

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Moorhead?

Mr. MOORHEAD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WISE, if we do keep the bills separate, I wonder if you would comment on the proposal that the one bill which is now cited as the Urban Development Act should not properly be changed to be called the Metropolitan Development Act.

Mr. WISE. I would certainly concur in that approach, Mr. Moorhead, definitely.

Mr. MOORHEAD. With respect to this Federal coordinator, whatever title we finally come up with, am I correct that it is your testimony that there should be a coordinator for every metropolitan area, and we would not need a special coordinator for a demonstration city; we would have this one Federal coordinator whether this was a demonstration city or not; is that not correct?

Mr. WISE. That is exactly my thinking. I think whether or not he is called a coordinator or a central source of information, whether he is out of the Bureau of the Budget or HUD, there is a great need for this in the localities.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I had not thought of that possibility, that he would be out of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. WISE. You might think about it.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I do not know whether we have the jurisdiction to do that.

Mr. WISE. If I may extend that thought for just a moment, Mr. Moorhead. I think the Bureau of the Budget has done a rather outstanding job of coordinating the efforts between various departments that have a parallel kind of a mission. The Executive order that came out, I think, last August or September related the planning requirements for the Open Space Act administered by HUD and the Land and Water Conservation Act administered by the Department of the Interior. These planning requirements are not in conflict, they are consistent. And this is one of the big jobs that the Bureau of the Budget has done.

Mr. MOORHEAD. If they can do the job here in Washington—and you are suggesting that we have a fieldman to do that for metropolitan areas—I think the committee should consider that.

Mr. WISE, you also testified about the job of relocation being metropolitanwide, and gave us an example in east Oakland of the possibility that the cities could use this new communities provision for establishing—for helping to solve their relocation. Is this outside of the city limits; is that what you are proposing?

Mr. WISE. The Oakland East development is somewhat similar to the Wisconsin situation I was speaking of. It would use a military facility of large acreage and would be some 12 miles outside the existing limits of the city of Oakland. But it would have the same city council, and the police department, and the same tax base, because it would be part of the same city.

Mr. MOORHEAD. And the city of Oakland would expand by the purchase route, and the people who live in this new community would be considered citizens of Oakland and vote?

Mr. WISE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I wonder if that could be done legally in other States, or is it a particular provision?