

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1968
(D.C. REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY)

68061766

HEARING
BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETIETH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

MAY 14, 1968

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations



GOVERNMENT DEPOSITORY
PROPERTY OF RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOUTH JERSEY LIBRARY
CAMDEN, N. J. 08102

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1968

JUL 2 - 1968

DOC.

14/7

94-340
9/3/968/no. 4

453365

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Illinois, *Chairman*

CHET HOLIFIELD, California

JACK BROOKS, Texas

L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina

PORTER HARDY, Jr., Virginia

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota

ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama

EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland

JOHN E. MOSS, California

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida

HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin

JOHN S. MONAGAN, Connecticut

TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Massachusetts

J. EDWARD ROUSH, Indiana

WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Pennsylvania

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, New Jersey

WILLIAM J. RANDALL, Missouri

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York

JIM WRIGHT, Texas

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Rhode Island

FLORENCE P. DWYER, New Jersey

OGDEN R. REID, New York

FRANK HORTON, New York

DONALD RUMSFELD, Illinois

JOHN N. ERLÉNBN, Illinois

JOHN W. WYDLER, New York

CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr., Ohio

JACK EDWARDS, Alabama

GUY VANDER JAGT, Michigan

JOHN T. MYERS, Indiana

FLETCHER THOMPSON, Georgia

WILLIAM O. COWGER, Kentucky

MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts

GILBERT GUDE, Maryland

PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr., California

CHRISTINE RAY DAVIS, *Staff Director*

JAMES A. LANIGAN, *General Counsel*

MILES Q. ROMNEY, *Associate General Counsel*

J. P. CARLSON, *Minority Counsel*

WILLIAM H. COPENHAVER, *Minority Professional Staff*

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York

CHET HOLIFIELD, California

HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin

JOHN N. ERLÉNBN, Illinois

CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr., Ohio

JACK EDWARDS, Alabama

ELMER W. HENDERSON, *Counsel*

VERONICA B. JOHNSON, *Clerk*

JANET A. HURTACK, *Clerk*

(II)

CONTENTS

Message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968, which would transfer authority to appoint RLA board members from the President to the District of Columbia Commissioner and give him authority to prescribe rules and regulations for the RLA-----	Page 2
Statement of-----	
Hughes, Hon. Phillip S., Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget----	3
Miller, Neville, Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; accompanied by Thomas Appleby, Executive Director-----	6
Washington, Hon. Walter E., Commissioner of the District of Columbia-----	4
Statement submitted for the record by Elizabeth S. Johnson, president, League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia-----	13

20110720

[illegible]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1968 (DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY)

TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE
REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 11:30 a.m., in room 2203, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John A. Blatnik (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives John A. Blatnik, Henry S. Reuss, John N. Erlenborn, Clarence J. Brown, Jr., and Jack Edwards.

Also present: Representative William L. Dawson, chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Staff members present: Elmer W. Henderson, subcommittee counsel; and William H. Copenhaver, minority professional staff.

Mr. BLATNIK. We now move on to Reorganization Plan No. 4. We have Mr. Hughes and Mayor Washington still remaining. We will call Neville Miller, Chairman of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. Mr. Miller, is Mr. Appleby with you?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. Is he to testify in any way at all?

Mr. Appleby, why don't you join Mr. Miller? Thomas Appleby, Executive Director of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

Reorganization Plan No. 4, very briefly, places in the Mayor-Commissioner the power now held by the President to appoint two members of the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Land Agency. Now, as I understand, the Mayor already appoints three members. This plan will give him authority to appoint all of the five members. The plan also transfers to the Mayor the authority to prescribe the rules and regulations governing the conduct of the business of the RLA now being prescribed by the RLA Board of Directors. This will enhance his power to guide the urban renewal program in the District.

(Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968 follows:)

(1)

[H. Doc. 279, 90th Cong., 2d sess.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TRANSMITTING REORGANIZATION PLAN No. 4 OF 1968 ON URBAN RENEWAL, WHICH WOULD TRANSFER AUTHORITY TO APPOINT RLA BOARD MEMBERS FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONER AND GIVE HIM AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE RLA

To the Congress of the United States:

Urban Renewal is a vital weapon in the Nation's attack on urban blight and physical decay. In the firm hands of a local executive determined to improve the face of his city, it is a powerful tool of reform.

In the District of Columbia, urban renewal is managed by a Federal Agency, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, headed by an independent five-man Board of Directors. Although the District government pays the entire local share of the costs of urban renewal and although the Commissioner of the District of Columbia appoints three of the five members of the RLA Board, the Agency need not follow the Commissioner's leadership or administrative direction.

To strengthen the District of Columbia Commissioner's authority to initiate and guide the administration of urban renewal, I am today transmitting to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968. This plan:

Gives the District of Columbia Commissioner the authority to appoint all five members of the RLA Board, by transferring to him the appointment function now vested in the President;

Transfers to him the authority to prescribe the rules and regulations governing the conduct of business by RLA. This function is now vested in the Board of Directors.

Urban renewal involves slum clearance, demolition, the relocation of families, the provision of new housing, the stimulation of rehabilitation and new employment. Throughout the Nation, it is clear that authority and leadership by the local chief executive is essential to weld together the full range of municipal functions and community service programs to change conditions in city slums.

In our Capital City the hopes for a balanced new town and new housing development on the Fort Lincoln site in northeast Washington, the rebuilding of the Shaw neighborhood, and a successful model cities program hinge on the leadership of the District of Columbia Commissioner. Members of the Congress have repeatedly stressed the need to establish the Commissioner's effective control of all functions essential to local redevelopment. The attached plan takes a major step toward that objective.

The plan does not alter the corporate status of the Redevelopment Land Agency or any of the authorities now vested by law in the Agency.

The accompanying reorganization plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code. I have found, after investigation, that each reorganization included in the plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code.

There are no direct savings deriving from this plan. However, it will improve the management of programs aimed at reviving the deteriorated social, economic and physical structure of this city, our National Capital. The benefits and savings from a more successful attack on these problems cannot be estimated in advance but their reality cannot be denied.

To achieve our goal of a model Capital, I therefore urge the Congress to permit this reorganization plan to take effect.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 13, 1968.

REORGANIZATION PLAN No. 4 OF 1968

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, March 13, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Section 1. Appointments.—(a) The functions of the President of the United States with respect to appointing certain members of the Board of Directors of

the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (D.C. Code, sec. 5-703) are hereby transferred to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

(b) Nothing in this reorganization plan shall be deemed to terminate the tenure of any member of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency now in office.

Section 2. Relationship of Board of Directors and Commissioner.—(a) There are transferred from the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia the functions of adopting, prescribing, amending and repealing bylaws, rules, and regulations for the exercise of the powers of the Board under D.C. Code, sections 5-701 to 5-719 or governing the manner in which its business may be conducted (D.C. Code, sec. 5-703(b)).

(b) Any part of the functions transferred by this section may be delegated by the Commissioner to the Board.

Section 3. References to District of Columbia Code.—References in this reorganization plan to any provision of the District of Columbia Code are references to the provisions of statutory law codified under that provision and include the said provision as amended, modified, or supplemented prior to the effective date of this reorganization plan.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Hughes, will you open this presentation on behalf of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968 with your statement?

**STATEMENT OF HON. PHILLIP S. HUGHES, DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET**

Mr. HUGHES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to present the views of the Bureau of the Budget on Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968, providing for certain reorganizations relating to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

Both this reorganization plan and Plan No. 3 of 1968 relating to the Recreation Board derive from a recognized need to provide the District of Columbia Commissioner with the necessary authority to effectively manage District affairs.

As I stated in my testimony on Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1968, thorough reorganization of the very top structure of the District government was a necessary precondition to plans for bringing municipal functions such as recreation and urban renewal under closer control. Since that has been accomplished—under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967—and a single executive has been substituted for the commission form of government, it has become possible, as President Johnson indicated, “to effect further improvements, both in the structure of the District government and in its relationship to other agencies serving the Nation’s Capital.”

Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968 carries out the President’s intent with respect to the Redevelopment Land Agency which is the urban renewal agency for the District. The RLA is a corporation established by law in 1946. Its powers are vested in a five-member Board of Directors. Under present law, two members of the Board are appointed by the President and three are appointed by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, all subject to Senate confirmation.

Under the reorganization plan, the Presidential function of appointing two members of the RLA Board would be transferred to the Commissioner, thus giving him responsibility for appointing all the members. Further, the Commissioner would be given an additional element of control with respect to RLA through the transfer to him of the

Board's functions of adopting, prescribing, amending, and repealing by-laws, rules, and regulations for the exercise of RLA powers or governing the manner in which its business is conducted. Provision is made in the plan for the delegation of the rulemaking functions to the Board.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 thus would bring the District's urban renewal program under the more effective control of the Mayor. As a result, the urban renewal activities of RLA could be woven into the fabric of related community improvement programs of the District while leaving its corporate status intact.

As one looks at the evolution of urban renewal from a simple slum clearance approach to a program involving housing rehabilitation, code enforcement, strategic spot demolition and increasing social awareness, the need for closely coordinating urban renewal with other municipal functions has become overwhelmingly apparent. Now, with the advent of the model cities program, we see urban renewal as the base for a wide panoply of programs directed at renewing—not just the brick and mortar—but the institutions, the human beings, the ways of life in large sections of the city.

The District of Columbia is one of the cities selected to carry out a model cities project—in the Shaw area. Under the best circumstances organizationally, this would be a complex and exceedingly difficult enterprise. It means meshing together, not only the components of physical renewal—code enforcement, public works, and the like, now split between RLA and other agencies—but welfare and employment programs and other municipal services. Without adequate controls over urban renewal operations and the ability to integrate them with these other project activities, the chances for a successful model cities program in the District could be drastically lessened.

The new District leadership has demonstrated the will and the capacity to improve the government of the District. Now, Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968 will make possible the more effective management of a vital segment of District affairs.

There will be, I am sure, plans advanced for bringing other municipal functions now vested in agencies outside of the District government more closely within its control. In the meantime, the plan before you—along with the recent designation, by Executive Order No. 11401, of the Mayor as the National Capital Housing Authority—represents a significant beginning in developing a well-coordinated program for improving District neighborhoods. I urge the Congress therefore, to permit this plan to take effect.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you, Mr. Hughes.

Commissioner WASHINGTON, do you have a statement?

Commissioner WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will you please proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER E. WASHINGTON, COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Commissioner WASHINGTON. Yes, sir. I will be brief. I think Mr. Hughes has covered many of the essentials, and my statement will, therefore, serve to endorse Reorganization Plan No. 4.

As the President noted in his message to Congress of March 13, 1968, accompanying this reorganization plan, the function of urban

renewal, which, in the District of Columbia, is carried out by the Redevelopment Land Agency, is an essential weapon in the District's attack on blight and decay in our community. The President also noted that Members of Congress have repeatedly stressed the need to establish the Commissioner's effective control of all functions essential to local redevelopment, including urban renewal. The reorganization plan is a major step in that direction. And as Mr. Hughes has pointed out, by Executive order the President has already acted to bring the National Capital Housing Authority within the jurisdiction of the Commissioner.

The Redevelopment Land Agency is a separate Federal agency composed of a five-man Board of Directors. Three of its Directors presently are appointed by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and two by the President. As indicated in the President's message, although the District contributes one-third toward the cost of urban renewal, the Agency is not required to follow the Commissioner's leadership or administrative direction. I would hasten to add that even though the Agency is not compelled by statute to follow my leadership, the Agency has given me its full cooperation and support on matters of vital concern to the District since our new administration took office. And indeed, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that, in addition, Mr. Miller and the Board have been particularly gracious since I have been in office. They have permitted me, upon my request, to use their own Director, Thomas Appleby, who is here, as my Housing Coordinator, which gave me a loose umbrella to sort of cover all of the housing agencies and to get them in a tandem operation so that we could develop a capacity to meet this gnawing housing problem. And I certainly want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that this has been a most gracious bit of cooperation and extension of good offices to me and to this city. And I certainly commend them.

