

hensive plan for the metropolitan area in which the program is located."

Section 7 of the demonstration cities bill provides for the office of a Federal coordinator. While this is a good idea, it is definitely limited. The duties of the Federal coordinator should be extended to include providing a clearinghouse for all Federal programs in the metropolitan area. His office should be tied in with the metropolitan information center provided in title IV of the Urban Development Act.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

We heartily endorse the goals of title I of this bill which would use Federal financial incentives to tie metropolitan planning directly into decisionmaking and action. The principle of supplementary grants to applicant State and local planning bodies that are actually carrying out development projects meeting truly comprehensive metropolitan or regionwide considerations is certainly commendable.

We have no quarrel with the language of most of the bill as contained in title I of most of its provisions.

We do suggest a change in section 105 of the bill, which defines development projects in terms of specified Federal programs. There are some notable omissions from the list of programs, including urban renewal, public housing, air resource management, public health grants, and Department of Agriculture assistance to water and sewer projects.

These omissions, in our opinion, further fractionalize the metropolitan area into central city and suburb and inhibit cooperation and commonness of purpose across jurisdictional lines.

It is our experience that it is unrealistic to administer an urban renewal program by taking only the interests of the central city into consideration.

This may seem politically objectionable to some. But it is a fact nevertheless that renewal and relocation must be dealt with at the total metropolitan scale. Otherwise, we continue to fence in the central city ghetto and to breed discontent and distrust when we should be committed to a policy of unity among all citizens. Furthermore, many urban renewal projects have failed to attract investment capital precisely because the total metropolitan market for housing, and for industrial and commercial facilities had not been taken into account.

We would therefore recommend that major urban renewal and public housing projects having a measurable impact on metropolitan development be included in section 105, as well as Department of Agriculture grants for water and sewerage facilities under section 306 of the Agricultural Act of 1961, when they are made in metropolitan areas.

Dr. Weaver has estimated that about a dozen metropolitan areas might become eligible for supplementary grants during fiscal 1967 and accordingly the administration is recommending a first-year program level of \$25 million. It is further stated that with continued encouragement under this program, about 75 metropolitan areas would qualify by the end of 5 years. We would like to see the provisions of this act extended to all 250 or so metropolitan areas within 5 years and Federal policy directed to that end. Only then will we be on the way