

those local objectives are compatible with the development of the whole area. If the objectives of the unit of local government are incompatible with the area development then the Federal Government should encourage perpetuation of such policies.

Accordingly, we suggest the language of section 802 be amended as follows:

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

SECTION 802. It is the purpose of this title to promote more harmonious inter-governmental relations and sound planning, zoning and land use practices by prescribing uniform policies and procedures whereby the Administration shall require, use, and dispose of land in urban areas in order that urban land transactions entered into for the General Services Administration or on behalf of other Federal agencies shall be consistent with and promote sound zoning and land-use practices and shall be made to the greatest extent in accordance with sound planning and development objectives of the local governments and local planning agencies concerned.

Furthermore, we believe the Federal Government should require comprehensive planning as a condition precedent to the disposal of Federal real property, rather than leaving such planning to the discretion of local government as provided by section 803. In our opinion, adding this requirement may spark planning activity where none was contemplated by local officials.

CHANGING TIMES

In conclusion, we wish to note our great respect for the Federal system, and for the autonomy of governmental bodies within their spheres of jurisdiction. But we think the changing times may require greater experimentation into specialized governmental units. Interstate compacts, such as the one being worked out between California and Nevada for the Lake Tahoe area, regional authorities, and the like might prove to be more effective means of marshaling resources to combat pollution, to accomplish highway planning, and to initiate effective land use policies than the elaborate structure of local governmental institutions now coping with such problems. We suggest that this is an area requiring study which might be generated by this distinguished subcommittee.

We appreciate very much the opportunity afforded to appear before this committee. If there are any questions we will do our best to answer them.

Thank you.

Senator MUSKIE. Thank you very much.

I note that you all expressed in the opening portions of your statements the problem of competition raised by the issue of the specialized and technical services. I am happy that apparently we have overcome the bulk of your objections, if not all of them, in the language of the bill. I gather that you agree on that point.

Mr. REUTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator MUSKIE. Mr. Fisher-Smith, with respect to your proposed language for section 802, is it your intent that such language give the Federal Government veto power in properly planning the objectives which it did not consider sound?

Mr. FISHER-SMITH. No, sir, I do not believe that is possible; rather I believe that there are instances where the Federal Government has been the custodian of lands and this custodianship has been beneficial