

Minutes of the First Meeting of the Ad Hoc Interagency Committee
on Metropolitan Area Problems

The first meeting of the ad hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems was held in the White House at 10 a.m. on Friday, October 25, 1957, with Governor Howard Pyle presiding. A list of those invited to attend the meeting is attached.

Governor Pyle opened the meeting by reading excerpts from Cabinet Paper CP-56-53 regarding the establishment of ad hoc working committees from among the Federal agencies. He then referred to the President's Williamsburg speech before the Governors' Conference on June 24, and the speech made by the President in New York City on last Monday, in which he again reiterated his concern with interlevel problems. The Governor proceeded to describe the work of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee and the possibility that the Governors will establish some kind of a State Government department or agency to handle their relations with the Federal Government and also with their own local units to avoid "by-passing" State capitals.

All of these developments clearly indicate that the Federal Government has a real problem in dealing with local governments and that much of the ill will that has been created among the Governors could be dissipated by the proper handling and coordination of the efforts of the Federal Government agencies. All of the above factors have led him to the formation of this ad hoc Committee to coordinate our efforts at the Federal level.

Typical of the problems that we face in coordination are the conflicts that arise in connection with urban renewal and Federal highway projects. Governor Pyle stated that we must come into court with clean hands when we ourselves urge the Governors to coordinate activities within their own States. This will be a real task because we have scores of grant programs and all of the complexities that accompany them. It is essential that the Federal agencies work together regardless of how difficult this task may be. This will require a dedicated approach in order to achieve some real accomplishments. Essentially our relations with the local governments of this country are concerned with the metropolitan areas problem.

Mr. Merriam was called upon for further discussion of the relations between the Federal and local governments. He declared that the metropolitan problem will get larger and be of greater significance in the future regardless of our improved relations with the States. Those Federal programs and activities that concern local government must be directed to a solution of the emerging metropolitan problem. In all of the local government conferences that he has attended recently, the question is always raised -- Couldn't the Federal Government organize itself better to help metropolitan areas? Contrariwise, he has customarily asked local officials and other individuals concerned with metropolitan problems what they have done themselves or through their own State governments.

He next addressed himself to the Federal Department of Urban Affairs, which is under consideration by the so-called Rockefeller Committee. So far as he is able to determine the consensus of expert opinion is against establishment of such a department at this time. The first step really should be the creation of this Committee which is a consultative and cooperative venture to obtain the maximum positive effect. It is heartening to know that a number of communities are now beginning to plan on a metropolitan basis and this should be helpful to this Committee's efforts. In any event, we must improve our coordination and come up with new ideas in the future.

Governor Pyle then proceeded to ask each representative present what programs or activities they were administering that had an effect upon metropolitan areas and local governments.

Mr. Sullivan, reporting for ODM, said that there were two main points of interest for his agency. First, ODM has a real interest in the relocation of Federal agencies in the 300 sites which have been selected in the event of a national emergency. Most Federal agencies have worked closely with State and local officials, but more often than not with the Governors' offices which have failed to tell the local governments of the decisions reached. There are instances, for example, where a Federal agency has selected the exact same site that was desired for the relocation point of a local government. Second, ODM has an interest in the identification of target and critical target areas which is done in conjunction with FCDA. The main problem here is one of definition. In the judgment of Mr. Sullivan, the Committee would serve a very useful and helpful purpose so far as his agency is concerned.

Mr. Mason, reporting for HHFA, said that they were very much involved in this problem and perhaps more so than any other agency. Programs administered by the agency, which are of local interest, include: insurance of mortgages, provision of low-income housing units, FNMA purchases to stabilize the mortgage market, Community Facilities Agency which provides for funds for planning of public works for small cities, and the Urban Renewal Administration which handles slum clearance and urban redevelopment. In the last 6 or 8 months HHFA has been paying closer attention to the road program and has established a good regional as well as a central office liaison with the Public Roads Administration. This Committee would be very useful in Mr. Mason's judgment.

Miss Heath felt that we need to establish a more formalized program for coordination, particularly with respect to the relocation problems caused by highway construction.

Mr. Hayward, speaking for the Commerce Department, declared that the biggest problem is getting information from the State to the local level. In reference to Public Roads, CAA, Census, and Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Department deals, of course, primarily with States but, nonetheless, this Committee would serve a very useful purpose.

Governor Pyle said that when he was Governor, he had the feeling that the State Highway Department used the Federal Government as an excuse for unpopular decisions affecting local communities.

