The research and studies forming the basis for the report were conducted pursuant to a contract between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the National League of Cities. The substance of such research is dedicated to the public. The author and publisher are solely responsible for the accuracy of statements or interpretations contained herein.

FINAL REPORT

ALTERNATIVE STUDY; MODEL CITIES PHASE-OUT/ COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PHASE-IN

for

Atlanta Urban Observatory
City of Atlanta

prepared by

J. Banks, Co-Principal Investigator
G. J. Thuesen, Co-Principal Investigator
School of Industrial and Systems Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology

October 31, 1973

ABSTRACT

TITLE:	Alternative Study; Model Cities Phase-Out/Community Development Phase-In
AUTHOR:	Dr. Jerry Banks and Dr. G. J. Thuesen, Co-Principal Investigators
SUBJECT:	An investigation of alternative means of preparing Atlanta for community development revenue sharing funds considering the possible termination of federal funding for Model Cities and the change in the structure of Atlanta city government resulting from the new charter.
DATE:	October 31, 1973
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY	Atlanta Urban Observatory Office of the Mayor City of Atlanta
SOURCE OF COPIES:	Georgia Institute of Technology and NTIS
HUD PROJECT NUMBER:	H-987
NUMBER OF PAGES:	37
ABSTRACT:	Alternative means of organizing particular departments within Atlanta city government along with two agencies facing eminent loss of federal support were investigated with respect to proposed federal community development revenue sharing legislation. Specific recommendations are presented regarding the utilization of Atlanta Model Cities staff and shifting the Urban Redevelopment Division of the Atlanta Housing Authority to city government. In addition, recommendations dealing with new and expanded responsibilities for the City planning activity are presented. These recommendations are based on the investigation of previous planning activities, the relationship of planning to federal revenue sharing legislation and the impact of the new city charter on the future responsibilities of planning in Atlanta city government.

CONTENTS

		Page
1.0	Executive Summary	1
1.1	General	1
1.2	Recommendations	1
2.0	Statement of the Problem	1
3.0	Approach	5
3.1	General	5
3.2	Interaction with City Administrators	6
3.3	Review of the Literature	6
3.4	Interviews	7
3.5	Information about Other Cities	8
3.6	Visits with HUD	9
3.7	Visits with Congressional Staff	9
4.0	Recommendation: It Is Recommended that a Department of Community Planning be Created.	9
4.1	General	9
4.2	Functions	10
4.3	Justification	16
4.4	Implementation	18
5.0	Recommendation: It is Recommended that A Department of Community Improvement be Created.	19
5.1	General	19
5.2	Functions	19
5.3	Justification	20
5.4	Implementation	25

Page

6.0 Recommendation: It Is Recommended that the Finance Department Become a Staff Activity Reporting Directly to the Mayor. . . . 30

7.0 Recommendation: It is Recommended that the Staff of the Atlanta Model Cities Program Be Integrated into the Operations of the City. . . 30

7.1 General 30

7.2 Findings. 30

7.3 Recommendations 32

7.4 Implementation. 33

8.0 Areas of Future Study. 36

8.1 General 36

8.2 Improvement of the Planning Process 36

8.3 Transfer of AHA to the City 36

8.4 Organizational Improvements 36

8.5 Experimental Citizen Participation. 37

FINAL REPORT

ALTERNATIVE STUDY; MODEL CITIES PHASE-OUT/
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PHASE-IN

1.0 Executive Summary.

1.1 General. On March 23, 1973, the Atlanta Urban Observatory contracted with the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering of Georgia Tech to recommend alternative policies and organizational structures for dealing with the phase-out of the Model Cities Program and the phase-in of Community Development Revenue Sharing. This report is the result of that research effort.

1.2 Recommendations. The report makes a number of recommendations concerning a restructuring of City government. Within the report, the recommendations are justified and necessary implementation activities are discussed.

.1 Department of Community Planning. It is recommended that a Department of Community Planning (DCP) be created to furnish the means for identifying community needs, developing community goals and objectives, and preparing comprehensive development plans. The DCP will be a staff department.

.2 Department of Community Improvement. It is recommended that a Department of Community Improvement (DCI) be created to conduct urban renewal and land acquisition/deposition. The report suggests the functions of zoning administration/enforcement and code enforcement (existing housing structures) as alternative additional assignments of the DCI. The DCI will be an operating (line) department.

.3 Atlanta Model Cities. If federal funding for CDA's ceases, it is recommended that the Atlanta Model Cities staff be disbanded as a defined entity or agency of City government. The Model Cities staff should be utilized within City government where opportunities exist.

2.0 Statement of the Problem.

On March 23, 1973, the Atlanta Urban Observatory contracted with the

School of Industrial and Systems Engineering of Georgia Tech to recommend alternative policies and organizational structures for dealing with the phase-out of the Model Cities program and the initiation of Community Development Revenue Sharing (CDRS). This project began April 1, 1973 and ended October 31, 1973.

The problem faced by the researchers has been multifaceted since there are presently a variety of federal funding arrangements that affect community development in Atlanta. Present funding consists primarily of categorical grants that are directed to a myriad of governmental, paragovernmental and private agencies, at the City, County and State level. These categorical grants are usually designated for specific purposes such as low cost housing, urban renewal, open space development and water and sewer projects. The current federal administration has been advocating the revenue sharing concept of providing federal monies to locally fund a variety of community development activities. Under this concept, block grants are to be allocated by formula to municipalities so that it becomes the responsibility of local government to develop priorities for the judicious application of these funds. Congress seems to be in general agreement with this approach.

Congress has taken the position that Community Development Revenue Sharing will not be approved until a housing bill has been signed. The administration's housing bill was presented to Congress in September, 1973 so at this time CDRS remains an unknown. Added to this uncertainty is the withholding of appropriated funds by the President. Thus, until this position is clarified by the courts one cannot be assured that the funds appropriated by Congress will actually be spent.

This study was undertaken with the presumption that the preponderance of categorical grants would be terminated. Operating under this assumption, the research team focused on those agencies that would be most affected. Both the Model Cities program and the Urban Redevelopment Division of the Atlanta Housing Authority appear to be near the end of their categorical funding. The urban renewal activity in Atlanta will be without any federal funding after July 1, 1974 while the Model Cities program is to be ended

not later than June 30, 1975. However, the Administration has indicated that it will attempt to accelerate the phase-out of Model Cities.

