Regional Plan Association

. . . a research and planning agency supported by voluntary membership to promote the co-ordinated development of the New York- New Jersey-Connecticut Metropolitan Region.

235 East 45th Street • New York, New York 10017 • (212) 682-7750

NEWS RELEASE

No. 1337
March 28, 1978

For further information:

Sheldon Pollack
212-682-7750

FOR RELEASE:

9:00 P.M.
March 28, 1978

PFIZER CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCES NEW HEADQUARTERS LEASE ON 42nd STREET AT REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION ANNIVERSARY DINNER

Pfizer, Inc., has just renewed its headquarters lease at 235 East 42nd Street for 14 years, Chairman Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., announced tonight in receiving the Regional Plan Association 49th Anniversary award at a dinner at the New York Hilton Hotel.

Mr. Pratt said the decision to remain in the City was made despite "one of the rockiest periods" in New York City's history.

In his dinner speech, he observed "a new philosophy abroad--one committed to getting involved and joining together with citizens, labor, government, with people who care about the region and the cities...We can't keep running away from the problems of urban America. For as surely as I stand here, they will catch up with us."

Though New York has not yet come through that rocky period, Mr. Pratt said, and "recovery is still a way off," he cited many points of encouragement:

--"Business is being treated as an ally instead of the enemy..."

--"Our Congressional Delegation is becoming aware of its very important role in the fate of this region..."

--"State agencies are showing increasing concern" to attract new enterprises and help existing ones.

(over)

"For this new climate, Governor Carey and Mayor Koch deserve much credit...A couple of years ago, who ever heard of Democrats talking like this?"

"Moreover, in both the public and private sector, labor has shown a willingness to listen rather than point fingers, to participate, and yes, to make sacrifices."

Mr. Pratt recalled that seven years ago, Pfizer tentatively decided to move out of Manhattan, but after intensive study concluded that Manhattan was the best place to be, though "the environment here has deteriorated..."

Mr. Pratt has been Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Pfizer, Inc. since 1972. Regional Plan Association is a civic organization whose research, planning and information programs aim at helping the people of the Region stretching from Trenton to New Haven make conscious choices about their future.

# # # # # # # #

Remarks by
Edmund T. Pratt, Jr.
Chairman of the Board, Pfizer Inc.
at the Regional Plan Association Annual Dinner
New York City
March 28, 1978

It is indeed an honor to receive the Regional Plan Association award.

I accept it with pride on behalf of all my colleagues at Pfizer.

I emphasize the role of my colleagues because they convert what might be abstract objectives into very tangible community activities.

We are extremely proud of the depth of their long standing involvement in city affairs especially at times in the past when the vogue was to put the city down.

Pfizer employees have been generous with their time and training in insuring that New York remains a vital place to live and work.

Our computer expertise has been made available to the Comptroller's office.

Our marketing research skills are being offered to determine how New York can attract and keep jobs in the health care industry.

Our people play a substantial role in the work of the Opportunities Industrialization Centers.

OIC as you know, provides essential training for minority groups to make possible their more rapid entry into the mainstream of business and economic life.

Our purchasing from minority businesses is a significant element in our business operations.

And in many other ways we have and will continue, as a matter of priority, to encourage our people to give their time and expertise where it can be helpful.

In addressing you today, I want to make it clear that I do not consider myself to be an expert in urban affairs or urban planning.

For this reason when I sat down to compose my thoughts, it seemed to me it might be more appropriate to talk about my role as a businessman who operates within the region.

--As a businessman who is concerned in a very practical way about the health and vitality of our region.

That concern has been demonstrated in what I suppose can be described simply as involvement.

A word, a thought, an idea that was probably unthinkable ten years ago.

Along with that involvement, business leaders had to bring with them a sense and a spirit of cooperation.

This new spirit of cooperation among diverse groups is, of course, not unusual to the members of the Regional Plan Association.

That's how you have succeeded.

I am proud that Pfizer is an old timer in this region.

Our company is a native New Yorker.

