A Blow To Counties!

Counties! We need your help!

We're now engaged in another life and death struggle over whether the Congress will recognize counties as equal partners with cities in new community development block grant legislation. That equality has already been established in three new, major federal laws - General Revenue Sharing, Law Enforcement Assistance and Manpower Reform.

Here's what happened.

Just prior to the December Congressional adjournment, the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee tentatively agreed to change the thrust (going back over the past three years) of pending community development block grant legislation and in the process dealt urban counties a devastating blow.

The committee, in the absence of a quorum, scrapped a provision authorizing the distribution of funds via a formula based on objective criteria of need to metropolitan cities (over 50,000 in population). Instead, the committee opted to "hold harmless" any local governmental unit (including counties) during the five fiscal years prior to July 1, 1972, had conducted an urban renewal, neighborhood development, model cities, or code enforcement program. Local governments which qualify would receive a guarantee of the five-year average of funds received for not only these programs but also for open space, water and sewer, and public facility loans. If allowed to stand, this provision would effectively preclude amending the bill to entitle urban counties a guaranteed formula share of funds.

On page 5 of this issue appears a justification for equity to urban counties in the distribution of community development funds. Clip this page and forward it to your Senators and Congressmen with a resolution of the county board endorsing the NACO position.

Under the committee's approach, cities would receive the bulk of the funds - estimated to be $1.7 billion out of a metropolitan area distribution of $2.0 billion. Funds not used for both harmless, about $300 million, would become discretionary funds for other local governments not entitled to hold harmless treatment. Urban counties thus would get the short end of the stick.

The essential point that must be remembered is that slums and blighted areas are not solely confined to areas within a metropolitan city but spill over into areas under the jurisdiction of urban counties. Without equipping the urban county with the federal financial resources to attack these problems the very success of a metropolitan city's community development program will be placed in jeopardy.

The Senate committee's action serves to lock in the past, continuing to reward cities for being in urban redevelopment programs, regardless of their current needs as compared to the needs of others. It has forgotten that the purpose of new community development legislation is not only the elimination of slums and blighted areas but their prevention as well. The United States simply cannot afford to spend most of its urban resources on curative efforts while paying little attention to prevention. In some cases urban counties are in the best position to prevent slums and blights. What's needed, however, is to distribute federal resources in a manner such that balanced development and redevelopment can go forward in our central cities as well as our suburban areas.

Quite frankly, we're sick and tired of being placed in a position of second class citizenship and are vigorously pursuing a change in the Senate bill. Amending the legislation must be the number one legislative priority for NACO. All the nation's counties must rally behind NACO's position seeking equity for urban counties in the distribution of community development block grant funds. The principle is too important!

Although all counties would not initially benefit from a formula share of funds, the door has to be opened for a reasonable number, with the expectation that more counties would participate in subsequent years. Act today!
The Federal Community Development Programs — Project Grants (Water and Sewer Facilities, Model Cities, Neighborhood Facilities, Housing and Urban Renewal, Rehabilitation Loans, Public Facility Loans). P.L. 93-137 appropriates bills, P.L. 93-137, appropriates funds for three of the seven Community Development Categorical Grants programs that the Administration had sought to terminate. The act would appropriate for FY 1974 $2,253,000 for Model Cities, $290 million for Urban Renewal and $25 million for Open Space Land. Although no funds were appropriated for rehabilitation loans, $90 million of carry-over funds will be available.

The Administration is urging Congress to undermine the Administration's attempts to terminate these programs. An alternate source may be the "New Communities" — Loan Guarantees programs which offer eligible or insured loans. In FY 1974, a similar funding level was proposed, but in FY 1973 it will be cutbacks, $50 million to conform with the FY 1973 level. Comprehensive Planning Assistance — "701 Grants" — (Housing Act of 1954, as amended). The HUD appropriations set P.L. 93-137 provided $75 million for FY 1974 as compared to $100 million for FY 1973 for "701 planning grants." Counties have always received funds through the states for this program.

The Administration intends to encourage states to assume management of their comprehensive plans from HUD. In the past "701" funds have gone directly to the metropolitan planning agencies, others to fund agencies through the states. The Administration may use the state's role in housing programs.

Cities over 50,000 population will continue to receive direct "701" funding but the remaining 50,000 are entitled to this same treatment because of the "701" statute (NAO is working to have counties over $50,000 funded directly as cities). With the greater emphasis on the role of states along with the 25 percent drop in appropriations, counties should expect fewer grants in FY 1974.

The Community Development Block Grant Program which the Administration sought to terminate, has been passed by both Houses of Congress and is expected to be signed by the President by March 15. Congress enacted a provision that states may make grants in aid of safety, sanitation, health, and general welfare programs and activities. It is expected that as many as 700 cities will receive grants for housing and community development projects.