Mr. Robbins, representing the Treasury Department, said that they had no special problems but that his department thoroughly agrees with the need for the Committee. He pointed out that Secretary Anderson is a co-Chairman of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, and that the Department is, therefore, participating in the coordination effort. (Governor Pyle praised the work that Secretary Anderson is doing and expressed the hope that we will be able to retain his services in his capacity as leader of the Federal group.)

Mr. Perkins said that HEW has a great many problems even though their programs reach essentially to States and counties and not to metropolitan areas. They would like very much to deal with metropolitan regions if they were regularly established government units, particularly in the Public Health field in matters of water treatment, water pollution, smoke abatement and air pollution, and the TB X-ray programs. The growth of metropolitan regions has left the aged and the aging in the central cities. Also ADC cases are glutted up in central areas. Furthermore, FCDA delegations to HEW add to their interest in the problem of juvenile delinquency which is essentially concentrated in urban areas as is the Children's Bureau problem.

Mr. Perkins declared that if the Committee would no more than keep our guard up against growing problems, it would serve a most constructive purpose.

The neglect on the part of the States to assume functions creates them for HEW. There is, of course, at the moment, no central point within the Federal Government to which those concerned with metropolitan problems could come. The HEW regional directors have been doing a slight job in Federal coordination at the metropolitan level. They could be used by Governor Pyle and Mr. Merriam. These regional directors are meeting in Washington next week and would be available if Governor Pyle wished to see them.

Governor Pyle commented on these last remarks and stated that he would like very much to meet with the regional directors. The Cabinet Paper previously mentioned makes reference to the need for this kind of area coordination. In fact, the Bureau of the Budget had a field service up until a few years ago which would be of real assistance in this task. The field service was active in the work of the Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations -- a successful venture in which Governor Warren had a leading hand and which included Federal-State-county and local officials from California, Oregon, and Washington. There are some 400 committees operating under our Cabinet system and dealing with regional problems. The Bureau of the Budget feels that we should re-establish the field offices and, if this occurs, the work of this Committee will be pulled into their orbit.

Mr. Merriam mentioned the existence of Federal business associations and indicated that he had asked the Civil Service Commission to give him a listing and an analysis of the activities of those that are still in operation.

Mr. Sullivan mentioned that ODM has regional committees in each of their ten districts.

Governor Pyle closed this part of the discussion by indicating that there was a need for a chain of command reaching into the activities of the Federal Government at the field level and that he would give this further thought.

Mr. Berry, speaking for FCDA, said that "by-passing" is the life history of his agency. They deal with all levels which means that FCDA has all the State and local government problems and a real problem of coordination at the Federal level. Almost anything this Committee would do would assist FCDA because practically everything that the agency does is concerned with inter-governmental relations. In response to a question, Mr. Berry declared that pending legislation of FCDA did not alter this fundamental fact inasmuch as their programs would still have intergovernmental implications and impacts. In this connection, he cited natural disaster relief as an example.

Mr. Stempler, representing the Defense Department, indicated that there were no significant direct programs but that the Department has daily problems with State and local departments in the following areas: Taxes and other efforts of municipalities to broaden their tax base (the assessment against Defense in one county in California is \$40 million and the department is now defending a legal suit brought by local authorities); serving of liquor on bases in prohibition areas; hunting and fishing licenses; use of water in dry areas, particularly in the West; zoning, with particular reference to oil refineries; closing of installations due to cutbacks of funds; location of a base; distressed labor areas; proposals for use of idle facilities for juvenile delinquents; regulation of freight rates within a State; law enforcement (Morton Committee); and the location of Nike bases.

Mr. Stempler stated that this Committee would be very helpful in these connections.

As a specific example as to the kind of problem Defense faces, Mr. Stempler cited the department's desire to sell the Presidio and locate outside the city about 30 miles away. If this is done, the city of San Francisco will complain bitterly.

Mr. Perkins pointed out that because HEW must make payments for impacted areas for school operation and construction, the Government may not save any money by such a move. This prompted Mr. Mason to comment that some 350,000 families will be dislocated in the future by the relocation of Government agencies.

Mr. Graves, when called upon, stated that there were 174 metropolitan areas at present with 6 out of 10 persons living in them. This will affect the vast majority of Americans. Mr. Perkins said that the ease of transportation today will start bringing people to Washington and that we will continue to hear from all 174 areas. Governor Pyle commented that the Committee will be grappling with the problems that daily face practically every person in the country, in one way or another.

Mr. Lynn of GSA said that his agency has the public buildings problem, the lease-purchase program, and transportation (motor pools). Although the agency is experiencing no difficulties at the moment, much good can be accomplished by this Committee.