It was born in Brooklyn, in 1849.

Hanging outside my office is a New York telephone directory.

It's date is 1878.

It is the first directory issued in New York City.

Pfizer is one of the 271 companies listed there.

As the company grew and prospered it expanded to:

Manhattan,

Queens,

Connecticut, and

New Jersey.

Pfizer now has 140 plants in 40 countries around the world.

Our worldwide work force now totals over 40,000 persons.

And our sales last year, reached two billion dollars.

We would not have been able to reach this point without a capable work force and favorable economic conditions and above all, a favorable economic environment right here in New York.

Obviously the environment here has deteriorated in the past decade.

In the old days when a city or a region began a downhill slide, the thing to do was move out -- it was as simple as that.

But it is no longer so simple.

The problems of this region are not unique.

Today, there are fewer places to go.

But more important as a restraining influence is the fact that a new philosophy is abroad -- one committed to getting involved and joining together with citizens, labor, government, with people who care about the region and the cities -- people set on putting things right -- people dedicated to strengthening and improving our prospects and solving our problems.

We can't keep running away from the problems of urban America.

For as surely as I stand here, they will catch up with us.

And when they do, we will be forced to confront them.

We at Pfizer faced the question of leaving the region about seven years ago.

At that point the tempo of corporate move outs was such that companies were leaving every week.

Like other managements, we had to consider what certainly seemed to be greener pastures.

From that atmosphere came a tentative decision to leave.

The only question remaining was where to move.

But relocating our headquarters represented a multimillion dollar project.

So it was decided that we ought to attempt the same type of objective management analysis as any other major decision we make in the course of doing business.

We hired consultants, brought our computers into use and began weighting major factor groups, and each factor within the group, about 90 factors, and finally rating their importance, and scoring.

The results of the survey?

New York was the best place for us to be.

We thought at first "there must be some mistake."

But what we found was that the computer dispassionately looked at all the significant factors - rather than one or two to which we were particularly sensitive.

And in comparing the various locations, there were still many factors in which New York held the advantage.

That was the conclusion -- New York was where we should be.

That decision, made during some of New York's darkest days, carried with it a commitment to do all we could to improve the environment in which we had staked a significant part of our corporate life.

Indifference was the surest way to undermine our own self-interest.

Since that time, back in 1971, New York has been through one of the rockiest periods in its history.

New York has not yet come through that period.

Although we have seen a good beginning, recovery is still a way off.

And it will be a long, arduous process with many painful decisions along the way.

But we must work toward and look forward to a time when New York's dramatic rescues from bankruptcy are not yearly events; when deficit financing is a thing of the past, remembered without nostalgia; when we no longer promise more than we can deliver, nor spend more than we have.

We must work toward producing a sound budget program including very specific steps to reduce the city's debt.

We must work to bringing the city to the point where it can independently enter the bond market without the need for Federal guarantees.

To get to that point we still have a long way to go.

Yet, some positive things have come out of the fiscal crises.

For one thing, there seems to be a greater willingness to listen among some of our elected representatives in New York City, Albany and in Washington.

On too many occassions business was not taken seriously when we complained of red tape, inefficiency, and excessive taxes; or worse, we were blamed for the city's woes.

Some had a cocky attitude: business could leave if it wanted to; it made very little difference.

Only after the loss of 650,000 jobs -- a billion dollars in revenue --did government begin to understand what the private sector meant to the economy of this region.

As Winston Churchill once said, "Business is often regarded as a wolf which should be killed, or a cow which should be milked; rarely is it viewed as the horse that pulls the carriage."

It is encouraging that business is being treated as an ally instead of the enemy -- that there is dialogue where once there only was suspicion.

It is encouraging that our Congressional Delegation is becoming aware of its very important role in the fate of this region, not just in assuring that New York City gets the financing it needs, but in assuring that our region gets a fair share of the revenue, the contracts, and the grants coming from Washington, and that federal policy doesn't reinforce the movement away from this region.

