

and experimentation carried out by these administrations, the Department is already deeply involved in the development of urban transportation facilities.

With this background on the program and the plan, I would like to turn to the matter of most concern to this committee: Why does the reorganization proposed constitute the most logical and efficient organization to carry out urban mass transportation programs?

Our analysis starts with the proposition that the development of our urban areas is first and foremost the responsibility of local government. Local government is responsible for establishing a community's development objectives, identifying the means by which those objectives will be achieved, planning the size and location of community facilities, and then carrying out the programs for facility development.

The Federal Government's purpose in providing technical guidance and financial assistance to the community is to assure that urban development proceeds at a pace and in a manner consistent with overall public objectives. Our goal should be to manage these Federal assistance programs so as to achieve what science calls a synergistic effect—accomplishing a total effect from the Federal effort which is greater than the sum of the individual programs.

At the heart of the organizational problem lie two facts. One is that transportation, as much as any other single factor, shapes the development of our urban areas. Consequently, if we are to create suitable living and working environments through orderly development of our urban areas, it is essential that transportation facilities be the servant of development and not the master.

The other fact is that each of the various modes of transportation are but pieces of a local, regional, national, and international transportation system. Therefore, if we are to provide most efficiently the transportation services necessary to our national defense and commerce, and the social cohesion and personal fulfillment of our citizens, transportation must be viewed as a system, and each mode of transportation must be viewed as an integral part of that system. This is especially true in the case of urban transportation where the inherent advantages of one mode of transportation over another are not always clear. Here, there is a real need for conducting research and demonstrations, identifying and evaluating alternatives, and then following through with action programs. Such a systems approach is difficult to achieve when the responsibility for transportation programs is divided.

The basic decision turns, then, on a judgment as to how the programs supporting these sometimes conflicting objectives can best be accommodated within the organizational structure of the Federal Government, and within the framework of Federal-State-local relationships. It was our judgment that the best solution lay in establishing a clear alinement of the functional responsibilities between the two Departments, and then providing for a meshing of the programs for transportation planning and development with the programs for urban planning and development through the establishment of a tight coordinative mechanism. Three steps were indicated.

The transfer of the urban mass transportation program to the Department of Transportation is the first. It permits the function of urban mass transportation to be treated in a systems context along