

Appendix IV

IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY

(The materials included herein were supplied by Representative Thomas B. Curtis, ranking minority member of the committee:)

OCTOBER 11, 1966.

Mr. LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,
General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KNOTT: Enclosed is a tearsheet from the Congressional Record of October 10. I would appreciate learning from you what action, if any, has been taken concerning the Subcommittee's recommendation of last May, as I wish to pursue this matter at some length during the next session of Congress.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

(The following is reprinted from the Congressional Record—Appendix, Oct. 10, 1966, pp. A5202, A5203:)

FEDERAL PROPERTY HOLDINGS SHOULD BEAR LOCAL PROPERTY TAX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1966

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country there is a great deal of federally owned property being improperly used and causing unnecessary hardship on various local and State governments. These Federal landholdings often cause economic problems in the locale in which they are situated because they erode the tax base of the area. On the other side of the coin, precisely because these Federal landholdings are not subjected to the economic discipline of local governmental taxation, they are often not utilized to their highest potential.

Last May the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation, of the Joint Economic Committee, issued a report calling attention to this problem and recommending the appointment of a high level commission or committee to identify such Federal properties and to recommend their proper utilization. Today I am inserting in the Record an excellent editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of September 21, entitled "Bolling's Future" pointing out underutilization of the Bolling-Anacostia area. I wrote to the editor of the Star commending him on the editorial and suggesting further thoughts for his consideration. The editorial and my letter follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 21, 1966]

BOLLING'S FUTURE

The language in the new military construction act prohibiting any use of the Bolling-Anacostia area for urban renewal purposes until 1971 is a senseless, capricious restriction, which Congress should never have approved. But the provision was enacted, leaving President Johnson the choice of accepting it or vetoing the entire billion-dollar construction measure. Faced with this decision, the President found a third way out.

He has made plain, in signing the bill, that he does not share the narrow view of Representative Rivers, the House Armed Services Committee chairman, that the military should retain control over land clearly excess to its needs. He instructed that urban renewal planning for the area proceed as rapidly as possible