It is encouraging that state agencies are showing increasing concern not only with attracting new enterprises to the area, but with helping the industries and companies which have made New York their long-time home.

There are still some in the political arena who are clearly unaware of what business means in jobs to their constituents.

I think however the trend is in the other direction.

For this new climate Governor Carey and Mayor Koch deserve much credit.

And I'll be the first to admit they surprised a lot of people.

A couple of years ago, who ever heard of Democrats talking like that?

But both the Governor and the Mayor have faced some difficult tasks and they have made some tough but much-needed decisions.

The language of government is beginning to change.

It is encouraging to hear talk of management reforms, productivity gains, cost effectiveness and balanced budgets.

In all this we owe much to the likes of Dick Shinn, Felix Rohatyn, Bill Ellinghaus, George Champion, and the many other business people who have spent considerable time lending their special talents to help their city.

Moreover, in both the public and private sector, labor has shown a willingness to listen rather than point fingers, to participate, and yes, to make sacrifices.

In one cooperative venture, the Business/Labor Working Group, I think a lot of us entered with a feeling of being ideologically world's apart.

We left with a great deal of understanding for each other.

It was as one prominent labor leader put it, "You can sit back and watch the city go down the drain, or you can try to help."

If you can get business, labor and government officials to work together on pressing issues, it seems to me you've come a long way closer to a solution.

And that's what we did - we worked together.

Instead of looking for scapegoats we decided to sit down and analyze the problems, roll up our sleeves and work together on solutions to our problems.

And, in the long run, they are indeed <u>our</u> problems, each and every one of us -- those of us from business, labor, from government, from academia -- we all have a stake in the future of our region.

Once we lay aside the rhetoric, we discover to our amazement that we can work together, that we do share, in many cases, common goals, that we can compromise on our differences, that we can be creative and innovative in our solutions.

This cooperative spirit is not unique to New York.

No region or city can cope with all the problems inherent in a loss of population and industries and vital jobs without public dialogue to determine the city's future.

It is against that background that many companies that are still here -- some 80 of the Fortune 500 -- are committing themselves to renewed efforts in rejuvenation of this great city.

And Pfizer is doing so.

It is doing so by action.

In fact I am pleased to announce that we have recently renewed for 14 years the lease on our headquarters building in New York City.

That, I say proudly, is the measure of our commitment to this area.

Perhaps I sound somewhat optimistic.

I mean to be optimistic because the ability to act forcefully depends so often on the sheer will to succeed.

No one who has participated in the cooperative efforts I have described could fail to recognize the enormous resources this City has in human capabilities and determination.

It is surely timely that the current issue of the London Economist has a special section on New York.

And what does it say?

It reminds us that the City is by far the largest in the United States, over twice the size of Chicago, its nearest rival.

It points out that New York's municipal budget of $14 billion a year is larger than that of any state of the Union and all but a handful of the world's nations.

From such heights, it goes on, the City was bound to decline.

But not really decline so much as change.

New York is changing and will survive as a more modern city.

Is not the lesson of history that great cities survive despite radical social change?

Rome was supposed to have disappeared centuries ago with the fading of the Roman Empire.

Some may think it is disappearing today, but in reality it is changing again - adapting to a changing civilization.

Madrid is no longer the capital of a Latin American empire, but the capital that once was still remains a major focus for Europe and the whole Spanish Speaking World.

The British Empire has come to an end, but London survives and thrives as an international financial and cultural center.

To me, in light of such history, the idea of this young city, the queen city of the most virile civilizations of the 20th Century, not being able to survive is unthinkable.

Americans can't and won't permit it!

And on this point what is the conclusion of the Economist?

It is true, that publication concludes New York is becoming noticeably less the dominating city of the United States.

But at the same time it is becoming increasingly the capital of the world.

And so I conclude New York is a test case.

It is a test case for cities around the country.

It is a test case for representative government.

The question is whether, after decades of extravagance, a democratic society at the city level, at the state level, or indeed at the national level, can accept its limitations.

