

our rental units, which range from \$125 a month to \$270 a month, leads us to conclude that this range will be substantially increased by the rental segment of our housing. We believe that the people attracted by the environment we are creating will be compatible within a wide range of income; segregating housing within narrow price categories is a distasteful alternative. Obviously 5 years will be required to determine the soundness of this proposition. But our first residents are pleased and our units are selling. Our next housing units will be under construction next year and will begin at a slightly lower range, about the \$18,000 area.

LOW-COST HOUSING

A possibility of going below this price, in relation to our land development and basic construction cost, seems remote. Our best opportunity for low-cost housing is in the rental field, where various Federal programs are available to us. Next year, approximately 100 units of housing for the aging will be under construction under a section 202 program and we are prepared to construct a building under section 221(d)(3) as soon as a sufficient number of qualified workers, or prospective workers, from our industrial commercial areas indicate the need for such accommodation. We have said that we will provide housing for anyone who works at Reston and we intend to fulfill that commitment.

Much that we propose should stimulate the appetite and cultivate the tastes of our residents, thereby enabling them to partake of the obviously superior cultural and educational facilities available in the central city. We are convinced that people involved in the community, with a renewed sense of identity and belonging, will make better citizens. This is clearly the challenge for all of us.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Fay, I certainly want to thank you on behalf of the subcommittee for a very excellent and informative statement. It is one of the finest statements we have received thus far.

Mr. Fay, I would like to ask you the same questions I asked Mayors Cavanagh and Lindsay and also Mayor Daley last week. Some people have the fear that the Federal coordinator which the bill will set up for each demonstration city program would be some sort of a Federal dictator, or as they call them, commissar, or czar. Now, I think the bill is clear that he would not have dictatorial powers. But I would like to ask you the two questions:

First, would the people who have such fears feel better, do you think, if we renamed the Federal official as a local coordinator rather than a Federal coordinator?

Second, do you think the idea of making the services of the coordinator optional to participating cities rather than mandatory as now provided in H.R. 12341 is a good one?

Mr. FAY. Mr. Chairman, I share your expressed feeling that the Federal coordinator—and frankly, I would prefer to call him a Federal expediter—would not become a czar or a dictator in the communities. I don't think there is anything sacred about the name. But is it a fact that in many communities we already have operating within the framework of the city government a local development coordinator. The number of such positions is really surprising, and is probably an outgrowth of the title that used to be around, urban renewal coordinator.

I would hope that the title would not be frozen so completely that it might impose a hardship from this point of view. And I really don't believe that the situation would be very much changed by whatever designation might be given him.

Again I repeat, I see the function of this man as an expediter concerned almost entirely with the expedition and facilitating of clearances and benefits under the Federal programs flowing into the localities. I don't see him having any opportunity for direction of the work, nor the selection of areas.