Finally, the new legislation adds a requirement that applications by units of local government must be approved or disapproved by the state within 90 days of submission. In addition to this, the act directs HUD to give priority to states which demonstrate a strong commitment to the state comprehensive outdoor recreation plan. States which do not meet the standards or which fail to meet the deadline may lose the money over a three-year period.

In this year's act several provisions are included which require the President to demonstrate that the states have met certain criteria before money is available. The act requires the states to demonstrate in their application that they have met several criteria, including at least one equal to or better than a similar standard contained in the federal act. The act also requires that the states have met certain criteria before the money is available. The act requires the states to demonstrate in their application that they have met several criteria, including at least one equal to or better than a similar standard contained in the federal act. The act also requires that the states have met certain criteria before the money is available. The act requires the states to demonstrate in their application that they have met several criteria, including at least one equal to or better than a similar standard contained in the federal act. The act also requires that the states have met certain criteria before the money is available.
Health Care Developments
Control Of Health Costs Sought

by Mike Gemmill, Director
Human Resources Center

Both the Congress and the Administration are proposing new health planning programs to curtail rapidly rising health care costs and improve the quality of health care. These proposals will have a definite impact on counties and their health delivery systems.

The Administration proposal calls for the merger of five existing health planning programs that expire on June 30, 1974: comprehensive health planning; regional medical programs; Hill-Burton hospital construction; experimental health services delivery systems; and area health education programs.

The five would be merged to create a new program that would support the establishment of some 200 multi-jurisdictional, private, non-profit organizations. These planning and development organizations would be legally independent of government, consumers, providers of third-party payers. They will have no final regulatory authority over health services, manpower or facilities, however, they will review plans and policies of governmental bodies within their jurisdiction.

In Congress, Congressman Paul Rogers (D-Calif.), Chairman of the House Subcommittee, Congressman William Roy (D-Kan.), James Hastings (R.N.Y.), introduced a bill (H.R. 10253) to amend the Public Health Service Act to assure the development of a national health policy, to assist states in their regulatory efforts and to promote area health planning programs.

The bill, entitled the National Health Policy and Health Development Act of 1974, would replace existing health planning and development programs including comprehensive health planning, Hill-Burton and regional medical programs.

Hearings will be held either in February or March. The Health Subcommittee is expected to take up before then another Rogers bill (H.R. 11511) that deals with health services (see County News, November 30, 1973, page 7). The Rogers bill has four main sections:

- **Part A** would establish a National Council for Health Policy. Appointed by the President, the five-member council would oversee development of a national health policy and oversight of federal health programs.

- **Part B** would set up a system of Health Service Agencies responsible for area-wide health planning and development throughout the country. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) would designate in each health area a private, non-profit corporation to handle planning and development.

- **Part C** would assist state governments in creation of state Health Commissions designated by HEW and responsible for state-level health planning and development.

- **Part D** would create a new federal program of construction assistance for health facilities.

Other Health Care Issues

HEW has designated the proposed geographical areas for the establishment of "practicing physicians" organizations which will review medical care provided under Medicaid, and Maternal and Child Health Programs.

The areas, published in the December 20, 1973 Federal Register, represent a major step in implementing the 1972 amendments to the Social Security Act (Section 1152) calling for the creation of professional standards review organizations (PSROs).

Secretary Caspar Weinberger approved 182 geographical areas, each of which will have its own PSRO. Twenty-five states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, mainly because of their limited populations, were designated as separate PSRO areas. The other 25 states, mainly the most populous, were designated as multiple PSRO units. Major metropolitan areas have been designated as single PSRO units.

County officials have the opportunity to offer comments, suggestions, and objections to the PSRO area designations within 90 days following their publication in the Federal Register. NACo has objected to PSROs on the grounds that they exclude the health of the safety of the health care from the policy-making governing boards. The exclusion is based on the grounds that county health officers are not "practicing physicians" as specified by Section 1152 of the act. NACo is appealing this decision to the HEW.

Health Funds

There are conflicting reports concerning the newly released $1 billion in health funds for health planning programs. The funds, appropriated by Congress for FY 1973, had been impounded by the Administration to slow down federal spending. The next week, on signing the FY 74 HEW-DOL Appropriations bill (see County News December 28, page 2), the President released the impounded funds in a surprising move. However, the funds will be spent over a period of three years and beyond.

For example, over $39 million has been "released" for project grants to combat alcoholism but $9.8 million will be released in FY 74, $19 million in FY 75, and $10.4 million in FY 76 and beyond.

Over $195 million was released for the Hill-Burton medical facilities construction program. However, the Administration has no plans to allocate funds in FY 74. It will allocate $39 million in FY 75 and $150 million in FY 76 and beyond.