However, despite this fine relationship with RLA, it is essential, as the President noted in his message, that the Commissioner of the District of Columbia's leadership role in urban renewal be assured on a continuing basis. The reorganization plan which you are now considering contains two separate provisions which would provide that assurance. First, it would transfer to the Commissioner the authority to appoint the two members of the Agency's Board of Directors who are now Presidential appointees. They would, of course, continue to be subject to confirmation by the Senate. Second, it would transfer to the Commissioner the power of the Agency's Board of Directors to establish rules and regulations governing the conduct of the Agency's business. The reorganization plan authorizes the Commissioner to redelegate this rulemaking authority back to the Agency's Board of Directors. This provision would give the Commissioner a great degree of administrative flexibility, while retaining essential control over the Agency's urban renewal programs.

The principal benefit of the reorganization plan is that it will insure a maximum amount of coordination of urban renewal activities under the Commissioner's leadership, without impeding the Agency's operations. There is probably nothing more fragmented in the city than the housing agencies, I think the Executive order and this step would go very far in bringing all those agencies responsible for an aspect of the housing program within the kind of umbrella that would give us the capacity to reach some of the housing needs.

The Agency's Board of Directors has assured me of its readiness and its desire to cooperate in implementing this reorganization plan. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that, with such cooperation, the urban renewal activities of the District of Columbia, which are so essential to the well-being of our community and its redevelopment, will be substantially improved.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to appear and endorse this reorganization plan.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you, Mayor Washington.

Mr. Miller, do you have a statement that you want to read at this time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. BLATNIK. Would you please proceed?

STATEMENT OF NEVILLE MILLER, CHAIRMAN, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY; ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS APPLEBY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Neville Miller, Chairman of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and I am pleased to offer this statement on Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968, concerning this Agency, which you are now considering.

I have been a resident of the District of Columbia since July 1938, about 30 years. I am a practicing attorney, with offices in the Munsey Building. I was appointed to the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Land Agency by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia in September of 1960, 7½ years ago. I am testifying from some municipal experience as I was Mayor of Louisville, Ky., from 1933 to 1937.

The Redevelopment Land Agency's function in the urban renewal process in the District of Columbia consists of executing urban renewal plans which have been adopted and approved respectively by the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia government. Even though the basic planning and financial decisions concerning the urban renewal plans are made by NCPA and the District government, many critical decisions remain to be made in the execution stage of urban renewal. For example, decisions relating to relocation of families, individuals and businesses and the staging of redevelopment affect the lives of many persons and the continuation of many businesses. For these reasons, and because urban renewal activities are vital to the District of Columbia, they should be carried out with ultimate control over them residing with the Commissioner. We think that Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968 achieves this desirable goal.

The Board of Directors of the Agency endorses this reorganization plan. We have always had and continue to have a close working relationship with the District of Columbia government. However, it is necessary to assure the District that such relationship will continue on a permanent basis by institutionalizing it. Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968 accomplishes this efficiently without any interruption of the Agency's activities; and, therefore, I urge you to approve the plan.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that as Chairman of the RLA, I was ex officio member of the Board of the National Capital Housing Authority while Mayor Washington was Executive Director, and I have worked with him for the last 7 years in housing, and we have always worked very well together and I am very happy to have him control this Agency. We think we can get along fine.

Mr. BLATNIK. Well, Chairman Miller, it is a good statement, a short statement. I want the record to show further that it is a very modest statement in view of the splendid record of performance which has been yours under very difficult circumstances at times. In connection with the proposed inner loop and outer loop of the highway work, we had some relationship with the National Capital Planning Commission and certainly with your Redevelopment Land Agency. It has been a difficult problem. I think you have done a splendid job and we commend you for your leadership. The fine job that your associates in the Agency and on the executive staff have performed is also highly commendable.

