

extremely costly with no assurance of commensurate benefits, and with positive undesirable features such as local Federal coordinators or directors and excessive National Government participation in local responsibilities.

We respectfully urge the distinguished subcommittee not to report the proposed act for the following reasons:

1. The proposed demonstration cities program would cost billions of dollars with no assurance of curing the failures of present Federal urban programs.

2. The placement of a Federal coordinator or director in each demonstration city would result in the exercise of considerable influence over local agencies.

3. The program would be highly preferential in nature, with sections of 60 or 70 cities picked out by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for special benefits.

4. The program will greatly intensify the competition for, and dependency on, funds available from the National Government rather than promote vital, creative, and imaginative local leadership.

5. Nonpassage of the proposed act would not leave a vacuum of inaction. The improvement in housing conditions in recent years has virtually all been accomplished by private construction, rehabilitation, and demolition efforts financed by massive amounts of private funds and in no way connected with the Federal urban renewal program.

STATEMENT OF T. BROOKS BRADEMAS, PRESIDENT, CITY PLANNING ASSOCIATES, INC., PLANNING, URBAN RENEWAL, DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS, ON DEMONSTRATION CITIES ACT OF 1966 (H.R. 12341 AND H.R. 12342)

The experiences gained in taking part in the development of urban renewal and community planning programs in some 100 American communities over the past 10 years, has convinced me of the basic soundness of President Johnson's demonstration cities proposal. We have been hindered in our ability to successfully solve the myriad problems of our urban areas by a number of factors. Not the least of these has been our seeming inability to properly utilize and coordinate the physical, social welfare, educational, economic opportunity, and other action programs that are presently available to us.

President Johnson, in his message to the Congress on the cities in March of last year brought into sharp focus the magnitude of the problems besetting urban America. But, it is not enough to point out the problems that face urban America and call for dedication and commitment on the part of all of us concerned with these problems without offering us the weapons to wage the battle. The President has offered the weapons. In fact, he has offered an arsenal in his demonstration cities proposal.

FUNDS ARE INSUFFICIENT

It is apparent that the demonstration cities proposal, which is clearly the most significant and far-reaching proposal for the solution to America's urban problems since the Housing Act of 1949, will not be effective unless sufficient "ammunition" is provided. Although the \$2.3 billion proposed to be appropriated over the initial 6-year period of the demonstration cities program may sound like a substantial sum, divided among some 60 or so communities, it would amount to an average of some \$38 million per community.

A recently completed study for the city of Buffalo, N.Y., revealed that to undertake the half dozen most pressing urban renewal projects would require a Federal grant of some \$48 million. This would account for only a small portion of the renewal needs of the community. To carry out the second and third priority renewal efforts in Buffalo would require in excess of \$100 million of Federal aid on the basis of the present one-half/two-thirds grant formula. These cost estimates include only the undertaking of specific renewal projects and do not include the many other public activities that must be undertaken if the city is to regain its physical, economic, and social health.

Taking the considerably smaller community of Springfield, Ohio, with a population of some 85,000 which has also completed the development of a community