The courses of action regarding the disposition of the Model Cities and urban renewal activities are closely tied to the pending CDRS legislation. However, it is clear that whatever action Congress finally initiates will mean a radical change in the way cities work with the federal government. As a result Atlanta will find itself with new and expanded responsibilities. What these responsibilities might be was reported in Nation's Cities, July, 1973. This report was a summary of seven regional conferences for municipal officials in which they were asked to consider what the proposed community development block grant approach of the Better Communities Act (BCA), the Administration version of CDRS, would mean to their cities. The following are quotations from this report:

1) Shift in Political Accountability. The city council will have a new responsibility to express community development priorities. The new concept will mean a local balancing of the demands for relatively scarce resources among competing interests. With the demise of existing categorical programs, there will be a scramble to city hall; it will be "agency against agency, citizen against citizen, and all against the council," one group said.
2) Expansion of the Scope of Municipal Services. BCA will mean that the local unit of general purpose government will be expanding its scope of services through taking direct responsibility for social and physical development activities that, in many cases, were previously carried out by quasi-independent agencies or were not performed at all.
3) Changes in Planning and Management Processes. The most dominant theme throughout the conferences was the recognition by city officials that BCA will make it imperative that all cities develop a new process of management and staff capacity for policy planning, program development, and evaluation. This capacity generally does not exist today. This requirement for new capacity will mean changes not only for the new program but will affect the management structure for all municipal functions.

4) Opportunities for Administrative Reorganization. City officials see BCA as providing new opportunities for local government to restructure and redesign administrative organization, reallocate functions and reorient the departments and agencies toward municipal goals and objectives.

5) Greater Citizen Participation in Municipal Government. Municipal executives assume that BCA will mean that citizen participation of the type pioneered by Community Action and Model Cities programs will continue and become a part of program administration. This will mean involvement of citizens in the process of problem identification and priority setting and in development and implementation of the programs. Some foresee that citizen participation will demand a sharpening of requirements for effective evaluation as well. Elimination of federal guidelines on citizen participation also will allow a new and welcome flexibility.

6) Improved Intergovernmental Cooperation. Municipal officials foresee that BCA will stimulate a new dynamic for solving regional problems by giving cities control over flexible funds which will provide them a new freedom to develop regional solutions to problems unfettered by the federal vertical administrative process. BCA also will mean that cities will have to get changes in the state government for enabling legislation and to seek improved coordination for community development activities with state plans for use of federal assistance programs in transportation, health, education, and welfare.

Much has been written about the Better Communities Act as it represents the Administration's position regarding Community Development Revenue Sharing. Since this bill was submitted on April 19, 1973, Congress has increased its resistance to the BCA proposal. It now seems that the legislation most likely to be passed will be more of a compromise between the Senate and House versions of community development revenue sharing.

There are differences between the Congressional bills and the Administration's Better Communities Act. It seems that Congress is more reluctant

to allocate funds with few strings attached. Therefore, in the House and Senate bills there are more application and reporting requirements and HUD would be given more power to terminate funding if it appeared that the funds were not contributing to the achievement of plans or national goals.

A major difference between BCA and the Senate bill is that the administration bill proposes to terminate the Model Cities program while the Senate bill contemplated the eventual inclusion of that program into Community Development Revenue Sharing. Since both the House and Senate bills are still in committee the specific content of these bills remains uncertain. However, the observation can be made that it will be quite unlikely that community development revenue sharing legislation will become effective before January 1, 1975, or perhaps July 1, 1975.

Another primary concern of the research team was the fact that Atlanta will be instituting a new Charter on January 1, 1974. The new Charter specifies certain organizational functions that must be carried out by specific organizational units. Therefore the team was directed to consider how Atlanta's response to the termination of categorical grants and proposed federal revenue sharing legislation could best be accomplished in light of the provisions of the new City Charter.

3.0 Approach

3.1 General. The research that led to the solution of the problems defined in Section 2.0 was performed in a systematic manner. A team was formed consisting of two faculty members and two graduate research assistants. The first item of business was the preparation and submission of an adequate research design. The proposed design was submitted on May 2, 1973. The research design was approved on June 14, 1973, subject to the addition of one program element concerning the preparation of ordinances to implement the recommendations of the research. The researchers have attempted to follow the design as closely as possible. However, the passage of time has resolved some of the work activities and created others. The research reported herein is the best solution possible to the problems perceived by the team subject to constraints on time and money.

In the following sub-sections some of the specific activities are discussed in very general terms. The purpose of this discussion is to give the reader a concept of the manner in which the research was conducted.

3.2 Interaction with City Administrators. The team interacted with the Director of the Urban Observatory and the Chief Administrative Officer throughout the conduct of the research. This interaction was both by written correspondence and through meetings. The purpose of the interaction was for information, direction, and the resolution of conflicting positions. These latter mentioned conflicts were between team members or through misunderstanding information provided by a source. At every instance the previously mentioned members of the Mayor's staff were candid and completely willing to give of their time and creative efforts toward the solution of the research problem.

Several written documents were prepared in conjunction with the team interaction with the Mayor's Office. "Community Development Issues" dated June 25, 1973, presented a set of ten issues which the team described as requiring resolution in order to bring the research to completion. "Proposed Department of Community Development: A Position Paper" dated July 17, 1973, was offered in later response to the discussion of "Community Development Issues." The team correspondence file contains numerous memoranda for record that served as a reference to the many conferences held with staff members of the Mayor's Office.

3.3 Review of the Literature. The earliest activity performed by the research team was the orientation of the members. This background material included a broad range of subjects as indicated by the following items:

1) Various special revenue sharing bills that have been proposed and the materials that have been prepared to describe the several companion bills.
2) Various written materials concerning the Model Cities program including recent evaluations, descriptive materials, and newspaper articles.

3) Consultant reports, and self prepared documents that describe paragovernmental agencies in Atlanta, e.g. Atlanta Housing Authority, Economic Opportunity Atlanta.
4) Documents that have been prepared concerning the reorganization of Atlanta.
5) Materials from other cities concerning community development and human resources, e.g. Milwaukee, New York, Chicago, Greenville.
6) Documents prepared by HUD under the title "Community Development Evaluation Series."
7) Documents prepared by the National League of Cities.

Reference material was brought to the attention of the research team throughout the conduct of the project. Documents were annotated, given a reference number, and entered into the files.

3.4 Interviews. Interviews with persons affecting and affected by the implications of the research were conducted. One purpose for conducting these interviews was to provide a better insight for the research team concerning the manner in which the City functions. A second purpose was to obtain input from various persons about their desires concerning community development in Atlanta. The statements of the respondents had great weight in the recommendations forwarded in this document. A recognized potential source of error lies in the fact that some of the interviews were abbreviated. However, in a number of cases, several interviews, either increasing in depth of subject matter, or, for added information, were conducted.