Mr. Morton of Justice declared that his department had no specific programs, but more than anyone else in litigation, they must coordinate "after the facts." Court cases often put Justice in the inconsistent position of representing two or more Federal agencies in a particular situation which have different and sometimes conflicting program interests. Perhaps we should take this Committee beyond the consultation phase to the identification of coordination problems. He suggested the establishment of a large-scale outline map of the United States with pins to show program impact. When two or more are coming into conflict, we will then have the facts beforehand. Governor Pyle indicated his approval of such a preventive technique which he described as the "tracking" process, since it would definitely reduce the litigation load for the Justice Department.

Governor Pyle called on Mr. Merriam for a summation of the situation and he responded by saying that we need this Committee because there is a recognizable and constantly present problem. This mechanism is only a beginning--we should develop it to serve a real purpose. One of the places to start would be for the agencies to indicate the problems which will arise in the next session of the Congress.

Governor Pyle concluded the meeting by stating that the comments had proved that there is an enormous problem. He agreed with the impending problems suggestion of Mr. Merriam and asked that the agencies represented submit their views to him on how we can coordinate the Federal Government for discussion at the next meeting which will be held within a few weeks. This Committee can serve as an interpretive channel to give agency heads Administration policies and views as decided at the White House level. These officials can then, in turn, clarify internally the policy determinations of the Administration.

The Governor stated that he was adding Agriculture, Interior and AEC to the list of the agencies that should be represented. He also asked to be informed as to what other agencies should be included on the Committee.

The Committee will be only as good as it is useful, and it must serve a mission. If not, the Committee will have to be abandoned. This is strictly an informal ad hoc committee which will meet quietly without undue publicity.

After thanking all for their attendance, interest, and contribution to the meeting, the Governor adjourned the session at 11:25 a.m.



Health, Education, & Welfare

Justice

Treasury

General Services Administration

Commerce



Federal Civil Defense Admin.

Defense

Office of Defense Mobilization

HHEFA

Bureau of Budget

Spec'l Assistant to the President
(Federal-State Action Committee)

Deputy Assistant to the
President

Under Secretary John Perkins

Assistant Attorney General
Perry Morton

Assistant Secretary Laurence Robbins

Administrative Assistant James F. Lynn

Assistant Secretary George Moore
will be represented by
Acting Assistant Secretary
Carlton Hayward

Deputy Ass't Administrator Lewis Berry

General Counsel Robert Dechert
will be represented by
Ass't General Counsel Jack Stempler
and
Harry Van Cleve

Assistant Director Charles Sullivan

Deputy Administrator Walker Mason
Assistant Administrator
Miss Annabelle Heath

Assistant Director Robert Merriam
Ass't Division Chief Thomas J. Graves

John H. Stambaugh
will be represented by
Doug Price
Dr. Arthur Burns

Howard Pyle

Special Assistant Wayne Warrington

MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING
OF THE AD HOC INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE
ON METROPOLITAN AREA PROBLEMS



The second meeting of the Ad Hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems was held in the White House at 10:00 a. m. on Monday, May 25, 1959, with Mr. Robert E. Merriam, Deputy Assistant to the President, in the chair. A list of those in attendance at the meeting is attached.

Chairman Merriam outlined the background of this committee (see minutes of first meeting held on October 25, 1957) and the recent events which led to the call for this meeting. Specifically, he mentioned the discussion on May 19, 1959, of metropolitan area problems in connection with the Clark Bill (S. 1431) held by the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, created as a result of the President's Williamsburg speech in 1957, and composed of top Administration officials and eleven Governors. This discussion resulted in a definite indication that neither the Governors nor the Federal representatives were inclined to recommend this legislation, and the staffs were directed to analyze and report back to the Joint Committee on this and similar bills.

The Clark Bill was then briefly analyzed by Mr. Merriam who pointed out the unique representation on the proposed metropolitan commission which amounted to a joint Congressional Committee with a few Presidential appointees attached to it, and with both the chairmanship and vice chairmanship to be held by members of the Congress. In his opinion, such a study committee should be either wholly executive or legislative in nature since experience with mixed commissions had not proven very successful. Inasmuch as the Federal

departments and agencies have been requested to submit their views on this legislation to the Congress, the basic question, therefore, is what should be the Administration's position on the form and the substance of this proposal?

Mr. Talle indicated that H&HFA had already prepared a re-
sponse to the Congress which has not yet been cleared by the
Bureau of the Budget but which letter generally favors the
objectives of the Clark bill.* A number of changes in the
measure are recommended by H&HFA, particularly with re-
spect to the recommended organization of the commission.
In the opinion of the agency, the commission should be headed
by an expert in the field who would devote full time to the as-
signed duties, and who should be appointed by the President.
H&HFA also urges an increase in the commission membership
from 18 to 25, with four of the seven new members being
private citizens.

