

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO T. F. ROGERS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
SCIENCE, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Q. 1. Please supply for the record a copy of the agreement reached with the National Academy of Science and the National Academy of Engineering, and a copy of the agreement reached with the Department of Transportation.

A. 1. a. Attachment (1) is a copy of the contractual agreement between this Department and the National Academy of Science and the National Academy of Engineering.

b. Formal agreement as to all details has not yet been reached with the Department of Transportation. We now expect that this will be accomplished in the next two weeks for transmission to the Bureau of the Budget. They will then prepare a determination order which will formally define the agreement between the two Departments. We now expect that this determination order will be completed by June 30, 1968. We will be pleased to forward a copy to you when it becomes available.

Q. 2. Please describe the extent to which other agencies have submitted proposals to H.U.D. for the funding of research, the purpose of the research, and the status of the proposals.

A. 2. Attachment (2) summarizes the proposals received from other Federal Departments and Agencies, the purpose of the research and the status of the proposals.

Q. 2a. What steps has H.U.D. taken to make other agencies aware of its research needs and the problems it wishes to resolve?

A. 2a. By his letter of October 11, 1967, attached, Dr. Hornig informed each of the appropriate Federal Departments and Agencies of the establishment within H.U.D. of the Office of Urban Technology and Research, and invited their cooperation in assisting this Office to fulfill its responsibilities. To assist them to obtain an understanding of H.U.D. research needs and problems, I forwarded to each of these Departments and Agencies a copy of our proposed "FY-69 Research, Development and Demonstration Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development." After they had an opportunity to review this document, I, or representatives of my Office, met with the appropriate representatives of 15 of the Departments and Agencies for an exploratory discussion and a preliminary identification of areas of mutual interest and activity. Attachment (4) was developed on the basis of these meetings, and indicates, on a qualitative and tentative basis, areas where some urban-related research and development, or potentially urban-related R&D effort is being carried out. In some cases the magnitude of effort is relatively small, whereas in others we consider it to be quite significant. It is our present intention to define these activities in more specific and detailed terms, and then to proceed to develop methods that would maximize their effectiveness. In particular, it is important to provide a means for a timely interchange of information on these activities. We have initiated discussions with the National Bureau of Standards relative to the design of an appropriate information network for this purpose.

Q. 2b. Has H.U.D. been in contact with the Department of Justice, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance regarding the crime and safety aspects of H.U.D.'s programs? With what result?

A. 2b. Yes. Representatives of this Department, particularly Mr. Arnold Sagalyn, Special Assistant to Secretary Weaver on Public Safety, have met with Mr. Robert Emerich, Science Advisor, Office of Law Enforcement, Department of Justice. Mr. Emerich is responsible for monitoring the contract between the Department of Justice and the Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA) for the design of a comprehensive Federal Public Safety Research and Development Program. H.U.D. is alert to the possibilities for public safety research and development in the Model Cities Program which is concerned with all significant aspects of public life in selected neighborhoods. We intend to remain particularly close to these Justice/I.D.A. activities to ensure that H.U.D.'s R&D program is properly responsive to the broad scientific and technological needs of the Law Enforcement area.

Q. 2c. Do you believe that discretionary funds should be available to laboratory directors to fund research relevant to national problems up to the point where proposals may then be submitted to the responsible agency? What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of such a concept?

A. 2c. This Department does not now have any government laboratories under its direct management and therefore, I cannot submit a useful Departmental view. From my own past experience, however, I am of the belief that laboratory