Study Phase II ends with this final report to the President. Major steps included:

Extending contacts with local, state, and Federal personnel including a special presentation to representatives of:

Council of State Governments.

International City Managers Association.

National Association of Counties.

National League of Cities. U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Working closely with program personnel to:

Refine and test recommendations for validity and feasibility. Seek additional opportunities for processing improvements. Implement approved recommendations to the extent possible. Develop action plans completing implementation.

MODEL CITIES

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY

The Model Cities demonstration represents the boldest and most innovative approach ever taken by the Federal Government to respond to the crisis of the cities. It draws upon a broad range of Federal programs which provide the maximum impact on a problem area of a city. Delays in individual programs could pyramid to an intolerable level unless methods are adopted to streamline and simplify the processing function. Therefore, elimination of time lags has particular significance for this ambitious program.

This problem has been placed under the microscope of a Model Cities System

Improvement Team consisting of representatives from eight agencies:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Department of Labor.

Office of Economic Opportunity. Department of Agriculture. Department of Commerce. Department of Interior.

Small Business Administration.

During Study Phase I ending June 30, the Team analyzed 22 Federal grant-inaid programs relevant to Model Cities. It determined processing times, and made recommendations to cut delivery times in Federal review and approval precedures.

In the second phase the Team worked closely with program personnel in testing, refining, and implementing proposed recommendations, and in identifying additional improvement opportunities.

RESULTS

Table I (at the end of this section) shows processing time reductions to be achieved by implementing approved recommendations. The original average Federal processing time for programs examined was 155 days. This will be cut in half and reduced by an estimated 77 days, or an average reduction of 50 per cent. Most time savings stem from four basic recommendations to:

Delegate more authority for final decisions or milestone actions to field

officers.

Increase significantly the amount and nature of pre-application consultation and technical assistance.

Adopt concurrent processing techniques wherever possible.

Reduce to a minimum technical reviews performed at the national level. In addition to these basic recommendations, more time can be saved by installing:

Standard processing times coupled with workable processing control and scheduling systems.

Simplified amendatory and revision procedures.