I have just a question or two. Mr. Miller, could you briefly explain, for our information and for the record, the procedure that is now being followed, or has been followed until now, in initiating and carrying through urban renewal plans?

Mr. MILLER. Originally, the areas of urban renewal planning were designated by the National Capital Planning Commission, after studies—we helped study—and they went to the Board of Commissioners. The Board of Commissioners then approved the designation of the area. They sent it back to the National Capital Planning Commission to make the plan. The National Capital Planning Commission then made the plan and sent it back to the District Commissioners to approve the plan. And that was a very detailed plan as to where commercial buildings should be and where residential buildings should be. Then, when they approved the plan as drawn up, they referred it to the RLA for execution, and we participated in helping form the plan.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is the question. You do participate in the formulation?

Mr. MILLER. We help.

Mr. BLATNIK. In what manner, sort of an informal——

Mr. MILLER. Informally, yes. We provide——

Mr. BLATNIK. —line of communication, consulting?

Mr. MILLER. We work with them and then when the plan comes back to them, they refer it to us and we carry it out. Then if there is any change in the plan to be made, we have to go back through the same process of referring it to the National Capital Planning Commission to approve it. And now, instead of the Board of Commissioners approving it, the single Commissioner approves it. Before the urban renewal program was mostly under the jurisdiction of the Engineer Commissioner—General Clark, General Duke, and General Mathe at various times.

Mr. BLATNIK. And the Engineer Commissioner also had charge of the highway program, did he not?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. BLATNIK. How would the highway program be coordinated and integrated with your Redevelopment Land Agency work as well as the National Capital Planning Commission?

Mr. MILLER. It depends on whether it went through our urban renewal areas.

Mr. BLATNIK. There has to be some coordination for the highway work quite separately. I mean the highway planners would not draw one map and show the route going this way and run it right through a brand new area that has just been redeveloped, would they?

Mr. MILLER. No. I think Mr. Appleby probably can explain it.

Mr. BLATNIK. Could you answer that, Mr. Appleby?

Mr. APPLEBY. I will try, Mr. Chairman. It gets coordinated really in two places, through the National Capital Planning Commission and through the District, now City Council, in approving an urban renewal plan. So that when a plan for a highway gets referred to the National Capital Planning Commission for advice on its location it must be approved by the City Council. The City Council also holds the statutory power to approve or not an urban renewal plan. So ultimately the City Council in both cases has to approve and, therefore, the various departments and the planning bodies have to get together before they get to that level.

Mr. BLATNIK. This get-together process required a lot of shuffling and shuttling back and forth and a lot of time, did it not?

Mr. APPLEBY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. What changes will take place so as to streamline and simplify the lines of coordination under the present reorganization plan, Mr. Appleby?

Mr. APPLEBY. Well, the statutory powers of the RLA, while they do include planning, they relate primarily, as the chairman said, to carrying out the urban renewal plan. And, therefore, in its business of improved planning it is not the major benefit that would accrue here. It is in the carrying out of urban renewal programs after a plan with a highway in it or street in it has been designated.

Mr. BLATNIK. I see.

Mr. APPLEBY. Then it falls into the bailiwick of relocation. For example, how the Redevelopment Land Agency carries out a program for the relocation of families could have an obvious great impact upon the mayor and his city and how he carries out his program. So ultimately this would mean that he could have more direct control over that activity once a plan has been approved.

Mr. BLATNIK. So the reorganization plan directs itself more to the effective and judicious execution—

Mr. APPLEBY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK (continuing). Of the operational end of your Redevelopment Land Agency?

I have more questions but we are a little short on time.

Mr. Erlenborn, would you please proceed.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it is true that in any urban renewal program of a city there has to be some agency like the RLA to plan and execute the urban renewal program. What is the usual setup in a large city? Do they have a separation, say, between the planning stage, such as the NCPC, and the execution stage, such as the RLA, or are they often combined?

