

ment processes that provide alternative solutions and by proving in the marketplace that the better environment, the whole community is what people want.

This is what you have to do to be successful. Both of those things are possible, I think. I frankly don't have fear of extending greater authority to local government in this area. I think a local land development agency in almost any metropolitan area in the United States can look forward and pretty well plot its growth over the next 20 years. It knows, for example, that it is going to add 200,000 people.

It knows what this means if it stops and thinks about it. It knows it is going to mean houses, schools, shopping areas, churches. It knows it is going to have to extend public utilities. It knows it has the tools to provide a better community. Suppose that when it was going to extend sewer and water and roads, the local land development agency would acquire land in that area and not just give the benefit of this sewer extension to the landowner on whose land it happens to be.

Suppose it said we will acquire the land under negotiation at market price, fair price to the seller. We will plan a community; put in the sewer and water and major roads and then market it. We will use the increment in land value that has been earned entirely through public action—nothing contributed by the landowner made it increase in value. It was public action that made the increase in value. We would then just use the value increment to pay for the stream valleys and forests that are going to be a deficit in the economics of community development in order that there can be real green spaces, real greenbelts to protect the community.

Financially it is all possible. There is no reason we cannot build well-planned communities to accommodate our growth. We have been able to pay for 14,000 acres of land in Columbia and to throw away 3,500 of this. You can say it is thrown away but it really adds to the value of everything else. We transferred those values to the land for development. We are able to wipe out all the Tasty-Freezes and filling stations along the highway.

We paid \$75,000 an acre for land on which we will distinguish the commercial uses to make a parkway. But this was peanuts looked at on the scale of our large landholdings.

If you pass this law—let's assume the funds are limited and they ought to be limited, because there ought to be a testing of it and if it works then the Department will come back to Congress for more money—and this need not be a subsidy. These are loans. They can be repaid out of land sale proceeds. This can be a revolving fund. It is an ideal kind of circumstance in which initiative from Congress can hold out a carrot of financial aid without ultimate cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Widnall?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Rouse, your statement is very interesting and I am sure that the committee itself wants to look into what you are doing and what you have done in the past and what you project in the future and this is something really creative.

Is it not a fact—is it not actually going to be necessary for you to control the governing body of that town for a long period of years in order to accomplish what you want to do?

Mr. ROUSE. That is a good question, sir, and obviously one we have had to struggle with. We have a unique and happy tradition in the