The dilemma is that if we go forward in the same profligate way we will destroy the social fabric.

But let's face it.

In pulling back, in bringing expenditures into line with resources, we also place a strain, a necessary strain, on the social fabric.

To navigate safely this transition in cities, states and nations is perhaps the major economic and political challenge of our time.

In New York -- because of its size, because of its prominence as a center of trade and culture, because of its worldwide fame, because of its special position in the nation and in the world -- in New York the drama of fiscal crisis is being played out before a worldwide audience.

And many of the leading actors, in this drama are right here in this room.

That is why I am full of hope.

A tough-minded hope, if you will, based on experience with the quality of the people represented here tonight from business, labor, government, and all walks of life in this city.

I say to you if New York City can't do it, then no one can.

And not for one moment will I embrace the thought that we will fail.

ISSN 0027-9013

NATIONAL CIVIC REVIEW

Vol. 67
No. Four

April
1978

What's Next for American Cities

William B. Shore

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

What's Next for American Cities?

by William B. Shore*

NOT many conferences produce the euphoria of the White House Conference held on January 29-February 2. In the midst of the growing debate over whether the federal government is cheating the northeast and shortly after a draft National Urban Policy called for targeting federal aid almost exclusively to distressed cities, about 500 persons assembled to talk about these issues. The dominant conclusion: your problems are my problems. City people signed for helping rural areas afflicted with unemployment; rural people acknowledged that urban problems—even New York City's debt—ought to be dealt with.

Among the specific policies on which workshop reports indicate wide agreement are:

—Unemployment deserves very high priority for national action.

—Jobs should be channelled to the unemployed rather than facilitating movement of the unemployed to jobs.

—Federal intervention often has been clumsy and has inhibited sound development, but national interests must be reflected in state and local programs. The solution lies in the direction of federal goals and standards without specifying how lower levels of government should reach them.

—The states should take more responsibility for effective urban governance and land-use planning.

—The federal government should assume much more of the costs of welfare and Medicaid, and the states, of education.

—The public should be more involved in public decisions; planning should take place at all levels of government with the plans meshed.

—Private enterprise should be more involved in national policy formulation related to jobs and land use.

—Governments should use incentives rather than regulations to make business interests consonant with the public interest.

—Some cities, e.g., New York, will need and should have special help in obtaining credit.

—Some national agency should provide more data on which planning at all levels of government can be based. Statistics should be broken down to neighborhood areas.

The President heard five-minute summaries of workshop conclusions on each of six topics discussed. Then he identified what struck him as the highlight of each topic:

1. In dealing with development, government at all levels, business and

---

* William B. Shore is vice president, public affairs, Regional Plan Association, New York City.

nonprofit organizations, including neighborhood associations, should work together.

2. We must be concerned with the human aspects of unbalanced growth, particularly the devastation resulting from unemployment in the first years of adult life, and with the failure of past programs to provide training and jobs.

3. (Responding to the summarizer's emphasis on federal assumption of welfare and Medicaid costs and state assumption of education costs) I notice applause for shifting financial burdens to Washington and responsibility away from Washington.

4. Enterprises need freedom to locate, and the U. S. is unable to discipline location patterns. We must recognize the importance of competition and the inevitability of change—but the human factor can never be forgotten.

5. We need to understand future trends better. (He agreed.)

6. Federal regulations should be more easily understood and U. S. standards should be more uniform. ("We've espoused these with great passion.") Public responsibilities should be more decentralized. ("I agree completely.")

The President concluded: Too many reports like this are never used; we're determined that this work will bear rich fruits.

In relying on the workshop reports for advice, the President should have in mind the participants and process. Governors appointed three-quarters of the delegates, and about one in five had a position in state government. Furthermore, governors delivered impressive speeches at each of the plenary sessions. City and county government people also added up to a large contingent, about one in seven. Business people were about one in six. So the early emphasis in the conference on day-to-day difficulties with the federal government was understandable—well over half of the delegates had to deal with federal regulations. In addition, the first plenary session speaker focused on that topic.