Mr. HUGHES. The pattern, Mr. Erlenborn, with respect to the urban renewal functions is that these are ordinarily a part of the municipal functions. A number of cities are moving, and there seems

to be a trend toward an integrated housing, urban renewal, planning and code enforcement enterprise, all of it a part of the municipal operation.

Mr. ERLBORN. You say part of the municipal operation. This would be a department of the city government—

Mr. HUGHES. Under the jurisdiction of the administrative head of the government.

Mr. ERLBORN. Not a separate agency appointed by the mayor or—

Mr. HUGHES. Well, in some circumstances it might be a board, it might be a division established by him. The planning body might, for instance be an individual supported by a board or advised by a board, or it might be a board itself. But the trend seems to be toward making these kinds of operations subdivisions of the municipal government.

Mr. ERLBORN. Directly responsible to the executive head of that government?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. ERLBORN. And in those cases where they have some sort of board or agency appointed, is it customary that the rulemaking powers and the conduct of the business of the board be exercised by the executive, the chief executive, such as is provided in this plan?

Mr. HUGHES. The short answer is, Mr. Erlborn, I am not really sure. I think, however, the general practice is for the executive to delegate these functions to his operating body or individual, whatever it might be—in this case, the Board. And I think the Mayor in his statement indicated this would likely be the pattern of operation in the District.

Mr. ERLBORN. So that when this plan goes into effect, you say that the setup here in the District of Columbia would be somewhat representative of the type of administration that is used in other large cities?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes.

Commissioner WASHINGTON. I would like to say just one word about that, Mr. Erlborn, if I may. The trend that New York has undertaken is characteristic of what is developing in the housing field—that of creating an administration of Housing and Development with a number of agencies, with a number of housing functions under that administration. The urban renewal facet, the public housing, the code enforcement, a relationship to the FHA with the 221(d)(3) and other programs, as well as certain programs in beautification which are under the HUD departmental sponsorship—all give you a total administrative package to use programs and new tools interchangeably. This is what we have achieved in a very loose way here by Mr. Appleby serving as the Housing Coordinator, setting up a task force of the Public Housing Agency, his own RLA and our own Code Enforcement Agency with a representative from FHA, operating to put the programs together and to use the tools effectively. For instance, using the leasing program in housing along or jointly with 221(d)(3) gives a total development that has several operational tools in it.

This is pretty much the trend, I would say, that cities are moving toward. It varies, however. In some cities, Baltimore, for example, the urban renewal and the public housing agencies are together with direction from the Chief Executive.

Mr. ERLBORN. If I understand correctly, authority over the National Capital Housing Authority has been given to you by Executive order.

Commissioner WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ERLBORN. Do you think that that Executive order and this plan go far enough or would it be desirable to merge the Housing Authority and the Redevelopment Land Agency?

Commissioner WASHINGTON. I think that my opinion here would be that those two functions, with respect to the current programs and tools that are available, would best serve for the present as separate entities. I think the matter of joint funding and program activity at this structure would not necessarily be wise, with the many other things that we have to do.

In other words, I would like to see the program strengthened and get as much capability out of the respective agencies now as possible with a view of putting some of the activities, like planning together, and perhaps the development work together at this juncture without putting the bulk of the program together. I think this is something that we could get to in another year or so, but I believe the development of capability, of the full capability of the programs at this time could best be achieved by keeping them as they are.

Mr. ERLBORN. You would not rule out sometime in the near future merger of these, too?

Commissioner WASHINGTON. Absolutely not. Those, I would not.

Mr. ERLBORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. I am curious to know how many of the proposals which have been made in recent months for the total reorganization of the various agencies involved with land use and planning and urban renewal and zoning and all of that were taken into account by the Bureau of the Budget when they came up with this reorganization plan?

Mr. HUGHES. As far as I know, Mr. Brown, the two relevant ones were the Housing Authority action by Executive order and this one. The Recreation Plan, the other plan this year that affects the District does not involve land per se. I do not know whether you had that in mind or not.

