

In our judgment a program designed to encourage creation of new communities should be tied closely to generally acceptable standards of desirable and achievable patterns of urban growth. It should stem from a well-defined national policy, established after full and detailed exploration of national housing and urban development needs. Such an urban growth policy can only be set after all concerned groups have had opportunities to advance their views of the problems and the proposed solutions. We have not had that kind of full and complete examination. Those among us who agree that a national urban growth policy is both desirable and needed have not all agreed on the shape and scope such a policy should take.

Mayors do not usually counsel more study—and hence delay—in any area of obvious national need, and they do put urban growth needs in that category. But in this instance they feel that more study and discussion is needed and is in order.

Mayors recognize their responsibility for developing and advocating constructive, meaningful roles for established communities in promoting the kind of urban development and expansion which can and will serve the best interests of all urban citizens.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors and National League of Cities are giving careful study to questions of public policy guidelines for more orderly urban growth. The studies should be completed within the year.

We would welcome—we would urge—similar studies under auspices of a blue ribbon commission organized by Congress.

The problems should get full review by all interested groups—public interest organizations, academicians, builders, realtors, trade unions. Only after that can we properly decide the course Federal, State, and local governments should follow in trying to shape the pattern of future urban expansion.

We submit that Congress should act on new towns legislation only after it is established that—

- (1) The program would not discriminate against older central cities and would not promote further economic and social disparities between central cities and new growth areas.

- (2) It would not serve to promote fringe area commercial and industrial growth and development to the detriment of the central city's tax base.

- (3) It would not further promote economic and social segregation and the further flight of the middle class taxpayer to outlying areas.

- (4) It would not further promote the undesirable proliferation of local government.

- (5) It would not divert scarce Federal resources from areas of great and immediate need into support of enterprises which have not need of Government support.

- (6) It would not serve to encourage real estate promotion ventures of questionable value in achieving more rational urban growth patterns.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities advocate legislation which encourages development of new communities within existing core cities and the transformation into new cities of existing smaller communities. Such development can be carried out in conjunction with well-defined community goals, in such areas as housing, education, and employment opportunities, for the entire city. Likewise, existing small cities can be made into new towns. The League of Cities and Conference of Mayors would support new towns legislation on those terms. But it cannot support new towns legislation which has the potential of accentuating urban-suburban social and economic disparities and developing outlying areas at public expense—and at the expense of established communities.

Urban mass transportation.—Title III extends the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 for 1 year and increases its grant authorization by \$95 million so that with existing funds \$150 million would be available for fiscal 1968.

This proposed 1-year extension at the \$150 million a year rate would not permit any serious planning by local governments for needed improvements of and additions to existing mass transit systems.

On the basis of current need figures from several larger metropolitan areas, we submit that the program level should approach \$800 to \$900 million a year. We also submit that the interests of the program and the localities would be served better if the grant-in-aid ratio were increased from two-thirds/one-third to 90 percent/10 percent, bringing it in line with the ratio applicable to the interstate highway program.