The delegates likely to be more oriented to the need for federal programs—those from civic organizations, trade unions and the federal government—constituted well under a third of the total. Another one in a dozen were researchers.

Under these circumstances, the strength of the acknowledgment that the federal government should set national standards and goals within which state and local governments would be expected to operate seems a strong point; and the number of federal programs that survived in the recommendations despite pervasive criticism of federal operations underscores the overall sense of the meeting that this is, indeed, one country and what happens in one part of it affects us all.

In a background piece for the conference summarizing previous national efforts to deal with issues of this kind, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations staff observed that President Eisenhower set up the Kestnbaum Commission specifically to recommend federal programs that might better be handled at a lower level. They failed to find any program of

significance. This White House Conference seemed bent on finding a way to cut back federal activities; instead, most of the workshops fell back on suggesting that improvements be made in intergovernmental and business-government relations. (Since the Kestnbaum report, however, there has been a proliferation of small federal programs which may be candidates for elimination if anti-poverty costs are nationalized.)

Even the widely-mentioned idea that the nation should be blanketed with interstate planning regions like the Appalachian Regional Commission or like those set up under Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 would increase rather than decrease federal involvement. The proposed commissions are dominated by federal and state representatives. Presumably, they would supersede existing regional planning agencies which, on the whole, are led by municipal officials, a few by state-appointed people, but never by federal officials. (Existing metropolitan regional planning commissions were scarcely represented among the delegates. That is perhaps a reflection of what governors think of their importance.)

Altogether, what with the state-local-business majority, the conferees' endorsement of federal involvement and action was impressive.

But the conference was not really designed to register the voice of the people. It was geared to broadening understanding of different viewpoints among people actively involved in government, planning and development—articulate people likely to influence opinion on their return home. In that, I think the conference was successful.

Now, it is time to contemplate the dilemmas revealed by the Conference—look them straight in the horns.

Firm federal standards . . . with flexibility?

For example, Henry Ford's message: Get the federal government off my back and let me make cars. But he admitted that valuable environmental improvements would not have been made as fast were it not for federal pressure and regulations. Is there a way through these dilemma horns? Conferees and speakers kept assuring each other that the nation could have both economic growth and environmental improvement, but we were not able to explain just how.

Local governments had the same plea as Mr. Ford. In the words of one workshop: "Local governments plead that the federal aid system should be based on trust in their common sense and good faith, and should grant them wide latitude to adapt federal programs to their local requirements." But for 30 years, while experts warned, Americans watched urban affairs become increasingly muddled while municipalities were in full charge of land use. It took federal carrots to get regional planning in the early 1960s, and it took federal threats of carrot withdrawal to get the regional planners to produce housing plans in the 1970s. It will take many more carrot threats to get the housing plans implemented.

The same workshop acknowledged that "the single most important approach must be the reexamination of both federal and state policies and programs so as to identify and utilize all appropriate means to carry out this

balanced national growth objective," i.e., "preserving and revitalizing the nation's reinvestment in its older cities and suburbs, and limiting urban sprawl." And: "Implicit here is a stronger state role." So local governments will not be operating alone with wide latitude.

Another dilemma.

There is a state version of the same dilemma. One workshop reported: "Federal environmental standards, applied uniformly throughout the United States, have not only resulted in an improved environment but have also reduced the competition among states for economic development by holding all economic activity wherever situated to the same pollution control requirements." Just below, the report goes on: "But uniform federal prescriptions, for example, to revitalize our older cities, to discourage duplication of scarce resources within a metropolitan area, or discourage new development which would be wasteful of energy, are not possible without violating individual freedom and overwhelming the great diversity of circumstances, needs, and preferences in the country. . . . Trade-offs of a subtle, fine-grained, sophisticated sort must be made among all these values and these trade-offs are generally best made at the local, regional or state level."