Mr. BROWN. Well, for instance, there is a report of the Federal City Council on Urban Renewal Programs for the District prepared in March of 1961. There is the Mayor's Work Report for a Better City in January of this year. There is another report prepared by the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies on the National Capital Planning Commission. Were any of these given consideration with reference to including in a single reorganization plan all of the various agencies that are involved in land use and zoning, redevelopment, and so forth?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes. I am sorry. I did not fully understand the question. Yes, Mr. Brown, we gave a good deal of thought to a broader action here with respect to land use, land planning, housing, urban renewal, and so on. I think the most notable absentee from the package is the National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. BROWN. Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. HUGHES. Fine Arts Commission, also. Both of them are involved. Each of them present some special problems that we struggled

with and did not solve to our satisfaction. Therefore, we dealt solely with this component of the package. I indicated, in the response to Mr. Erlenborn's question, the trend is pretty clearly toward the unification of planning functions as a part of administrative operation of a municipality. Doing this is complicated within the District because not only the District is involved but also the Federal Government is involved, and there is also a national public interest in the Nation's Capital and the monumental nature, at least, of some portions of the Capital. This does complicate the planning problem, and we just have not developed a solution that it seemed to us solved that portion of the problem.

Mr. BROWN. Well, now, when you develop that solution, do you presume that it will make a change in the plan for the functioning of the RLA?

Mr. HUGHES. It will certainly affect the operations of the RLA. I would not see it as affecting the organizational location of the RLA or the District's responsibility for those functions.

Mr. BROWN. Basically, my question is, why does the Bureau of the Budget bring in plans on a limited basis when it seems to me the whole problem is such a broadly encompassing problem that it might do well to hold off for another few months and come up with a plan that would resolve all—I should not say resolve all of the problems but resolve the administrative relationship of all the agencies involved in a much clearer manner?

Can you give me any background of the thinking of the Bureau of the Budget in this area, or the administration in this area?

Mr. HUGHES. It seems to us, Mr. Brown, that the direction of motion, the desirable direction of motion, is to place in the hands of the District government, the Mayor-Commissioner, more of the tools that are necessary to carry out the land planning, land use, housing functions than he now has.

This being the case, the plans like plan No. 4, which are dealing with a portion of the problem but which move RLA, for instance, under the Mayor's control, seem to us to be motions in the right direction. The problem of moving other components, the Fine Arts Commission and the Planning Commission, two that we have mentioned, is essentially a problem in resolving the balance as between the interests of the District as a municipality and the interests of the Federal Government, which are both operational and monumental and National Capital problems that have significance nationwide. The problem of resolving those has been difficult. To decide what is the District's, in a sense, and in what areas of National Capital planning, for example, the Federal Government, either on its own behalf or on behalf of the Nation at large, should have a say, we have not been able to resolve these problems at this point.

Mr. BROWN. Have you any time frame by which you will have those resolved, because you see—I do not want to go into any detailed history, but this is basic to the whole reorganization problem of the government of the District of Columbia. There are those of us who found some fault with the President's reorganization plan last year because of our feeling about what the most efficient administrative relationship might be and whether or not this could better coordinate the three interests involved—the national interest, Federal govern-

mental interest, and the interest of the residents of the District of Columbia—by means of a centralized head, or whether these three are going to be coordinated in some other and lower level manner in the decisionmaking process.

Do you have any ultimate time frame for when we will begin to get a full picture of what the government of the District of Columbia is going to look like when you get this area of problem resolved?

Mr. HUGHES. Well, I am not in a position to give you any schedule for these other areas. I think the President, both last year in his comments on Reorganization Plan No. 3 and again this year in the context of these two plans, has made it clear that he sees the need, the District's need, for increasingly more authority commensurate with its responsibility in these areas. But I do not have any time schedule which we would propose—

Mr. BROWN. The need for the District Commissioner to have more authority.

Mr. HUGHES. That is right. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN. Which puts it back into the hands of the White House because the White House appoints the District Commissioner, is that right?