Interviews were conducted with persons representative of various facets of the city as follows:

1) Representative of Citizens and Citizen Groups
   - Mrs. Martha Weems, Chairman
     Model Cities Mass Convention
   - Ms. Susie LaBord
   - Col. Malcolm Jones
     Citizens Advisory Council for Urban Development

2) Representatives of the Political Structure

- Alderman Wade Mitchell
- Alderwoman Panke Bradley

3) Representatives of Paragovernmental Agencies

- Mr. William A. Allison, Executive Director
  Mr. Amos Parker
  Economic Opportunity Atlanta
- Mr. Ed Sterne, Chairman of the Board
  Mr. Les Persells, Executive Director
  Mr. Jim Henley, Director, Urban Redevelopment
  Atlanta Housing Authority
- Mr. Harry West, Executive Director
  Atlanta Regional Commission
- Mr. Paul Bellows, Executive Director
  Research Atlanta

4) Representatives of City Agencies

- Mr. Davey Gibson, Acting Director
  Mr. Roy Norman
  Mr. Sam Russell
  Atlanta Model Cities
- Mr. Charles Davis, Director
  Mr. Richard Stogner
  Department of Finance
- Mr. William Wofford, Director
  Mr. Norman Koplon
  Department of Building
- Mr. Collier Gladin, Director
  Mr. George Aldridge
  Mr. Pierce Mahoney
  Department of Planning
- Mr. George Barnes
  Department of Public Works
- Mr. Paul Ivey
  City Land Agent

3.5 Information about Other Cities. A number of cities throughout the United States have taken steps to prepare for revenue sharing. The team visited with the Metropolitan Development Agency (MDA) in Tampa, Florida. It was learned that the Executive Director of the MDA has as his goal the allocation of most of the agency activities to new or existing departments within city government.

The cities of Greenville, South Carolina and Athens, Georgia, have

undergone studies that have suggested similar reorganization of their governmental structure. The proposal is unsatisfactory for Atlanta in that super agencies would be created serving to isolate the mayor from line agencies. A study for the City of Milwaukee was conducted with similar conclusions reached by the research team.

3.6 Visits with HUD. To better understand the legislative proposal of the administration and to obtain a more accurate prediction on the timing of the implementation of the legislation, visits were made to HUD at its various offices as follows:

- Mr. Ralph Johnson, Director of Operations Division
  Mr. Fred Russell, Assistant Director for Planning & Relocation
  HUD Area Office
- Mr. John Edmunds, Assistant Regional Administrator for Community Development
  Mr. Henry Bankston
  HUD Regional Office
- Mr. Patrick Henry, Executive Assistant to Warren Butler
  Mr. Don Dodge, Director of Evaluation
  Office of Community Development
  HUD Headquarters

In addition, the team attended a meeting sponsored by the HUD area office concerning the Better Communities Act.

3.7 Visits with Congressional Staff. To obtain a balanced view of the proposed and potential legislation, visits were made to congressional staff in Washington as follows:

- Mr. Ray James
  House Housing Sub-Committee
- Mr. Bob Malokoff
  Senate Housing Sub-Committee

4.0 Recommendation: It Is Recommended that a Department of Community Planning be Created.

4.1 General. The Department of Community Planning (DCP) must furnish the means for identifying community needs, developing community goals and objectives, and preparing comprehensive development plans. To assure the reasonableness of plans developed, this Department must work closely with the Department of Finance so that the cost implications of the plans under consideration are fully understood. In addition to preparing a guide for the growth and development of the City, the

DCP should be aware of all state and federal funding activities while providing liaison for Community Development Revenue Sharing funds. The Department of Community Planning must provide access to those interested in information regarding the City's current plans while also making available, on request, any information pertinent to the development of those plans. Lastly, the DCP should be the focus for requests by citizens and others regarding current City data.

It is essential that the DCP operate as a staff group reporting directly to the Mayor. This organizational recommendation is based on the services to be provided by the Department of Community Planning and the working relationships required among the Department of Finance, the Mayor, and the Council. The proposed staff activity represents the potential for a comprehensive planning capability that will provide the Mayor with a sound basis for the setting of priorities for Atlanta's development.

It is recommended that the functions described in the following paragraphs be incorporated in the Department of Community Planning. Each of the general functions are subdivided into more specific functions which are then described by listing the types of activities required for their performance.

4.2 Functions.

4.2.1. Comprehensive Physical, Social and Economic Planning. This function, in its broadest sense, gives the Department of Community Planning the responsibility for long and short range planning encompassing all aspects of City living. Thus, the DCP will be involved with planning for housing, transportation, recreation, land use, economic opportunity and social services. It is believed that the DCP will initially emphasize physical planning until the need for social and economic planning becomes evident and the capability of the Department is strengthened in these areas.

(1) Identification of Community Needs. The Department of Community Planning should provide the mechanisms for

assessing the needs of the City through the direct involvement of its citizens.

(A) Citizen Participation. The Department of Community Planning will develop the procedures and provide the manpower to incorporate citizen participation in the City's planning process. In addition, the DCP will coordinate all other citizen participation activities that are occuring within the line functions of City government.

A variety of approaches should be utilized to provide an accurate assessment of the feelings and attitudes of the City's citizens. These approaches should provide reliable information, but more importantly they must provide the initiative for citizen participation. Thus, it is the DCP's responsibility to not only record citizen input but to actively promote citizen involvement in planning activities. Such approaches might include the activities described in the following paragraphs.

[1] Permanent Advisory Groups.

(a) The DCP could fund advocacy planners who represent geographic areas or communities within the City.

(b) The DCP could provide resources and assistance to those citizens groups that are attempting to organize.

(c) The DCP should develop methods for eliciting the comments of existing citizen groups on a regular basis.

[2] Public Hearings. The DCP should have the responsibility for communicating the time and place of city, state and federal hearings that impact on the citizens of Atlanta. In addition, public hearings related to the development

of the Comprehensive Development Plan and the Zoning Plan should be instituted and operated by the department.

[3] Citizen Surveys. The Department of Community Planning should initiate surveys and polls on a regular basis to furnish a broad based understanding of the attitudes of Atlanta's citizens.

[4] Direct Input of Individual Ideas. Direct telephone access should be provided to any citizen that wishes to express his ideas regarding the City's goals, plans, and direction. This activity would be a listening post concerned with overall planning of the City.

(B) Community Needs Assessment. The DCP should develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive data that would assist in the identification of community needs. Such data might include the number of units of substandard housing, number of unemployed, miles of substandard streets, etc.

[1] Data Supplied by Agencies and City Departments. There are numerous agencies and operating Departments providing both money and services to the citizens of Atlanta. These agencies are an excellent source of data that would be essential for a systematic evaluation of the community's needs. The Department of Community Planning must identify these information sources and it should be the DCP's responsibility for incorporating this information in the planning process.

[2] Data Developed by the Department of Community Planning. In addition to the information sources outside the DCP, it is essential that a permanent data base be established and maintained by the Department. This data base

would include those selected statistics that would be frequently used to assess the needs of the City in general terms. The information base would include data resulting from citizen participation, the information supplied by participating agencies and other City Departments, and information developed by the staff of the DCP.