Is there a difference between federal environmental standards and "prescriptions" on rather similar subjects? Isn't that the same dilemma that business people and local governments have pointed to: broad public goals are important, but they have to be applied to diverse specific situations. In the case of states, a uniform national policy keeps private firms from playing one area off against another to lower the standards, but how can the diversity be dealt with?

We delegates talked around this dilemma a great deal. At times we ridiculed federal requirements and were righteously angry at the extra time and costs they imposed on business and government. At other times, we recognized the national problems that localities and states could not be expected to solve without a framework of federal direction within which to move. But we reached no new conclusions on how to slip through those two dilemma horns.

Public participation . . . do we have time and money to be effective?

The White House Conference itself is an example of another dilemma. Public participation in developing broad public policy is an obvious good. But on very few occasions, even in the recent flurry of public participation programs, has enough time and money been devoted to the process to achieve more than George Gallup does every day. (I am talking here only of broad policies, not neighborhood planning issues.) Delegates to the White House Conference worked hard at their tasks for four days in an atmosphere that could not have been more conducive to constructive discussion. A very competent staff spent months preparing. Yet the President should not justify any decision or claim any new important insight on the basis of our reports. Dilemmas can be identified from workshop statements, as I have done above; but conferees did not come prepared to really wrestle with them.

There has been considerable pride among government people about public participation. People and public officials have talked to strangers about questions that will affect their lives. That is nice and makes us feel good. But many participants are getting over that high and have quit participating because they do not feel they are reaching rational conclusions that would not otherwise have been reached by officials. To do that, public participation programs must ask better questions and provide better information. The dilemma is: that takes much more time and money than we have been investing. Even if governments invest the money, will a reasonably representative public be willing to invest the time?

American cities . . . impossible to turn the tide, but unthinkable not to.

The most important dilemma to confront is the future of American cities—the issue that Regional Plan Association hoped would be the centerpiece of the White House Conference. On the one hand, it seems almost impossible to turn around the strong trends that are drawing out of city centers the offices, shopping and other services that made cities traditionally the places where people come together.

Without such activities, there is little reason for those who have a choice to live in cities or older suburbs. So failure to turn those trends would condemn most American cities to becoming reservations for those who cannot leave: the poor, old and handicapped. America must choose between the almost impossible reversal of present dispersing trends and the almost unthinkable loss of the traditional city as meeting place—with the resulting abandonment of those who cannot join the rest of us as we scatter through the countryside.

In the November National Urban Policy draft, "Cities and People in Distress," there were hints that cities should regain their former role and become home for people of all income levels. But the issue was not argued and the conclusion was left vague. The White House Conference workshop and plenary sessions, taken as a whole, made the issue even fuzzier. I have quoted above one workshop that wanted to use "all appropriate means" to revitalize cities and limit urban sprawl, and another that felt that uniform federal prescriptions to revitalize cities would violate individual freedom. Most workshop opinions were far less clear. In truth, only Governor Michael Dukakis of Massachusetts dealt with the dilemma head-on: he came out for cities and turned the powers of the state government to help them.

It is past time for debate. Many cities are losing the base on which to rebuild their attractiveness. Diminishing population growth will limit jobs and facilities available to remagnetize city centers. The northeast already has stopped growing.

In the mid-1960s, the United States confronted dilemmas of race relations and made some fundamental decisions. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, America confronted the dilemmas of environmental quality and made some fundamental decisions. In the late 1970s, it is time to confront the dilemmas of the future of American cities and the people abandoned there.

REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION

235 East 45th Street • New York, New York 10017 • (212) 682-7750

MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION

Members receive all research bulletins and periodicals of Regional Plan Association and attend the Regional Plan Conference without charge. They have library privileges and are invited to the annual corporate meeting of the Association. $2 of each membership is allocated to producing and distributing The Region's Agenda, to be published at least four times a year.

PERSONAL MEMBER—$15 per year
Members receive one copy of publications and membership privileges. Publications are sent to home address only.