Mr. HUGHES. I think whatever authorities, again, the Commissioner receives, obviously subject to review by the Congress, would be dealt with in the context of the functioning Council and the other kinds of actions that we have talked about before.

Mr. BROWN. The Council which is appointed by the White House?

Mr. HUGHES. That is correct. There is no substitute—I think the President has made this clear, and I certainly reemphasize—there is no substitute for home rule as a means of expressing the will of the local population. We are trying, however, to enable the District government to have a broader base of communication with the population of the District and also to strengthen the hand of the Mayor-Commissioner in dealing with these problems.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Hughes, we could go on probably for all afternoon on this subject, but I find it difficult to understand why the principle of home rule is desirable, for instance, in the area of building location and undesirable, say, in the area of recreation planning.

Mr. HUGHES. I think home rule is a desirable thing, and if there were an elected Mayor and City Council there would be home rule. I do not think we have any argument on that score.

Mr. BROWN. Well, the problem here again is that it seems to me the recreation area is a function wherein home rule should play a very important part. The problem of how you plan the development of the District of Columbia as the site of the Federal Government and as the national monumental city and as the site of residence of those people who live there; how you coordinate those three interests which are broad, and compare that with the recreational interests of the people in the community which are limited pretty much to the people who reside in this community. How do you coordinate these two things in a governmental system is what was at issue last year when we were talking about the reorganization plan of the District of Columbia government generally; and I think it is maybe what is at issue in the conversation we have had today. And, so far, it seems to me that the direction is not abundantly clear but rather confused by

the plans that we have gotten from the Bureau of the Budget. I have no objection to this plan. I do not think it goes far enough. I think it is much too narrow and much too restricted in its scope. If we had time, I would like to ask you if the RLA wanted to redevelop a couple of blocks in Georgetown what it would have to go through, and I think you would spend most of the afternoon telling me what all the redtape procedures are that it would have to go through.

Now, if we are going to cut that redtape, I would like to know, as soon as we can from the administration, where all these wonderful things come from under our philosophy of government, what that plan is. And it seems to me that it has not been too well-developed yet.

Mr. BLATNIK. No further questions?

Thank you very much, Commissioner, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Appleby.

Commissioner WASHINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. We have a statement submitted by the League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia, written by Elizabeth S. Johnson, the president, in support of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968. The statement will appear at this point in the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, PRESENTED BY ELIZABETH S. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT

The D.C. League of Women Voters supports the President's Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968 as a further step in coordinating and focusing responsibility for the essential functions of a city government.

The league has advocated centralization of "authority for urban renewal in the District government." Reorganization Plan No. 4 will begin to bring some order to the city's housing program by allowing the Mayor to make his own appointments to the Redevelopment Land Agency.

Thus, because of our interest in a more efficient and centrally responsible government under the single Commissioner and City Council, we urge the Congress to permit this plan to take effect.

Commissioner WASHINGTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Good luck.

This concludes the hearing on Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968.

The subcommittee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.)



The first part of the report is devoted to a general survey of the situation in the country. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done during the year. The report is divided into three main parts: the first part is devoted to a general survey of the situation in the country; the second part is devoted to a detailed account of the work done during the year; and the third part is devoted to a summary of the results of the work.

The first part of the report is devoted to a general survey of the situation in the country. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done during the year. The report is divided into three main parts: the first part is devoted to a general survey of the situation in the country; the second part is devoted to a detailed account of the work done during the year; and the third part is devoted to a summary of the results of the work.

The second part of the report is devoted to a detailed account of the work done during the year. It is followed by a summary of the results of the work. The report is divided into three main parts: the first part is devoted to a general survey of the situation in the country; the second part is devoted to a detailed account of the work done during the year; and the third part is devoted to a summary of the results of the work.

The third part of the report is devoted to a summary of the results of the work. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done during the year. The report is divided into three main parts: the first part is devoted to a general survey of the situation in the country; the second part is devoted to a detailed account of the work done during the year; and the third part is devoted to a summary of the results of the work.



