

The core of this bill is the provision in section II providing that grants shall be made only if the Secretary of the Urban Department finds that the applicant is following through on metropolitan general planning and program planning of particular facilities, as to the location and scheduling of public facility projects, and in adopting and properly administering zoning codes, subdivision regulations, and similar land use and density controls. Here is offered recognition of a problem which confronts virtually every urban community, and particularly metropolitan areas with a multiplicity of governmental jurisdictions. It is impossible to locate and plan proper public facilities until various uses of land in specific areas of the urban community are planned and then regulated to assure conformance with the land use and public facility programs. Public facility planning in growing urban communities must be projected in most cases a minimum of 20 years ahead, and programming of actual construction 5 to 10 years ahead. This process is totally impossible until and unless the land-use planners have determined, and the governing authorities have controlled, the planned uses of land for residential, commercial, industrial, and other developments.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest an amendment to title I of H.R. 12946. We have suggested to Secretary Weaver that a new program and an additional appropriation be provided for loans to local agencies for feasibility studies for water, sewerage, and storm drainage facilities to determine long-range, communitywide needs projected for a minimum period of 20 years, as required in the water-sewer planning guide recently issued by the Urban Department in compliance with the provisions of the 1965 Housing Act. These loans would be made by the Urban Department for engineering or feasibility studies by qualified professional engineers. They would be repayable within a specified period such as 5 years, and would go to utility agencies under a metropolitanwide coordinated planning project, or in the absence of such, to a metropolitan planning agency.

There apparently has been some thought in the Department that general planning agencies might be entrusted with the detailed functional planning in the water-sewer field. Our belief is that an effective program requires a coordinated planning of these expensive facilities by the responsible utility agencies in cooperation with the general planning agencies, as is provided now in other Federal legislation for highway facilities, recreational facilities, mass transportation systems, etc. And, for this purpose, an appropriation of from \$20 to \$30 million should be provided which would finance desperately needed long-range plans for from \$2.5 to \$5 billion of water-sewerage facilities. We must have functional planning of facilities to back up implementation of general planning. The urban development bill does indeed propose the only feasible method of accomplishing the urgent need in metropolitan areas for metropolitanwide general community planning, functional planning of various public facilities, and coordinated implementation of programs conforming with such general and functional plans. Unfortunately, our urban communities are fragmented into numerous sovereign local governments and into numerous agencies in those individual governments. These local instrumentalities are built into State constitutions and laws, and into city charters, and they cannot be obliterated or merged. But they will respond to a well-conceived opportunity for collective and cooperative planning and action.

In this bill the Urban Department, and the President, again have rejected the alternative of centralized Federal control and decisionmaking, and have devised a system of technologies and intergovernmental cooperation that conveys the planning, decisions, and implementations to our local communities.

We in Tennessee have struggled with the problems of urban government and of planning and serving the needs of new urban growth and development for many, many years. We amended the Tennessee constitution to authorize city-county consolidation, and our State legislature enacted a series of laws facilitating the creation of one urban government for one urban community. One great crushing problem has been rapid urban growth. More than a half million people in Tennessee flock into our cities every 10 years, consuming open land and requiring hundreds of millions of dollars of municipal investment. Our cities of all sizes have annexed more than 450,000 persons in the last decade and have placed another 200,000 suburbanites under a new metropolitan form of government in Nashville and Davidson County. Still, with the spread of blight in the old central cities, large and small, and rapid urbanization at the fringes, there have been overwhelming problems, particularly from the viewpoint of financial resources. The sprawling of population and businesses over into gradually in-