Chairman Merriam then posed these questions as to the
Administration's posture: Do we perfect the legislation? Do
we leave the study entirely to the Congress? Do we say that
the study is not needed at this time? These are the three
alternatives.

General Bragdon pointed out that the pending Housing bill does
contain a provision for comprehensive planning of urban
problems. The Administration would prefer a different kind
of provision for urban planning but this proposal was sent to
Congress too late for inclusion. It is understood, however,
that the Administration's provision will be offered as an amend-
ment to the bill as reported.

He went on to state that the first 11 of the 13 duties which the
Clark bill assigns to the proposed metropolitan commission
involve public works with which his own office is constantly
concerned. Furthermore, there is no reason why the Joint
Federal-State Action Committee should not be able to probe

* This letter was not dispatched, it later developed.

into this problem and furnish the answers since a good deal of urban planning could and should be done by the States, although he conceded Mr. Morton's point that State legislatures often prevent or impede effective State action on urban problems. The Clark Bill, in a sense, represents an incursion by the Legislative into the affairs of the Executive Branch.

Mr. Patterson commented that we should concentrate on the duties of this commission which essentially are directed to the determination of the needs in the metropolitan situation. He is dubious, consequently, about the commission's ability to do any more than that which has already been done by public and private groups to date.

Mr. Morton indicated that he was speaking for himself and not the Justice Department but that he believed the bill was poor political science and represented a venture into a vacuum. The Executive Branch is partly to blame for the introduction of this measure because we have provided no apparent alternatives. The final result of its enactment would be more Federal spending on municipal problems. For these reasons, he would be inclined not to favor the bill.

Mr. Kieffer declared that creation of this commission will slow up action on metropolitan problems all up and down the line.

Mr. Talle then said that it was his hope that the Administration would not counter this proposal with another study group but rather the establishment of an action committee. He believes that the Ad Hoc Committee could accomplish much.

Chairman Merriam then asked the Committee if the following did not represent the group thinking: (1) The Administration recognizes that there is a serious problem; (2) there have been a great many studies and surveys in this field, both public and private (including national conferences), such as the Kestnbaum Commission, Joint Federal-State Action Committee, and Council of State Governments; (3) the problem is widely

known and understood and the Administration is well aware of it through its activities in connection with H&HFA, General Bragdon's office, the revival of the statutory National Housing Council, the Ad Hoc Committee, and the work of Mr. Merriam's own office, and (4) the Administration has reached the conclusion that all levels of government are involved and that a national commission is not needed because it would, among other things, only serve to delay necessary action.

The Committee concurred in this summation, and it was agreed that the Bureau of the Budget, through Mr. Archambault's office, would draft a letter along these lines and clear it with the agencies through the regular Bureau channels.

Chairman Merriam then raised the other basic question as to the seemingly uncoordinated situation with respect to different Federal grant programs as they impinge upon State and local activities in metropolitan areas, e. g., highway and urban renewal projects. While it is true that progress is being made in coordinating our efforts at the national level to produce a satisfactory local result, still it is somewhat confusing to the public generally. The question, therefore, is whether or not there is a need for and a useful purpose for this Ad Hoc Committee? Can we do good or are these problems too specialized for a group like this one?

Mr. Morton stated that we should avoid collisions between and among Federal programs. He asked whether it would be possible to have a staff reporting system which would alert the group prior to "consultation after the fact."

Chairman Merriam pointed out that many such mechanisms now exist, such as General Bragdon's office, the Bureau of the Budget, the White House staff, the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, and others. He agreed, however, that where any member of the group sees a broad policy question developing that his office should be advised and a meeting of the Committee will be called from time to time for the purpose of discussing it and to assure that the impact of various Federal programs upon other levels of government is a beneficial one. In consequence, the Committee will have no set meeting schedule or agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a. m.

Deputy Assistant to the
President

Robert E. Merriam
Chairman

Treasury

Lawrence B. Robbins
Assistant Secretary

Justice

Perry W. Morton
Assistant Attorney General

Commerce

George Moore
Assistant Secretary

Health, Education, and Welfare

Jarold Kieffer
Assistant to the Secretary

Bureau of the Budget

Raoul Archambault, Jr.
Deputy Director
Thomas J. Graves

Office of Civil and Defense
Mobilization

Governor Leo A. Hoegh
Director, represented by:
John Patterson, Deputy
Director

General Services Administration

Franklin Floete,
Administrator

Housing & Home Finance Agency

Norman O. Mason,
Administrator, represented by:
Henry Talle, Assistant
Administrator for
Program Policy

White House

General John S. Bragdon
Henry S. Brooks
Douglas R. Price



MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE
AD HOC INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON
METROPOLITAN AREA PROBLEMS

The third meeting of the Ad Hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems was held in the White House at 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 16, 1960, with Mr. Robert E. Merriam, Deputy Assistant to the President, in the chair. A list of those in attendance at the meeting is attached.