HEW maintains that the plan to spend the released funds over several years is not a delaying tactic aimed at holding down the rate of spending. According to HEW the delay occurs because of the time required between when HEW receives funds and when the recipient receives the money. Any questions concerning the amounts or release of funds by category (family planning, community mental health, comprehensive health services, maternal and child health, environmental management, etc.) should be directed to NACo.

Regional IX Aid

The NACo Council of Intergovernmental Cooperation (CIC) Region IX Federal Aid Briefing will be held January 24-25 at the Sir Francis Drake Hotel in San Francisco. The meeting is designed to provide county officials in California, Nevada, Arizona and Oregon with the latest information on federal programs.

James K. Mahoney, San Joaquin County, California, President Region IX, CIC has scheduled an outstanding group of speakers for workshops on January 24 on topics including: "The Changing Role of Grants Administration" (including Revenue Sharing operations), "The Demise of Categorical Grants: A Myth?", "Affirmative Action and Federal Grants", and "The Role of the Federal Regional Council".

The speakers will include Fernanda Deaver, Chairman, Region IX Federal Regional Council and Bernard F. Hillenbrand, NACo Executive Director. There will be an evening reception on Thursday.

On January 25, the CIC will join with the County Superintendents Association of California (CSAC) for the first CSAC Federal Affairs Forum to discuss federal (Continued on page 13)
Guest Editorial

Property Tax Problems

by Joseph Mrurnane
Executive Director
Maryland Association of Counties

The property tax system has been greatly criticized in recent years, and local governments, as major users of the system, have borne the brunt of the criticism. Too often, however, counties have been the victims of the property tax system rather than the perpetrators of it. State leaders, governors and legislators have decried the use of the property tax as unjust but have failed to propose alternate sources of revenue. Recent happenings in Maryland illustrate this point.

Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel has given the state’s property owners a “Christmas gift.” He ordered 10 percent reduction in the assessment rate and, in effect, ordered a reduction in tax bills. His unilateral action, done over the objections of a majority of the General Assembly, has been appointed to study the property tax problem, has dire consequences for the counties of Maryland. Reducing the assessments will mean a loss of revenue amounting to more than $40 million for county governments in the state. If the rate is cut by 10 percent, the effect will be to increase the tax rate. The taxpayer will not benefit in the least. The ridiculousness of the governor’s position was pointed out by the Senate. He said the state would have to raise its property tax rate to recoup the lost revenue.

The governor said he was taking the action to reduce the inequity in the present system of assessment, but in Maryland, the responsibility of assessing property for tax purposes belongs to the state government, and it is the state’s inefficiency that has caused the inequities.

Since 1958, Maryland law has required annual reassessment but the state still reassesses one-third of the property each year. The state has failed to achieve standardization of assessments through the counties of Maryland.

In 1972, the assessment ratios ranged from 45 percent to 55 percent of market value and forced taxpayers in some counties to pay a disproportionate share of the state’s budget.

Even though repeatedly requested, the governor has consistently refused to provide local governments with alternate sources of revenue so that the property tax can be reduced. The result is that local governments are forced to rely on the property tax as the major source of revenue.

Each of these problems contributes to the inequity of the total system and thus places uneven tax burden on different classes of taxpayers depending upon the county in which they live and the year in which their property is assessed.

If achieving equity is the governor’s goal, then a viable alternative is removing inequities in the assessment system might have been to: reduce the accounts reassessed in 1973 by 8 percent; increase the accounts reassessed in 1971 by 8 percent; maintain the current assessment on accounts reassessed in 1972.

This formula would produce equity and substantially the same revenue as would have been generated by the normal increase in the state and local assessable bases as a result of calendar 1973 reassessments.

Having created this situation, the governor should waste no time in converting to annual reassessment of all property. Concurrently, the legislature should give serious consideration to providing local governments with alternate sources of revenue so that the property tax can really be reduced. Further, the legislature should remove the governor’s unilateral authority to change assessments and require that tax assessment matters be handled through the normal legislative process.

Counties will more than justly claim the confidence placed in them.

Many of the other bills enacted also were the result of compromise. Maybe these measures are better for the struggle. Most county officials particularly should agree that this is true of the highway bill. The same could be said for the health maintenance organization measure and the Older Americans Act. Several of the other measures only bought time through one-year extensions. We are hopeful that in these cases, the final result will be worth the wait. More importantly, these programs (EDA, health services, OEO) were kept alive and not dropped by executive fiat.

All in all, it possibly was the most productive first session in a number of years from a county view. We normally expect most bills to get through in the second legislative session, but with the loss of the Senate and Congress.