(2) Development of Community Objectives. Once the community needs have been identified, the Department of Community Planning will have the responsibility for developing the overall objectives that the City must realize in order to provide for these needs. These objectives would be worked out with the Mayor and the Council. The general objectives would be furnished on a one year, five year and fifteen year basis as they will provide the guide for the Comprehensive Development Plan.

(3) Preparation of the Comprehensive Development Plan. Based on the general objectives previously developed, the Department of Community Planning must coordinate with all affected City Departments and other agencies to determine the programs by which the City's objectives can be realistically accomplished.

(A) Development of Program Objectives. The Department of Community Planning should review and evaluate all programs proposed by line Departments so that the Mayor and Council have a thorough understanding of the implications of each program as they relate to the overall objectives of the City.

(B) Priority Setting for Specific Programs. The Department of Community Planning, through its interaction with the Finance Department, Mayor, Council, and other Departments of the City, should provide a list of priorities for the proposed programs. This list should be prepared on a one year, five year, and fifteen year basis so that it will be incorporated

into the Comprehensive Development Plan.

(C) Program Implementation and Monitoring. The Department of Community Planning should develop and monitor a schedule associated with the realization of the general objectives of the City. This coordinative activity would assure that the individual program schedules are in accordance with the overall schedule for realizing the City's goals.

(D) Program Evaluation. The Department of Community Planning must have the capability to post audit the individual programs to determine their effectiveness and contribution to the overall objectives of the City. The program evaluation would be coordinated by the DCP with the detailed evaluation performed by those line Departments actually responsible for the implementation of the project.

4.2.2. State and Federal Funding Liaison. The DCP should have an overview of all sources and uses of funds provided by external agencies for the operation of the City. The DCP should provide resources and assistance to enhance the City's likelihood of receiving additional outside funds.

(1) Determine New Sources and Requirements for Funding. A continuing activity of the DCP should be the search for potential sources of external funds. In addition, the requirements for receiving these funds must be recorded and communicated to the affected Departments so that they can prepare the appropriate response.

(2) Maintain a Current Data Base Concerning Current and Pending State and Federal Funding. The Department of Community Planning should be able to answer questions concerning types of funding, amount of funding available, and other pertinent general matters. The DCP should refer detailed questions about external funding to the City Department or agency responsible for preparing applications for these funds.

(3) Coordinate Federal Revenue Sharing Funds. Community Development Revenue Sharing Funds coming to the City will affect a broad range of activities within the City. The Department of Community Planning should provide the support required to receive these funds. This support should include the following activities:

(A) Determine Revenue Sharing Requirements.

(B) Prepare Applications for Revenue Sharing.

(C) Prepare Reports Required by Revenue Sharing.

(4) Assist in the Preparation of Legislation. In many instances the overview and information available to those in the Department of Community Planning will be valuable in the preparation of legislation. The DCP should support such activities on an as needed basis.

4.2.3. Provision of Access to City Information. Since the Department of Community Planning should have the most comprehensive view of City operations, it is appropriate that this Department become the focus for information concerning the City's direction and operation. Most of this type of information is available in the individual Departments and therefore the Department of Community Planning would act as a referral service rather than develop a comprehensive data base of its own. This activity should be coordinated with the citizen participation activities of the DCP. Specific activities might include:

(1) Providing factual information concerning the plans for Atlanta and its quality of life.

(A) Providing information regarding plans and planning activities.

[1] Published reports describing plans such as the major throughfare plan.

[2] Documentation of information utilized in the development of City plans.

[3] Reports listing community priorities, goals and schedules describing the anticipated timing related to the realization of those goals.

(B) Providing statistical information pertaining to Atlanta and the metropolitan area.

[1] Census information.

[2] Survey of housing characteristics.

(C) Providing general reference information.

[1] Municipal yearbooks.

[2] Literature concerned with urban problems.

(2) Providing a referral service that indicates how to obtain information concerning activities undertaken by other Departments within City government.

4.2.4. Self-Improvement of Community Planning Capability. The process by which the City develops the Comprehensive Development Plan should be improved on a continuous basis. It should be the responsibility of the DCP to investigate methods and techniques that could improve the planning process. Presently 701 funds provided by HUD for planning and management assistance can be used to support this type of activity.

4.3 Justification.

4.3.1. The City of Atlanta Must Have the Ability to Undertake Comprehensive Physical, Social and Economic Planning. At present there is no comprehensive planning group functioning within the City government structure. The present Planning Department focuses on special projects (such as the impact studies related to the location of MARTA stations) which are generally funded from outside sources.

The only comprehensive control presently being exerted on the City's programs is within the budgeting process administered by the Finance Department. The present process fails to systematically develop objectives and programs to meet those objectives. The single overiding criterion for program justification has become an economic one. Thus, it is important that a more comprehensive approach be undertaken.

4.3.2. The proposed Department of Community Planning Should Be a Staff Function Responsible to the Mayor. By organizing the Department of Community Planning and the Department of Finance

as staff groups, interaction should occur in a more balanced manner. (Budgeting should not be isolated from program development and visa versa.) The proposed change in organizational structure is designed to help mitigate the present imbalance between budgeting and planning.

The Department of Community Planning must provide an overview of City activities and it must be free to interact with all the operating (line) Departments in City government. This ability to coordinate and assess the direction the City is moving can be realized only if the Department of Community Planning is a staff function reporting directly to the Mayor.

All operating Departments should be line functions with responsibilities for program implementation. A more distinct separation of staff and line functions should increase the overall effectiveness of City government.

4.3.3. The Department of Community Planning Must Develop and Implement the Planning Process by which the Comprehensive Development Plan is Prepared. There is an awareness among Department heads, political leaders and administrative personnel of the critical need within City government for a coordinated, long and short range comprehensive planning effort. Present decisions are generally made without a systematic development of objectives and evaluation of the options available. Increasing the scope of planning activities within City government will help ameliorate this situation leading to governmental action that is based on a sound planning process.

The new City Charter approved March 1973, directs the Mayor to prepare a one year, five year and fifteen year Comprehensive Development Plan. Thus, comprehensive planning must become a normal function of City government. The preparation of these documents should be the responsibility of the proposed Department of Community Planning.

4.3.4. The Department of Community Planning Should be a New Department. The Department of Community Planning should be a newly constituted function within City government. Since the proposed scope of the DCP is much broader than the present Planning Department, it is recommended that a new department be formed rather than upgrading the existing Planning Department. The formulation of a new department will emphasize the new and stronger role that the Department of Community Planning should play in Atlanta government.