Chairman Merriam opened the meeting with a discussion of what the Administration's position should be with respect to the metropolitan problem and reviewed current developments which would seek to define the Federal Government's role with respect to urbanism. It was his feeling that Senator Clark's proposal for a study commission is no longer an active possibility now that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is in actual operation. He announced that the Advisory Commission definitely plans to engage a top level expert on metropolitan problems as part of its permanent senior staff. (See staff paper prepared by that Commission on metropolitan areas which is attached.)

By the same token, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is unlikely to report out this session Senator Clark's bill to establish a Department of Housing and Community Development because it is premature and the Congress has always been slow in accepting the creation of a new Cabinet department.

In Chairman Merriam's opinion, the Administration has been placed in an overly defensive position in this matter and steps should be taken to coordinate Federal programs affecting the more than 190 standard metropolitan districts which now exist. It is important that this be done not only in behalf of this Administration but also to ease the administrative burden of the incoming Administration. We should develop and leave as a legacy a clear cut pattern of the Federal Government's responsibilities and duties in this area. Through coordination of Federal activities we should be able to develop a positive approach to the many kinds of problems we face and will continue to face in Federal-city relationships.

There is a strong possibility, Chairman Merriam continued, that the Administration will be asked to make an important post-election address before the American Municipal Association which could well

serve as a public announcement of the legacy in the field which this Administration is bequeathing. He asked that the members of the Ad Hoc Committee keep this possibility in mind.

The purpose of today's meeting is to stimulate discussion and establish a project or projects for the development of constructive ideas in the next several months. As an example of one phase of the problem -- commuter transportation -- Chairman Merriam mentioned the series of discussions which have been held with the joint representatives of the American Association of Railroads and the American Municipal Association proposing \$100 million in aid for cities to take care of the mounting transportation needs of the daily commuter. This will result in an increasing pressure for the Federal Government to enter into a new field of financial assistance to our cities.

As another example, the Chairman cited the fact that the President's highway program has resulted in States and municipalities becoming highway-oriented, which is not surprising since nearly two-thirds of the remainder of this program, or \$17 billion, will be spent in urban areas. The question naturally arises as to whether the Federal Government should permit the States to allocate these funds within urban areas in any one of several combinations, and perhaps even including their use for mass transit facilities.

The Chairman then opened the meeting for discussion by the members. General Bragdon presented a prepared statement (see copy attached) citing the necessity for comprehensive planning on a broad-scale basis and not confined solely to public works. He did not feel that a Cabinet department was essential but rather urged that coordination of Federal activities be achieved through a statutory planning office to be placed within the Executive Office of the President.

With respect to highways, General Bragdon favored multiple use of these funds and also their utilization for mass transit, but it should be done on a straight fifty-fifty matching rather than the presently wasteful ninety-ten ratio. Likewise, here planning is very necessary, especially in light of the transit developments in Philadelphia and other cities which have begun to subsidize commuter transportation.

Chairman Merriam agreed and mentioned the District of Columbia transit authority legislation which is now pending and wherein the Administration has agreed to share some of the costs. Senator Williams of New Jersey has introduced legislation which would establish a nationwide program of \$100 million for this purpose. He then indicated that this Committee should establish a task force to consider this problem intensively in

relation to General Bragdon's proposal, and to develop a program for possible inclusion in the President's final State of the Union Message next January. This task force will include the representatives on the Committee from General Bragdon's office, the Bureau of the Budget, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, and Health, Education, and Welfare. (Mr. Graves of the Bureau of the Budget was instructed to call a meeting of these departments and agencies to launch this study.)

General Bragdon then urged the need for \$6 million annually for five years for planning purposes under Section 701 of the Housing Act, but to be conditioned on a fifty-fifty matching with Federal funds. With respect to the revolving fund of \$48 million for planning of public works shelf projects under Section 702 of the same Act, he believed that this should be increased to \$96 or \$100 million. This belief was predicated upon current experience which demonstrated that the \$48 million fund has stimulated \$2 billion of projects. All of this further proved to General Bragdon the necessity for a statutory Federal planning agency.

Chairman Merriam next considered the problem of coordinating at the local level a number of Federal stimulative grants. Mr. Brownson of HHFA discussed the "Workable Program for Community Improvement" required by his agency to make certain that a plan is communitywide in scope and to avoid the creation of new blight while old blighted areas are being eradicated. (See copy of paper briefly explaining this program which is attached.)

