,000	267,000	619,000
Dallas	1,556,000	249,000	437,000
Atlanta	1,390,000	311,000	373,000
TOTAL	34,914,000	6,071,000	5,928,000
GROUP #3			
Boston	2,754,000	127,000	159,000
Cleveland	2,064,000	333,000	155,000
Milwaukee	1,404,000	107,000	125,000
Cincinnati	1,385,000	152,000	127,000
Kansas City	1,254,000	151,000	161,000
Indianapolis	1,110,000	137,000	166,000
New Orleans	1,046,000	324,000	139,000
Tampa	1,013,000	109,000	241,000
Columbus	916,000	106,000	161,000
Louisville	827,000	101,000	102,000
Norfolk	681,000	168,000	102,000
TOTAL	14,454,000	1,815,000	1,638,000
GROUP #4			
Minneapolis	1,814,000	32,000	332,000
Seattle	1,422,000	42,000	315,000
San Diego	1,358,000	62,000	325,000
Denver	1,228,000	50,000	299,000
Portland	1,009,000	23,000	187,000
Phoenix	968,000	33,000	304,000
TOTAL	7,799,000	242,000	1,762,000
GROUP #5			
Rochester	883,000	58,000	150,000
San Antonio	864,000	60,000	148,000
Dayton	850,000	94,000	123,000
Sacramento	801,000	38,000	175,000
Fort Worth	762,000	83,000	189,000
Hartford	664,000	51,000	115,000
Honolulu	629,000	7,000	129,000
Salt Lake City	560,000	4,000	112,000
TOTAL	6,013,000	395,000	1,141,000

two per cent of the growth. (Chart II) These metropolitan areas are Boston, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Kansas City, Indianapolis, New Orleans, Tampa, Columbus, Louisville, and Norfolk.

Not all of these metropolitan areas require a satellite new community program of thirty thousand to one hundred thousand in size. In fact, some of the smaller areas could best be served by satellite neighborhoods of eight thousand to ten thousand people. It is not our purpose here to plan all of the metropolitan areas, but rather to emphasize the need for focusing on areas of urgent need with a concentration of people and problems.

A fourth category might consist of those metropolitan areas with substantial growth but relatively small black populations. Minneapolis, Seattle, San Diego, Phoenix, Denver, and Portland would make up this list. A satellite-new-communities program in these areas would relate to the goals of managing growth, rationalizing mass transportation, protecting the environment, and providing an alternative to ordinary subdivision development. Desegregation in these areas can readily be achieved by other measures.

A fifth category, very similar to the fourth, would include such smaller metropolitan areas as Rochester, San Antonio, Dayton, Sacramento, Fort Worth, Hartford, Honolulu, and Salt Lake City. They all had substantial growth and none of them had very large black populations. Some could use a desegregation program, and — while a satellite neighborhood program would undoubtedly be beneficial — the urgency and the scale of the need for such a program in these areas is minimal.

Cities like Pittsburgh and Buffalo form a category of their own. Each had an insignificant record of growth between 1960 and 1970. There would be very little reason for a new-communities program in these areas, unless possibly to provide for replacement of substandard units — which is, of course, a program quite different from the one I described here.

Amount of Land Needed

How much land, then, do we need for satellite new communities? The population of the United States as a whole grew by some 23,500,000 people between 1960 and 1970, and about fifteen million people were added to the metropolitan areas of over five hundred thousand in that period. As was noted, Congress expects the population to increase by another seventy-five million between 1970 and the year 2000, though some experts believe that a growth of fifty to sixty million is a more realistic figure in view of the declining birth rate. For our purposes, however, it is reasonable to assume that each of the metropolitan areas will grow by approximately three times the growth it experienced between 1960 and 1970, but at a declining rate.

In order to calculate how many new communities we will need, let us assume that only half the population growth in each metropolitan area should be accommodated in new satellite communities. The balance of the growth can fill up vacant land in existing suburbs or vacant industrial land in the cities (perhaps as new towns-in-town). Moreover, to anticipate population growth in these new satellite communities, land should be made available so that they can reach their ultimate size over a 30-year period. In that case, no additional land would be required to replace substandard housing, since the new units would originally be built with this purpose in mind. The substandard units thus vacated in the cities can themselves become the sites of new dwellings in the city.

A minimum new-satellite-community program would call for the acquisition of land in the metropolitan areas listed in Groups #1 through #3. One-half of the estimated population growth during the next 30 years in those areas amounts to approximately 16 million people. A maximum program, on the other hand, would involve acquiring land for satellite communities in all of the metropolitan areas listed in Groups #1 through #5. One-half of the estimated 30-year growth in these areas would amount to almost twenty-one million people.