In addition, the citizen participation activities should increase the visibility of the new DCP allowing it the opportunity to develop a rapport with all citizens of Atlanta. At present, certain power blocks and special interest groups have access to City government through political arrangements. This is not to say that these relationships are illegitimate. However, in addition to the special interest groups the City needs participation by citizens who cannot afford the time or money to organize.

4.4 Implementation.

.1 Staffing. The Department of Community Planning will perform functions not presently provided by City government. Thus, it will be necessary to hire additional persons with the appropriate professional background. The most logical first source of personnel would be those currently employed by the present Department of Planning. These people possess many of the qualifications necessary for the successful operation of the expanded planning activities in the new DCP. In fact, they presently perform some of the functions recommended for the new Department.

Additional manpower may be provided by those presently employed in the Model Cities program. Since certain Model Cities personnel have been involved in comprehensive planning and citizen participation activities, their experience and capability would be a valuable addition to the Department of Community Planning.

.2 Schedule. The creation of a new department with new functions

and a shifting of staff requires a transition period so that operating procedures can be standardized. It is anticipated that such a transition period would last at least one year and it is likely to be two years before the Department of Community Planning could perform all the tasks that it has been assigned. Such a lengthy transition time will allow for an orderly expansion of activities without loss of effectiveness in the activities presently being performed.

Two major activities that will immediately confront the new DCP would be the preparation of the one year, five year, and fifteen year Comprehensive Development Plan and the preparation of the Zoning Plan. Within one to two years the coordinative activities associated with Community Development Revenue Sharing will be an additional responsibility that must be undertaken. Citizen participation activities must begin immediately with a continuous effort to improve and expand that activity.

5.0 Recommendation: It is Recommended that A Department of Community Improvement be Created.

5.1 General. The objective of the Department of Community Improvement (DCI) is the dynamic physical improvement of the City. The operations are related to changes, particularly in the removal of unsafe structures, the removal of urban blight and deterioration, the acquisition of lands for parks, recreation and renewal, and in insuring that the intentions of the City fathers, with respect to land use, are maintained.

This section of the report discusses the functions of the DCI in rather general terms, since the functions are currently being performed by existing agencies. The justification for the DCI is mainly a set of individual justifications for the transfer of existing agencies or components to the DCI. The implementation activities related to the creation of the DCI mainly concern the staffing patterns and movements.

5.2 Functions. The Department of Community Improvement, a line department,

would have functions A and B, shown in Exhibit 1. The functions in Exhibit 1 are those currently existing within operating agencies. Hence, no amplification is made here. Functions C and D have been considered by the research team. However, the data base from which the team has prepared the final report precludes a decision in which full confidence rests. Rather, a set of considerations have been prepared. Those responsible for organizing the City government under the new charter are asked to include additional considerations then make a decision concerning the inclusion or exclusion of Zoning Administration and Enforcement and Code Enforcement (Existing Housing Structures) in the DCI.

Function A, Urban Renewal, is essentially a function to be transferred from the Atlanta Housing Authority. Function B, is essentially the removal of the Land Department to the DCI in combination with a function transferred from AHA. Function C, Zoning Administration, is essentially the removal of certain activities conducted by the old Department of Planning, and nominally the Department of Building to the DCI. Function D, Code Enforcement (Existing Housing Structures), is essentially accomplished by removal of a similar function from the Department of Building. The inclusion of Functions A, B, C, and D, or the subset of Functions A and B, would form a line department whose mission is truly the physical improvement of the community.

5.3 Justification. The justification for the DCI is based principally on the justification of the individual statements appearing in the previous section. In general terms, there is a need for a line agency that will concern itself with the dynamic improvement and maintenance of the community. This is particularly true with the advent of revenue sharing in which elements of City government and paragovernmental agencies will no longer be funded directly by the federal government. The continuation of important functions like urban renewal will be enhanced by departmental status within City government. The urban renewal function will form a nucleus about which similar and supporting functions (currently performed as on-going activities) will congregate.

Exhibit 1

Functions of the Department of Community Improvement

A. Urban Renewal

1. Project planning
2. Relocation
3. Family services
4. Central maintenance
5. Citizen participation in project areas
6. Rehabilitation of businesses and residences
7. Clearance, demolition, and removal

B. Land Acquisition and Deposition

1. Acquisition of land and easements to land for renewal, State highways, and City purposes other than that of the Board of Education
2. Lease preparation necessary to functions of other City Departments
3. Management of City owned property other than property owned by the Board of Education
4. Disposition of excess property
5. Maintenance of leases on all City owned property
6. Solicitation of appraisals
7. Administrative matters necessary to the preparation of a file on property to be condemned on the basis of eminent domain

C. Zoning Administration and Enforcement

1. Receipt of applications for special use and zoning
2. Review of applications with respect to form and compliance
3. Referral of applications to other City Departments
4. Submission of applications to the Planning Board
5. Notification of impending hearings
6. Update, maintenance and transfer of information
7. Inspection related to zoning compliance

D. Code Enforcement (Existing Housing Structures)

1. Enforcement area scheduling
2. Inspection of dwelling units
3. Interaction with property owners to obtain voluntary compliance
4. Preparation of files for the court in pursuit of compliance

The remaining justification is treated by stating an activity which should be implanted within the DCI then presenting some important considerations related to that statement. In two cases, the research team has not taken a final position on a statement. However, a number of considerations are listed.

5.3.1. The function of Urban Renewal Should be Transferred from the Atlanta Housing Authority to the Department of Community Improvement.

(1) Under the charter to be implemented January 1, 1974, the Mayor is responsible for implementing the comprehensive plan as adopted. Control is increased and enhanced by locating all operating elements as line agencies within City government. The DCI is designed to contain all the functions necessary for redevelopment and provides a means to help implement the comprehensive plan.

(2) Public agencies and functions should be responsible to elected officials. The renewal function, as it is currently located, is within the purview of a paragovernmental agency (AHA) and as a matter of policy, is inappropriately located.

(3) It is deemed important that if renewal is to remain viable in Atlanta, it should be in a position to compete for block grant funds. By creating urban renewal within DCI, this competitive position is strengthened.

(4) The DCI depends on its Redevelopment Division for its strength and cohesion. Renewal contributes cohesion to the DCI by tying together the other divisions of DCI.

(5) At the present time, the renewal process is as follows:

> After the City designates an area to be improved the project planning is performed by the Technical Services Department of the Urban Redevelopment Division of AHA. The land is surveyed by contract and purchased by the Real Estate Department of the Urban Redevelopment Division of AHA. The plan is implemented in accordance with zoning regulations and through the efforts of the Rehabilitation Department or the Property Management and Demolition Department of the Urban Redevelopment Division of AHA.

From this statement, it is seen that a good deal of interaction with the City is required for smooth operation of the renewal function. This cooperation would be enhanced by making urban renewal a part of City government. In addition, the DCI contains the functions necessary to redevelopment and eliminates duplication by AHA of land acquisition activities.