General Bragdon spoke of flood plain zoning and expressed the belief that the Corps of Engineers should not build levees to protect housing where it should not exist. Land should not be protected by the Federal Government where it is cheaper to buy it out.

Chairman Merriam directed that Mr. Graves get together with the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Commerce Department and General Bragdon to see if the concept of a "workable plan" could be expanded to embrace other Federal programs affecting urban areas.

Mr. Stemplar of Defense discussed the problems of his department in the acquisition of property in cities for Nike sites and the problems involved for cities in the disposal of surplus plants such as the Houston Ordnance works.

Mr. Floete made mention of the problems centering around disposal of surplus lands for parks, education or health purposes, and which find General Services Administration required by law to follow certain procedures. The Chairman inquired as to the desirability of changing

the law to permit GSA to sell property at less than the highest bid to assist a community. Mr. Floete stated that the law now requires sale at fair market value, and expressed the fear that Congress would give away properties if GSA sold on a basis of anything less than the "highest and best use."

Mr. Patterson favored General Bragdon's proposal for comprehensive planning to avoid merely a consideration of public works planning. The Chairman expressed his feeling that we are, at present, too uncoordinated and that perhaps a central overall planning unit would be desirable. He mentioned that the President's plan for reorganizing the White House is likely to be recommended and that its adoption would close the gap now existing in the planning field.

Mr. Kieffer declared that looking at these problems from the Federal point of view should not blind us to the fact that we must not dictate to communities. We do not have sufficiently detailed information at the Federal level on what the metropolitan areas are doing to help themselves. This could well dovetail with General Bragdon's proposal for a planning unit which he would center in an expanded Housing Department to maintain data and encourage comprehensive metropolitan planning. This Department would: (a) try to get completely adequate data on metropolitan areas; (b) encourage local planning units; (c) make available results of local planning to relevant Federal departments and agencies; and (d) use the central planning agency to settle broad issues and policies between and among Federal agencies.

The Chairman then inquired as to the amount and nature of the interchange of information with respect to mutually associated Federal aid programs. At best, it would appear to be informal and fortuitous rather than systematized. It was General Bragdon's thought that the proposed planning unit would take care of this vital need.

The Chairman then summarized the three main lines of inquiry established as a result of this meeting:

- 1) Mass transit and the highway program;
- 2) The "workable program" concept and its relationship to the clearinghouse function; and
- 3) The question of changing the surplus property disposal law. (GSA agreed to take this under consideration.)

He announced that there would be another meeting of the Committee within a month or two to consider working papers to be developed as a result of this meeting. It was urged that all members think and discuss with others any additional areas in which headway might be made in strengthening

Federal-metropolitan relationships and the achievement of a more effective and coordinated Federal approach. It was also urged that meetings be called within their own departments or agencies by the Committee members to discuss these problems in advance of the next meeting.

Chairman Merriam concluded the meeting with the statement that we definitely need a series of constructive suggestions to formulate a well-rounded Administration position on the proper role of the Federal Government in its relations with the metropolitan areas. Consideration will be given to the issuance of a directive to all agencies regarding any items which should be called to the attention of the Committee in formulating such a policy. It is very important to establish these lines of communication.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.



Attachments

THE AD HOC INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE
ON METROPOLITAN AREA PROBLEMS

Chairman	Robert E. Merriam Deputy Assistant to the President
Treasury	Lawrence B. Robbins Assistant Secretary
Justice	Perry W. Morton Assistant Attorney General
Defense	Jack L. Stempler Assistant General Counsel
Commerce	George Moore Assistant Secretary for Administration
Health, Education, and Welfare	Jarold Kieffer Assistant to the Secretary
Bureau of the Budget	Thomas J. Graves Assistant to the Division Chief
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	John S. Patterson Deputy Director
General Services Administration	Franklin G. Floete Administrator
Housing and Home Finance Agency	Charles B. Brownson Liaison Officer
White House	General John S. Bragdon Henry S. Brooks Douglas R. Price



June 16, 1960

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE
AD HOC INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON
METROPOLITAN AREA PROBLEMS



The fourth meeting of the Ad Hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems was held in the White House at 2:30 p.m. on Friday, November 18, 1960, with Mr. Robert E. Merriam, Deputy Assistant to the President, in the chair. (See attached list of those in attendance and final versions of papers discussed at this meeting.)

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Merriam. He proceeded immediately to a consideration of the paper which represents an agreement recently reached between the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Bureau of Public Roads for the joint use by local governments of the planning funds available to both agencies, by asking whether this could be issued without further action.

