

Council which also by law must hold public hearings and I presume would allow the public to express themselves.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Segal has a response, I assume, on this same point.

Mr. Segal.

Mr. SEGAL. Yes, I just wanted to comment just from another point there. Our task force considered the points that you raised, and we felt that the overriding need was to have the District Recreation Department become part of the District government. But in light of some of the points you raised and making the additional point that perhaps no function of the city needs to be more responsive to the community needs than recreation, it is because of that that we recommended the formulation or appointment of the community advisory board.

Now, there are nine regions that the Recreation Department is divided into. So our suggestion was to have a representative from each of the regions on this board, elected by the people in the region, in addition to having two youth representatives and representatives appointed by the various agencies involved. And our thought was that these people would, in effect, develop the kind of needs they have in their communities, the kind of recreation needs they have, make budget proposals and suggestions. And on the basis of this, the way I visualize it, we would actually have a more responsive board with no slights intended to the present board, but really a much more responsive board, responsive to the community needs than we have had in the past. And, of course, the Mayor is here and can speak for himself in terms of what his intentions are, but this was the thinking of the task force in considering the points that you raised.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Yes, maybe I could restate the question.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mayor, to bring you up to date, we were discussing not only the need for much greater funding—the recommendation has been made that the present fiscal level of \$7.6 million for recreational purposes in the District of Columbia should be tripled, in addition to approving the amount of the funding and the procedure for budgeting and funding—but the question of how much, or to what degree, will there be representation of the community in planning of these programs.

Mr. Erlenborn, will you restate your earlier proposition?

Mr. ERLNBORN. The sentiment I was expressing in the form of question was the fact that presently the District of Columbia Recreation Board is broadly representative of the community. By law they must hold their meetings at stated times and places, and meetings must be open to the public so that they can at least observe and hopefully participate in the deliberations of the Board in establishing policy for recreation in the District, establishing the overall plan.

Now, all of these authorities are being transferred to the Mayor-Commissioner, who by law does not have to have any public hearings or allow the public to participate in establishing the recreation plans for the District. My real question was why was this authority for planning not given to the Council, which is broadly representative of the residents of the District and must hold public hearings.

Commissioner WASHINGTON. I would think that might even be counterproductive. I think the matter that we are concerned with is