(6) At the present time renewal is located within the Atlanta Housing Authority. AHA is an agent of the City as permitted in Georgia Code 69-1115. Atlanta's redevelopment and renewal activities were placed in AHA by resolution (adopted by the Board of Aldermen, September 19, 1955, approved September 21, 1955). The opinion of the City Attorney and also of the legal counsel for AHA is that the Urban Redevelopment Division of AHA can be removed from AHA by renouncing the empowering resolution mentioned above.

(7) The employees associated with urban renewal will receive job security as employees of the City.

5.3.2. Land Acquisition and Deposition Should be Located within the Department of Community Improvement.

(1) The Real Estate Department of the Urban Redevelopment Division of AHA duplicates, in part, the activity of the City Land Department. The functions of both departments are land acquisition and disposition. These departments should be merged and consolidated into the DCI.

(2) After an initialization period, efficiencies of operation should be realized.

(3) Placing the Land Department within the DCI locates it so that close coordination with the Urban Renewal Division (of the DCI) is possible.

(4) The proposed structure is consistent with that of the Model Cities process which has strong intuitive appeal.

(5) The City Land Agent is in agreement with the relocation of the City Land Department into the DCI.

5.3.3. (Alternative) The Functions of Zoning Administration and Enforcement Should Be Transferred from the Old Department of Planning and the Department of Building to the Department of Community Improvement. As stated in Section 4.2.1., this potential transfer creates an alternative for the decision makers. The following set of considerations have been formulated by the research team:

(1) Zoning administration accounts for about 20% of the activities of the present Planning Department. The activities are purely administrative in nature.

(2) Skill requirements of those involved in zoning administration within the Planning Department are generally low.

(3) There is little or no resistance, within the executive level of the Planning Department, to the removal of all zoning responsibilities. These individuals expressed a desire to assume a larger role in planning and coordinative activities.

(4) Zoning administration is separated from other Planning Department activities. Although there is coordination of effort, the planning function would in no way be hindered by the removal of zoning activities.

(5) Zoning enforcement requires inspection. The Department of Building currently performs all inspection services for the City.

(6) An alternative location for Zoning Administration and Enforcement is the Department of Building. However, this concentration of enforcement power in one department leads to a later potential for the abuse of such power.

(7) Zoning administration and enforcement are line functions and should be contained within a line department.

5.3.4. (Alternative) Code Enforcement on Existing Housing Structures Should Be Located within the Department of Community Improvement. As stated in Section 4.2.1., this potential transfer creates an alternative for the decision makers. The following set of considerations have been formulated by the

research team:

(1) Since the DCI contains the function of rehabilitating businesses and residences, this function provides a coordinative and supporting role. The area enforcement planning would be coordinated with the Urban Renewal Division of the DCI through its project planning, relocation, family services, citizen participation, and rehabilitative functions of the DCI.

(2) The placing of code enforcement on existing structures within the DCI would cause its removal from the Department of Building. Currently, the Department of Building performs all inspection services for the City.

(3) The Director of the Department of Building is in opposition to this transfer. He has offered the following considerations concerning the potential restructuring:

(A) The transfer would cause a "lessening of professionalism."

(B) The transfer would place unrelated functions within the DCI.

(C) The current operation of the Department of Building is very smooth.

(D) City inspection services should not be separated.

5.4 Implementation. The implementation of the DCI will occur mainly by the movement of staff from one operating activity to another. The implementation would be in the form of an immediate transfer rather than a lengthy phase-in. That is, the operational changes would occur as soon as possible with only a minor transitional period.

5.4.1. The Function of Urban Renewal Should Be Transferred from the Atlanta Housing Authority to the Department of Community Improvement.

(1) Staffing.

(A) The following departments (and their personnel) of the Urban Redevelopment Division of the Atlanta Housing Authority should be transferred to the proposed Department of Community Improvement:

Administrative Planning Department

Rehabilitation Department
Real Estate Department
Property Management and Demolition Department
Bedford-Pine Project
Model Cities Project
Edgewood Project
Vine City Project
West End Project

This transfer involves forty-six employees.

(B) The Public Housing functions of AHA and the function of the Urban Redevelopment Division of AHA are functionally independent but operationally dependent. The following departmental resolutions are suggested concerning supporting departments of AHA:

[1] Finance Division. The Urban Renewal Division of the DCI will only require that one or two people (if any) from the Division level staff be transferred since the City Finance Department will provide payroll and budgeting services. These persons (if any) will be transferred to the Department of Finance of the City. Within the Finance Division the following staff transfers are indicated:

(a) Administrative Services. In order to make a rational statement concerning the number of individuals that will be required in a transfer to the City, a workload analysis should be performed. This analysis will indicate the proportion of total service provided by the Administrative Services Section to the Urban Redevelopment Division. The transfer will be based on the resulting statistic.

(b) Accounting Department. One person in accounting directly serves the Urban Redevelopment Department of AHA and should

be transferred to the City Finance Department. Others could be transferred if the City's Finance Department is overloaded by the creation of the DCI and if AHA's Accounting Department is overstaffed.

[2] Technical Services Division. Technical Services is designed to support renewal and should be transferred to the DCI in its entirety. This transfer involves thirteen employees.

[3] Family and Community Services. The Assistant Director, Relocation, Family and Community Services; the Manager, Redevelopment Family Services; two Business Relocation Officers; and the staffs of the Bedford Pine, Model Cities, Edgewood, Vine City and West End Projects would be transferred. This transfer involves forty employees.

(C) AHA has the capabilities for grounds maintenance, weed control and reconditioning of substandard housing. The Urban Renewal Department of the DCI can create these capabilities from AHA's excess Maintenance and Improvement staff but the actual size of the maintenance department has not been determined.

(2) Equipment. The Redevelopment and Housing Divisions of AHA share their equipment. An inventory of all equipment which was bought with Redevelopment funds will have to be made. Redevelopment will take only this equipment and purchase whatever else is needed.

(3) Employee Benefits.

(A) The retirement plans for AHA and City employees differ somewhat. AHA employees contribute 5 1/2% of their salary and AHA matches it. City employees contribute 6% and the City matches that. AHA employees can withdraw their investments with interest but would not get the matching funds.

(Whether this rule could be modified in this unusual case has not been discussed with the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company.) Those employees with more than five years of service can receive full pension benefits if they leave their contributions in the AHA pension plan until age 65.

(B) In order for AHA employees to be given credit for their years of service (and the benefits earned) an act must be passed by the State Legislature. The credit referred to here would be as part of the City retirement system.

