

offer valuable aid to public administrators, fiscal officials, program planners, economists, and financial analysts.

The study examines the provision of State and local public facilities and the availability of credit resources to help finance them. This study is concerned with existing capital plant and the expected growth in requirements over the next 10 years. The second volume, which will be released shortly, will deal with the credit financing of State and local facilities, with particular reference to the municipal bond market.

The estimates are based on the separate assessment of each important category of public facilities, e.g., roads, schools, sewers, airports, etc., prepared by a number of specialists. While the estimates represent their best judgment of the facilities needed to provide adequately for the growing needs of our society, on the basis of a general economic projection for the period covered, it can be expected that some were more moderate than others in projecting increases.

One mildly surprising aspect of the results is that they are closely in line with three other recent studies, each based on a completely different methodology. One is a projection of capital outlays, presented in chapter I of this study, based on extrapolation from past trends and correlations—in short, “a mathematical projection”—derived from past relationships. The second is based on a recent survey of the 50 States and derived from an economic model prepared by the Federal interagency study of economic growth and employment opportunities. A third study was prepared by the Center for Priority Analysis of the National Planning Association.

It might normally be expected that the projection presented herewith, reflecting the so-called “aspiration standards,” might indicate greater expenditures than those based on projections of previous relationships or expectations of public officials. But the fact that it is not higher does not necessarily reveal a downward bias. In the recent past, our rate of growth in the public facility sector has been brisk; and it may be that a continuation of this pace would bring us closer to realistic aspiration standards than one might expect. In any case, comparison of our study with the others will in itself offer a stimulating and productive undertaking for the people who are looking ahead in this field of economic activity.

The professional experts who prepared this study in response to the committee's request have given generously of their time and energy. The committee is grateful to them and to their organizations for so graciously making available their time and talents. The participating experts are identified at the beginning of each chapter and in the table of contents.

The committee is particularly grateful to Dr. Arnold H. Diamond, Assistant Director, Office of Economic and Market Analysis, Department of Housing and Urban Development, who, as consulting economist to the committee, undertook the major responsibility for planning the scope of research, editing and coordinating this study. Eleanor Aeschliman assisted with the editing. The study was under the general supervision of John R. Stark, Deputy Director.

JAMES W. KNOWLES.