At twenty-one people (or approximately six units) to the acre — a relatively low density — one million acres of land would be required to house twenty-one million people. The land, in appropriate locations, may cost from one thousand dollars to three thousand dollars per acre. Therefore, a maximum of only three billion dollars is required for the entire land acquisition program I have described. Even at lower densities, or with more land allocated for industrial parks and commercial use, three billion dollars should be adequate. The minimum program, of course, would cost even less.

At densities of thirty-three persons per acre (including land for recreational, commercial, industrial, and other uses) the program would cost at most two billion dollars. Densities, of course, will vary from one metropolitan area to another. In smaller metropolitan areas, available land for satellite neighbor-

hoods and communities will be less expensive and lower densities may be preferred, while land will be most expensive in areas like New York and Los Angeles, and therefore somewhat higher densities will be desirable.

Funds for land development are an initial expense rather than an annual expenditure, and the land ought to be resold for development at a profit. Moreover, three billion dollars spent once is a surprisingly small figure compared to the ten-billion-dollar *annual* expense of the federal government for housing.

Location of Satellite New Communities

The metropolitan areas most in need of a satellite-new-communities program have already been identified. The next problem to be considered is where, within each metropolitan area, should they be located? While each metropolitan area requires a specific plan in order to adequately answer that question, there are certain definable principles to be considered in the acquisition of land.

The first step is to determine where *not* to build. In this regard, one can do no better than to paraphrase David Wallace's list of *don'ts*:

☐ *Don't build on the ocean beach.* The shore and a substantial area next to it should be preserved in a natural state and be for public use and enjoyment.

☐ *Don't build at the river's edge or violate the riverside or the river's setting with inappropriate development.* The quality and quantity of clean water, a vital natural resource, flood control, and public enjoyment require application of controls in all areas of the river landscapes.

☐ *Don't build on flood plains except under strict controls.* Common sense (which doesn't usually prevail) would dictate limiting development where frequent floods occur.

☐ *Don't build on steep slopes or denude areas of forests.* Amenity and water management, both vital to future urbanization, argue for this caveat.

☐ *Don't build in areas of great recreational value or unique visual personality.* These areas can become the most valuable for people as open space close to urbanization.

☐ *Don't allow seriously harmful development in violation of principles of natural conservation to remain.* We must not be forever victims of mistakes of the past. Over time, uses that are clearly not in the public interest should be phased out, and nature reëstablished in our cities.

These environmental safeguards actually remove very little land from circulation in comparison with the total amount available. Even in the Atlantic Region, with its present low-density consumption rates, enough land is left after securing these lands to accommodate all the development anticipated for the next fifty years.

If the removal of certain lands from development defines part of the form which the metropolitan area will take, the rest is defined by the design of the transportation system. This element of the metropolitan plan should be considered next — not only because the nature of the transportation system will determine the location of the satellite new communities, but also because the existence or absence of a mass transportation system has a major impact on the employment opportunities available to their residents.

Automobiles serve only low-density areas efficiently. If sufficient streets and parking spaces are provided to accommodate the automobiles of all the residents of medium-density areas, very little land is left over for the buildings. More urban land is presently used for transportation facilities than for any other function outside of residential. Most suburban zoning codes now require two parking spaces per apartment unit or town house, and over two-thirds of the land area in a typical suburban shopping center is earmarked for parking. A typical community college usually provides about 150 square feet of parking space per student, or one parking space for every two students. Though not all neighborhood obsolescence can be attributed to the automobile, it is certainly true that no urban neighborhood or industrial area developed prior to World War II has the space or design to accommodate a majority of its residents traveling by auto.

In the past, mass transit has been largely built to catch up with population growth, since only high-density population centers can support it. However, both Stockholm and Toronto have shown us that mass transportation systems (in these instances, subways) can determine future growth. Unless the origin and destination of the transit system are in clustered locations, it is not possible to have a mass transit system at all. The automobile, on the other hand, lends itself rather to low- density, single-family housing. The process, then, is circular — the more expressways that are constructed, the more single-family homes are encouraged. Conversely, if subways or high-speed buses are provided, high-density developments are generated at their nodes. Since this ap-

pears to be one of the facts of life, good planning suggests that such subway stations or mass transit stops become the foci of new satellite communities with shopping, commercial, and municipal facilities, together with apartments, near the core, and single-family homes and townhouses located at the periphery.