(C) The salaries and job descriptions for AHA employees will have to be reviewed by the Finance and Personnel Departments to determine the pay scale for the transferring employees. It is proposed that transferring employees receive no less than their present salary. If a transferring employee should fail to meet the City pay grade requirements he would stay at his salary level until he meets the requirements. In order for AHA employees to be given credit for their accrued sick and vacation leave a City ordinance must be passed. The amount of leave transferable is a decision to be made by the City Council.

(4) Schedule. This transfer should be accomplished immediately on the creation of the DCI.

5.4.2. Land Acquisition and Deposition Should be Located within the Department of Community Improvement.

(1) Staffing. Staffing of the newly created Division will be accomplished by merging the City Land Department and the Real Estate Department of the Urban Development Division of AHA. The City Land Department consists of five professional and three support staff persons. The Real Estate Department of the Urban Development Division is authorized a staff of ten, although there are currently three vacancies. Of the seven remaining, there are three professional and four supporting staff persons. The new Division would be initially staffed with approximately eight

professional and from four to seven supporting staff persons. As the Division continues its operation the two staffs will learn each other's jobs such that efficiencies of operation can take place with fewer staff required.

(2) Schedule. This transfer should be accomplished immediately on the creation of the DCI.

5.4.3. (Alternative) The Functions of Zoning Administration and Enforcement Should Be Transferred from the Department of Planning and the Department of Building to the Department of Community Improvement.

(1) Staffing. Zoning activities are currently performed within the existing Department of Planning and the Department of Building. The existing Department of Planning has seven persons involved in zoning administration, one of which is clerical. The Department of Building has three persons involved with zoning enforcement. The resulting Division within the DCI would be the combined staffs from these Departments.

It is possible that one or two zoning staff of the total of ten persons would remain with the Department of Community Planning if their services are deemed as necessary.

(2) Schedule. If this alternative is adopted, the transfer would take place upon establishment of the DCI.

5.4.3. (Alternate) Code Enforcement on Existing Housing Structures Should Be Located within the Department of Community Improvement.

(1) Staffing. Code Enforcement on existing structures is currently performed by the Housing Rehab Division of the Department of Building. The activity is broken down into two parts which are Housing Code and Housing Code Compliance. The staff size of these components is approximately 30 and 7 persons, respectively. The Housing Rehab Division would be moved in toto to the Department of Community Improvement if this alternative is adopted.

(2) Schedule. If this alternative is adopted, the transfer would take place upon establishment of the DCI.

6.0 Recommendation: It Is Recommended that the Finance Department Become a Staff Activity Reporting Directly to the Mayor.

Presently the Finance Department has the responsibility for maintaining all accounting records, preparing the City budget and operating the City's data processing equipment. Each of these activities affects all the operating departments within City government. In addition, the budgeting activity determines how the City revenues are to be spent. With Atlanta's new Charter, the Mayor and the Council will be in a better position to coordinate the spending of the City's money in light of the City's objectives.

To improve the overall activities of program budgeting, planning, and implementation, the Finance Department must advise the Mayor and the Council regarding the fiscal realities of the City's programs. This advisory function can best be served with the Finance Department operating as a staff function reporting directly to the Mayor. In addition, the accounting and data processing activities of the Finance Department serve all Departments and organizationally these activities should be performed as a service or staff function.

7.0 Recommendation: It is Recommended that the Staff of the Atlanta Model Cities Program Be Integrated into the Operations of the City.

7.1 General. The sphere of interest of the research team was two-fold. The phase-out of Atlanta Model Cities was one concern and the phase-in of Community Development Revenue Sharing was the second concern. This section of the report presents the findings, recommendations, and implementation activities associated with the first concern.

7.2 Findings. These findings are based on a gathering of information via interviews and evaluation reports. The researchers have condensed the vast amount of source material into the short narrative below. In some instances, the research team reached a consensus of opinion based on the source material rather than quoting from an analytical report.

.1 The Model Cities staff represents a source of valuable talent for City government. Staff members' educational levels are high as evidenced by the job description requirements. Staff members have experience in the planning of physical, social, and economic growth programs for the Model Neighborhood Area residents of the City. The staff has a great deal of experience in the letting and administration of contracts for the provision of physical and social services. These skills will be in greater demand with the advent of revenue sharing.

.2 The Model Cities process, which emphasizes coordinative capability, has shown some limited success over the four action years. In the Economic Growth Core, resources of all City departments that impact on the area have been coordinated to improve the area. Day care centers have proved successful in meeting the needs of parents and children. Some neighborhood improvements have been provided for Model Neighborhood Area residents.

.3 On the other hand, it is apparent from the large funding levels and the evaluations made by Executive Systems Corporation and the Atlanta University School of Social Work, that the Model Cities program has not achieved the kind of economic and social growth expected in the Model Cities Area.

.4 Because of the level of performance and the lack of unqualified successes in the Model Cities program, there is a lack of confidence in the Model Cities process within City government. This lack of confidence has been expressed to the research team by many department heads and others. The lack of confidence has not been associated with the individuals of the Model Cities Staff, but in the process itself and its concentration on one small area of the City rather than the City as a whole.

.5 Interviews with individuals associated with Congressional Housing Sub-Committees and with HUD's Office of Community Development have indicated that the Model Cities agency can expect funding at a reduced level until approximately January 1, 1975 and even until July 1, 1975.

.6 Interviews with administrators within City government have indicated a desire within the City to maintain those skills now

available within the Model Cities staff for operating the City government.

.7 No significant problems would be encountered in transferring Model Cities employees to other City operations, since they are presently City civil servants.

7.3 Recommendations. Based on the previous findings, the research team has developed a set of recommendations which generally state that the Model Cities Program be discontinued if federal funding ceases and that the staff be used wherever appropriate. It is hoped that the City will evolve toward an operational status similar to the Model Cities process. However, the research team feels that such an evolution will take at least four years.

.1 If federal funding for CDA's ceases, the Atlanta Model Cities staff should be disbanded as a defined entity or agency of City government. So that those services and skills available from individual staff members not be lost to City government, heads of City departments should be encouraged to review the needs of their own organizations and operations. Where opportunities exist, Model Cities staff members should be given priority for hiring. This would provide for the maintenance of the Model Cities skill and experience within City government and provide an increase in skills inventory and planning capabilities within the Departments of City government.

.2 As an amplification of the above statement, no attempt should be made to transfer the Model Cities staff to other City operations as a single unit. Such an organization would lack organizational power and credibility. The skills of the Model Cities staff are suitable and needed in both comprehensive and project planning. Comprehensive planning will be a function of the Department of Community Planning while most project planning activities will occur in the operating Departments.

.3 Upon termination of federal funding for the administration of Model Cities activities, all administrative activities should cease. All Model Cities activities that depend on Community Development Revenue Sharing (block grants) should be reconsidered at the termination of federal categorical funding. Continuation



of these activities will be based on community plans, priorities, and budgets.