BUSINESS ORGANIZATION
Members receive up to eight copies of publications. The dues rate and the number of publication copies depend upon the number of employees in the organization:

Under 10 employees	$25	(one copy)
10 to 24 employees	$50	(two copies)
25 to 49 employees	$100	(four copies)
50 employees or over	$200	(eight copies)

MUNICIPALITY or **COUNTY** (in Region)
Members receive up to six copies of publications.
Membership dues are based on population (1960 Census):

Less than 5000	$25	30M to 35M	$85
5M to 10M	$35	35M to 40M	$95
10M to 15M	$45	40M to 45M	$105
15M to 20M	$55	45M to 50M	$115
20M to 25M	$65	50M to 100M	$125
25M to 30M	$75	More than 100M	$150

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION, SCHOOL DISTRICT, OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCY—$15 per year
Members receive one copy of publications and membership privileges.

SUBSCRIBER
Corporations and foundations are urged to provide additional financial support for the Association's work. Contributors of more than $200 are considered subscribers. They receive multiple copies of publications and conference registration and may consult the Association staff (within reasonable time limits) on information gathered for planning purposes.

_____
name

_____

_____
city

_____
state *zip code*

Please enroll the above agency or individual as a member of Regional Plan Association.
(Contributions to RPA are deductible for income tax purposes.)

- ☐ Personal
- ☐ Business Organization
- ☐ Municipality or County (in Region)
- ☐ Non-Profit Organization, School, Other Government Agency
- ☐ Subscriber
- ☐ We wish to purchase the following RPA publications:

_____ _____

_____ _____

If you are now a member or are now joining Regional Plan Association, deduct 30% from listed prices on RPA publications.

Enclosed is a check for $ _____
(Please make checks payable to Regional Plan Association.)

BOOKS

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE POLICY. The findings of a major study on the relationship between public transportation and urban density. Deals with transit demand, transit operating characteristics and transit costs as a function of development density for eight modes of public transportation (taxi, dial-a-bus, local bus, express bus, light rail, light guideway transit, rapid transit and commuter rail). Establishes general ranges of where these are appropriate in terms of downtown size as well as the surrounding residential density. Summarizes extensive statistical material not previously available in one source. (Published by Indiana University Press, June 1977). 242 pages. 91 exhibits. 23 photographs.

REGIONAL PLAN NEWS

99. **WHERE TRANSIT WORKS.** A summary of the study relating the applicability of eight public transit modes to different densities of urban development (see **PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE POLICY).** August 1976. 23 pages.

101. **REGIONAL TRENDS 1976.** A digest of demographic, employment, income, enrollment, sales, building, transportation, and other trends in New York City and three suburban portions of the Region in the 1970's. 1977.

102. **ENERGY UPDATE.** Gross energy consumption in the Region in 1975, changes by major fuel source since 1970, and electrical generation fuel requirements and plant characteristics in 1976. Issues of increasing energy dependence and supply constraints that are facing the Region. 1977.

BULLETINS

126. **POWER FOR THE MTA: An examination of future ridership, service, and electric power requirements for Metropolitan Transportation Authority facilities.** Prepared for the Power Authority of the State of New York. June 1977. 92 pages. 29 exhibits.

127. **THE REGION'S MONEY FLOWS: I. The Government Accounts.** A systematic presentation of government expenditures and revenues in 1972 and 1975, by level of government and by type of expenditure for New York City and three suburban portions of the Region. July 1977. 88 pages. 8 charts. 1 map. 24 tables.

128. **THE REGION'S MONEY FLOWS: II. The Business Accounts.** Gross regional product originating in the private sector by industry of output, income or factor payments, and outlay or expenditures, for New York City and three suburban portions of the Region in 1972 and 1975. Highlighted are the transactions of 1,200 major corporations and 20,000 not-for-profit establishments located here. Late 1977.

129. **THE REGION'S MONEY FLOWS: III. The Household Accounts.** Personal income and personal consumption expenditures by source, commodity, income distribution, and household characteristics for New York City and three suburban portions of the Region in 1972 and 1975. 1978.