Mr. Peterson stated that it was his view that the statement in paragraph 3 of page 3 could be strengthened to further buttress the concept of cooperative planning. Mr. Carey pointed out that this administration has been extremely careful to avoid the appearance of coercing State and local governments by express conditions and new requirements. Mr. Peterson, while agreeing, felt that a real effort should be made to get local cooperation and inquired whether we should seek joint applications on a metropolitan area basis rather than through single unit applications. He agreed to furnish certain proposed language to the two agencies. Mr. Brownson observed that there is some relevant tradition in the success which his agency has had with respect to making the workable program concept acceptable to State and local units.

Chairman Merriam declared that the question is one that also involves the possibility that the President should inform the Governors of this agreement by way of a letter to each. Mr. Kieffer then inquired whether or not this is a forerunner of a broader concept of cooperation between the Federal Government and localities. It was the Chairman's view that this is a specific action that can be taken at once and that the broader issue is presented in the other papers before the Committee for discussion at this meeting. To his mind comprehensive planning is a different matter and one that definitely is broader in scope. Mr. Moore commented that this is as far as the two agencies can proceed without legislation. With this viewpoint, Mr. Bane expressed agreement. Mr. Kieffer then stated that it is essential to place this agreement in perspective when it is released to the public.

After asking for further suggestions, Chairman Merriam declared the discussion closed on this paper. He opened the discussion on the broader memorandum dealing with the organization within the Federal Government to

cope with metropolitan area problems. He indicated that this paper is for discussion purposes only, and that the first 21 pages represent a factual background. It was requested by the Chairman that any editorial changes or additions to this section be sent to Mr. Graves for incorporation in the final form of the document which will be left as a legacy to the next administration.

Mr. Kieffer called attention to pages 3 and 4 and inquired as to why we should concentrate on what might have been done. This is a very good paper and it should specify the kind of organization the Federal Government should have to meet this problem. The paper should emphasize that the Federal role has been maturing. Mr. Patterson pointed out, as did several others, that in six out of seven local efforts to solve the metropolitan problem only Dade County (Miami) had voted to help themselves.

Mr. Morton said that Justice was involved in the metropolitan area problem beyond the matter of suppressing crime. He stated that the litigation against St. Joseph, Missouri, for water pollution was largely instrumental in the favorable vote by its citizens on a bond issue to build a new sewage system. It was his further feeling that Federal financial help to citizens has been overly stressed and that we should be emphasizing what the Federal Government is doing to help the local people help themselves.

Chairman Merriam then called for specific editorial changes in the first 21 pages and asked that they be sent to Mr. Graves as soon as possible. He then proceeded to a discussion of the recommendations of the report.

Mr. Morton called for more emphasis on the positive role of the Federal Government in the urban situation. Mr. Kieffer, while believing that a department of urban affairs is essential, said that even with such a department the need clearly exists for Presidential coordination in this field. The other members of the Committee expressed themselves as being in complete agreement with this point, particularly the Chairman who declared that the question of a department of urban affairs is a matter for the next administration to ponder. Under any circumstances, he emphasized, the Presidential coordination role is needed. All urban activities cannot be placed in one department and the President will need assistance in coordinating the urban programs of the several agencies.

Discussion next centered on the proposal in the report for a Presidential study commission on metropolitan area problems. Mr. Bane felt that such a commission was not necessary inasmuch as we now have an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which can perform this task. Mr. Kieffer concurred. Mr. Carey, however, discussed the background of the proposal and the legislative developments which have occurred. This is a national problem of immediate moment and it is proper for this Committee to make such a recommendation. It is unlikely that

the Advisory Commission would take anything but fragments of the problem for study, whereas this is a problem requiring overall attention. This would not be a catalytic agency but one that would define the Federal role in urban affairs. Mr. Patterson agreed with this latter point.

Mr. Carey continued with the statement that this problem needs crystallization and a Presidential Commission would be able to highlight the significance of Federal-local relationships. Mr. Bane then stated he agreed if the scope of reference outlined by Mr. Carey is maintained.

Chairman Merriam said that in lieu of recommendations one, two, and possibly three, we should recommend what we think the next President would find acceptable by way of a Presidential office mechanism or organization to provide coordination of Federal programs affecting cities. We cannot talk in terms of specific staff appointments, but we can discuss the need for an institutional base for handling coordination of metropolitan problems. He said there was a likelihood that President Eisenhower would propose to his successor the creation of an Office of Executive Management which, in effect, would be an expanded Bureau of the Budget, and which could handle these matters on a formalized basis. Secretary Flemming feels this should be supported from other sources, and there is evidence that the new administration would favor a larger role for the Bureau of the Budget.