A good deal of technological study has gone into the development of new mass transportation systems; it is not necessary at this stage to choose between them. It is sufficient to state that what is needed in most of our metropolitan areas is a series of new satellite communities linked to the central city and to each other by some form of high-speed mass transportation — whether it be subway, bus, monorail, or Gravity Vacuum Tube. Planning for transportation must be done simultaneously with determining the location of satellite communities, since each is closely related to the other.

In our larger metropolitan areas, the time now involved in traveling from one place to another exceeds the time devoted to any other single activity, except for sleep and education. The very least that will be accomplished by a good mass transportation system will be to provide inner-city residents with an opportunity to find their way quickly and inexpensively to the sites of the industrial jobs in outlying areas, while suburbanites similarly are able to commute to jobs downtown. Hopefully, if people eventually are able, through the development of new satellite communities, to live near their work, the total burden on the mass transportation system will be considerably diminished. It is even possible that recapturing those millions of hours of commuting time will contribute toward an improvement in the quality of life for the residents of both our cities and the new satellite communities.

The Inner City

This focus on metropolitan areas does not deny that rural problems such as poverty, hunger, disease, poor education, and substandard housing also require urgent attention. Our description of urban racism as a conflict of black and white, is but a simplification of a larger problem involving Spanish-speaking people, Indians, Appalachian whites, and other minority groups in many of our larger cities. And, finally, our emphasis on new satellite communities does not imply that inner-city housing problems should be neglected. Industries able to provide significant employment for ghetto residents should be induced to locate there. The test for the industrial use of the land relates to the number of jobs created per acre. Only a few industries will qualify. The Brooklyn Navy Yard is an example of land of this type. In more instances, the land will be suitable for construction of "new towns-in-town."

Until a sufficient number of satellite new communities are built to relieve crowding in the ghetto, emphasis there should not be on urban renewal programs that displace more persons than they accommodate, but on programs that seek to improve the quality of education, to reduce unemployment, and to give ghetto residents a voice in the public decisions that affect their lives. What should be built in the ghetto, now, are medical facilities, schools, libraries, neighborhood centers, and adult job-training facilities. After satellite new communities have relieved the pressure of overcrowding, substandard housing in the ghetto can be eliminated, and "new towns-in-town" can be built on the vacated land. With overcrowding ended, ghetto rents and the artificially high value of slum buildings will decrease.

Creation of new satellite communities can serve as the catalyst for economic and social solutions to the nation's urban problems. Current policies and legislation, however, do not provide for these communities in sufficient number . . . in the most critical locations . . . or in a manner that will assure desegregation. Consequently, I have suggested a program of land acquisition now by an agency of the federal government. Most of the land needed could be acquired within two years of the passage of the necessary legislation through the government's power of eminent domain.

I am aware of the inevitable resistance to the idea of removing one million acres of land from private control by this method. But historic precedents for federal land utilization in the public interest exist. Land grants to colleges expanded public education; additional grants to railroads opened the west. And contemporary administrations have continued to acquire land for other public purposes such as construction of highways, slum clearance and urban renewal. I have tried to demonstrate that the creation of satellite communities by federal land acquisition would give us a new arena for the solution of our most critical urban problems. I believe that no other domestic public purpose deserves a higher priority.

Mr. Weissbourd, a member of the Board of Directors of the Center, is president of Metropolitan Structures, Inc., of Chicago.

About the Center...

☐ The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to clarifying basic issues and widening the circle of their discussion and understanding. It was founded in 1959 as the principal activity of the Fund for the Republic. It is supported by contributions from more than 100,000 members who give amounts ranging from $15 to $1,000 and more a year. (Contributions in excess of $10 are tax-deductible.)

☐ Members receive bi-monthly *The Center Magazine* containing articles, essays, discussions, symposia, and interviews drawn from the Center's continuing program. On alternate months members receive *The Center Report* containing information on the Center's personnel and activities, including the various studies planned and in progress.

☐ Audio tapes — in either cassette or open-reel format — of selected Center dialogues (edited for classroom, seminar, and broadcast use) are also available to members at cost.

☐ Center studies that have received wide attention in recent years include those on the Vietnam war, the technological revolution, student unrest, the American character, the corporation, the requirements for peace, the oceans as the common heritage of mankind, the American Constitution, a world constitution, the mass-communications media, and the university.

A first-year introductory membership in the Center is $10. Checks can be sent to the address below. Or, if more information on the work of the Center is desired, inquiries can be sent to the same address.

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS
Box 4546, Santa Barbara, California 93103