.4 Any community groups for which the Model Cities staff provides an advisory or analogous role will receive representation from the Mayor's Office, at his option, or whoever the Mayor designates to provide the continuing role.

7.4 Implementation. In order to implement the recommendations above, staffing plans and schedules need be developed. The research team has examined these matters and has recorded its thoughts as shown below. The material in this segment should be taken as suggestive only, rather than precise or exact. If the recommendations are adopted, consultation between affected parties and agencies should take place leading to further detailed plans.

.1 Staff Use. As discussed above, Model Cities staff members have experience and training which will be useful to the City. The following statements amplify this potential:

(1) Social, economic, and physical planning are performed by the Model Cities staff. The two former planning areas are required by the new Department of Community Planning. Most operational Departments within City government have a need for project planners. Approximately twelve members of the Model Cities staff are involved in social and economic planning and project administration. Approximately six of these are planners, three are project administrators and three are clerical. The project administrators possess capabilities that would be useful to all line Departments.

(2) The Department of Community Improvement will require a project planning capability. The physical component of the Program Operations staff of Model Cities could support this requirement. Approximately five persons, two of which are clerical, provide this service for Model Cities.

(3) The legislative body of City government is authorized by the new charter to have a staff of its own. Members of the Research and Development staff of Model Cities would be likely candidates for the type of staff envisioned. The Research and Development staff of Model Cities includes 18

persons, four of which are clerical. Perhaps nine of the total staff of R & D could be used by the legislative branch of City government. Since the Department of Community Planning will have a research and evaluation function, the remaining Model Cities R & D staff could be absorbed by the Department of Community Planning.

(4) The Administrative Office of Model Cities consists of eight persons. These persons can be utilized in the administrative function of the new Department of Community of Improvement and elsewhere in City government as required.

(5) The Community Affairs Office of Model Cities has four persons, two of which are clerical. This staff can be utilized in support of the citizen participation function of the new Department of Community Planning.

(6) The Executive Director and his staff are candidates for similar positions in the new Department of Community Improvement. The new Department of Community Planning will also have a requirement for additional top administrators.

.2 Schedule. On the basis of conversations with individuals on related sub-committees of the Congress and within HUD Headquarters, it appears that January 1, 1975 is the most likely date for the start-up of special revenue sharing with a July 1, 1975 start-up the latest date foreseen. Based on those dates, the following time phasing is suggested for the integration of Model Cities personnel into City positions and the close-out of CDA programs.

(1) Present to June 30, 1974. Interim federal funding should be used to close out all CDRS dependent projects requiring resource or manpower commitments past October 31, 1974. Staff levels can remain as they are through this period.

(2) June 30, 1974. This date would be the closure date for categorical grant projects requiring commitments of more than four months. All physically oriented (categorical grant) programs should be closed out. On-going social service and training (categorical grant) programs could be continued. In contracting for projects extending past this date, consideration should be given to the possibility of a

6-month funding extension.

The Department of Community Planning would officially assume responsibility for physical planning at the policy and program levels. The Department of Community Improvement would officially assume project planning responsibilities in the physical sector.

(3) June 30, 1974 to January 1, 1975. The CDA staff would administer interim programs and effect a gradual reduction in levels of activity. They would continue to be responsible for the maintenance of all Model Cities facilities. They would also proceed with necessary public information activities to explain the present phase-out and the new structure for physical, economic and social programs within the City. During this period, transfer of physical and economic planning staffs from Model Cities to Departments of City government would begin.

(4) January 1, 1975. If this date is designated the CDRS start-up time, then it would also be the effective termination date for all Model Cities programs. Notification of the actual revenue sharing start-up date should be available in advance so that if there is an extension until June 30, 1975, the CDA staff could then accept options to extend social and community service programs until April 30, 1975.

(5) January 1, 1975 to April 30, 1975. If an extension occurs then interim programs would continue. Further, final arrangements for the return of CDA property and assets to the City would be made during this time. The CDA staff would continue to maintain these properties.

(6) April 30, 1975. Final program closing for all Model Cities projects would occur. Final transfer of staff and facilities to the City would commence.

(7) June 30, 1975. The transfer of staff to other City activities should be completed. The termination of Model Cities and the transfer of further Model Cities responsibilities to the Mayor's Office will be completed.

8.0 Areas of Future Study.

8.1 General. In the conduct of this research several further areas of study have become evident. Constraints on time and the sequencing of events are such that these areas could not be included within the current effort.

8.2 Improvement of the Planning Process. Recommendations within this report include the creation of the Department of Community Planning. The creation will require the undertaking of a greater role in the planning process. This will be accomplished through the hiring of additional skilled staff and the improvement in skills of current staff. It will also be necessary to develop a new planning process that effectively utilizes citizen input during all phases of the development of the Comprehensive Plan.

A detailed plan of activities will need be developed in which the goal of the plan is the emergence of a capability to perform comprehensive physical, economic, and social planning and coordination. The plan of activities will include time estimates and resources needed to accomplish each activity.

8.3 Transfer of AHA to the City. It is recommended in the final report that the renewal function of AHA be transferred to the City. It has been recently brought to the attention of the investigators that it may be possible for all of AHA to transfer to the City. This alternative had been dismissed previously as infeasible. The infeasibility was thought to be a function of the impossibility of the City's incurring the debts and liabilities of AHA's public housing program. It may be possible that the debt of AHA can be considered an obligation of the United States for which the City would not be liable.

There are numerous advantages and disadvantages concerned with a possible move of AHA to the City. The feasibility of the move should be studied as well as the potential benefits and burdens for the City.

8.4 Organizational Improvements. The recommendations in this report can be considered interim or evolutionary. The researchers visualize the need for a massive change in the manner in which the City does its business. Some of these necessary changes are dictated by the new

Charter. The full amount of the envisioned changes are not immediately practical. The City must systematicly transfer to a strong mayor form of government. After the Mayor has begun to affirm his position, organizational changes of real consequence can begin. Possibilities include the creation of super departments and the movement into the provision of social services after rescinding the Plan of Improvement.

These changes need be studied in great detail and a broad based plan for organizational restructuring needs be prepared. This plan would be developed using techniques of organization development and, more importantly, input from those in power. Only those in power (or future power bases) will be able to insure the effectiveness of the improvements.

8.5 Experimental Citizen Participation. The researchers have recommended several possible citizen participation activities in the body of this report. Admittedly, this is not an area of expertise of the researchers. It is realized that the current citizen participation in City government is subject to improvement. Further study in alternative means of citizen participation is encouraged. Experimental programs are suggested. These programs would operate within selected areas of the City. A strong research and evaluation component would be included in these experimental programs. Funding for these programs would be sought from HUD.