The metropolitan area problem fits into this picture because it involves program and planning coordination matters which will have to stem out of the President's office. It is part of his leadership role which we should stress in our report.

On recommendation number three, it was the Chairman's strong opinion that the field office concept should be stressed if the President is to attain full coordination of metropolitan activities. We should indicate that careful consideration be given this concept in any establishment of an Office of Executive Management. Mr. Carey described the role of the Bureau of the Budget field offices when they were in existence. Mr. Patterson contended that the present OCDM field offices could be utilized. Mr. Kieffer declared that such offices are the President's "eyes and ears" in the field, and that such units could serve all units within the Executive Office of the President.

Chairman Merriam then proceeded to a consideration of recommendation number four, which he felt should be revised in the light of the preceding discussion. This agency should have added responsibilities inasmuch as both Presidential candidates endorsed the integrated agency concept for HHFA in the campaign.

On recommendation number five, Mr. Bane suggested changing the language to indicate that the Advisory Commission would do what it could within the terms of its law. It was then decided that recommendations numbers two and five would be rewritten to conform with each other.

Chairman Merriam asked if it would be necessary or desirable to continue the Ad Hoc Committee on an advisory basis. Mr. Kieffer and others answered in the affirmative. If the head of the Office of Special Projects were given the staff job for metropolitan coordination, he would undoubtedly welcome the existence of the Committee. It is a natural tool of administration. Mr. Carey and Mr. Patterson agreed with this view. Chairman Merriam then requested that a recommendation be added to the report to continue the Ad Hoc Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems.

Mr. Floete pointed out that a recent law in connection with the disposal of surplus property requires the General Services Administrator to give local governments a reasonable time to acquire such property. What is a reasonable time will ultimately require a decision at the Presidential level.

Mr. Kieffer referred to the comments in the report on the Penn-Jersey situation and said that the report should urge local communities to develop comprehensive plans as a prelude to a gearing of Federal-State-local activities into the locally-approved plan. Otherwise, Federal program standards will prevail since the Federal Government must move along on its programs.

Chairman Merriam did not call for discussion of the proposed letter to the Governors but said his own feelings are slightly negative. Mr. Carey supported its being sent as a tangible administration effort and accomplishment. Mr. Merriam then said he may release the HHFA-Commerce agreement in a speech before the American Municipal Association at the end of the month. (See copy of speech attached.)

Comments were next requested on the workable program expansion. The Chairman commented that this is a tool to accomplish stimulation of local planning effort. Mr. Carey said that more local planning would come about through sound Federal organization, but the workable program concept is both a rationalization of our interest at the local level and the need for local planning.

Mr. Stempler called attention to pages 10 and 11 regarding the extension of this concept to direct Federal programs where the burden of proof for a deviation from a local plan would be placed upon the Federal agency. This would create a very real problem as it concerns military construction. Mr. Carey said that all Federal agencies should cooperate with local governments in order to make community planning meaningful. Even though we decide where a Federal building will be placed, the GSA always consults local officials in advance. Federal action should seek to be compatible with local action. It was agreed by the Chairman that this section be reworded accordingly.

Mr. Bane proposed that the first and last sentences in paragraph 4 of page 11 are too broad in their connotations and it was agreed that they should be eliminated.

Mr. Flues asked if we had any protection against the possibility of excessive demands upon the Federal Treasury by the municipalities. Chairman Merriam doubted that we have any ready answer at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.



Attachments

LIST OF THOSE IN ATTENDANCE AT THE FOURTH MEETING
OF THE
AD HOC INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON METROPOLITAN AREA PROBLEMS



- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Chairman | Robert E. Merriam, Deputy Assistant to the President |
| Treasury | A. Gilmore Flues, Assistant Secretary |
| Justice | Perry W. Morton, Assistant Attorney General |
| Defense | Jack L. Stempler, Assistant General Counsel |
| Commerce | George Moore, Assistant Secretary for Administration |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | Jarold Kieffer, Assistant to the Secretary |
| Bureau of the Budget | William D. Carey, Executive Assistant Director |
| | Thomas J. Graves, Assistant to the Division Chief |
| | Frederick O'R. Hayes, Budget Examiner |
| | Norman Beckman, Management Analyst |
| Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization | John S. Patterson, Deputy Director |
| General Services Administration | Franklin G. Floete, Administrator |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | Charles B. Brownson, Liaison Officer |
| Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations | Frank Bane, Chairman |
| White House | Floyd D. Peterson |
| | Henry S. Brooks |
| | Douglas R. Price |