While the clouds of pessimism and uncertainty hang heavy over Washington, we have a lot of unfinished business in 1974. The only way we can keep moving ahead is to lock in to our selected legislative priorities and not lose sight of them. There still are opportunities.

NACE "Matter and Measure"

National Association of County Engineers

Deadline For Conference Reservations

A last reminder: January 30 is the deadline for sending in official Disney World hotel reservation forms for NACE’s Annual Management and Research Conference, February 24-27, 1974, at Disney World, Florida. (Note: you don’t have to belong to NACo to attend). Send the "original" hotel registration form sent you. Hotel will not accept xerox copies of the form. Also, reservations for only one family can be requested on each form. For further information on the NACE Conference, contact Chairman Charles L. Goode, Orange County (Fla.) Public Works Administration, 118 West Kaley, Orlando, Florida 32806, (305) 848-3444.

We’ll see you at Disney World!

Suggestions Next

Look for “Suggestions for Conserving Energy” in the next issue of County News. This special supplement lists energy conservation measures to help you and your crew members during the energy shortage. Many of the suggestions were made by your associates. We welcome your comments in or on the article, since the data will be part of one of our training manuals.

County Achievement Award Program

It is time to submit entries for NACo’s 1974 County Achievement Award Program. This program recognizes implemented projects in your county government’s structure, management, and services. Award-winning programs could be projects in highway safety, traffic control, bridge construction/reconstruction, maintenance management, right-of-ways, landstape, etc. Programs relating to mass transportation and energy conservation are especially appropriate.

Get achievement award entry forms and rules, write or call Florence Zeller at NACo (301) 579-2211 or write to NACo for awards presentation at NACo’s studies and entry forms must be sent to NACo before March 31, 1974.

In addition to providing each county with an opportunity for its programs to be recognized, the case study will update NACo’s existing library of case studies. County officials use these for developing new programs.

Illinois Officers

The new officers of the Illinois Association of County Superintendents of Highways are: President, Thomas Gazda, Macoupin County Superintendent of Highways; Vice President, L. Max Venier, Schuyler County Superintendent of Highways; Secretary-Treasurer, Raymond R. Wells, Henry County Superintendent of Highways.

HILLENBRAND'S WASHINGTON REPORT

202-785-9591
An Open Letter To Congress:
Include Counties In Community Development Legislation

Dear Mr. Congressman:

As a member of the 93rd Congress you are faced with a number of critical decisions, not the least of which is how to allocate limited federal fiscal resources for the prevention of blighted and blighted areas, inadequate housing and inadequate community facilities and services, all of which are plaguing our nation's urban centers.

Pending community development block grant legislation, which Congress has considered in various forms over the past three years, is designed to restructure the federal effort to help solve local physical development problems.

Original proposals called for consolidating various categorical community development grant programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) — urban renewal, model cities, water and sewer, open space, rehabilitation loans, public facility loans and neighborhood facilities — into a single block grant program.

Under these proposals funds would have been distributed by formula to cities over 50,000 in population.

The formula was intended to determine need. The proposal linked these areas to those areas on the basis of need. Nearly 60 percent of the amounts authorized would have been guaranteed to these cities. Other local governments, including counties regardless of population, would have been forced to compete for the limited funds remaining.

While the National Association of Counties (NACo) does not deny cities have a need for some of these funds, it does not believe that cities should be more favored than another local government also suffering from the same problems — namely, the urban county.

The general policy of the National Association of Counties adopted in 1972 and reaffirmed in 1973 calls for consolidating development block grant legislation to provide a formula share of funds for urban counties, defined as those over 200,000 in population, excluding the population of metropolitan cities (those over 50,000) within the county.

This definition was contained in an amendment adopted as part of the 1973 House Banking and Currency Committee's version of community development block grant legislation.

The statute in 1973 recognized the need of urban counties for a formula share of funds and incorporated this definition into its "Better Communities Act" proposal.

In testimony before the House and Senate Subcommittees on Housing in 1973, NACo justified including urban counties in the formula distribution of community development funds:

1. The problems which community development block grant funds seek to solve are not exclusively confined to metropolitan cities, nor are they the sole responsibility of cities to solve. Rather, these problems know no geographical boundaries and exist in areas under the jurisdiction of both cities and counties.

2. The 200,000 base population figure for urban counties is appropriate since it equates the criteria of need, powers and responsibilities under the expectation of urban formula funds for the purposes set forth in the legislation by such counties vis-à-vis metropolitan cities. It represents a concept of equal consideration for the need of areas outside of metropolitan cities as well as those within, which are often identical in characteristics.

3. Counties are the major providers of public assistance and social services at the local level, both to people within and outside the cities. Their services have a direct relationship on the ability to undertake a comprehensive community development program. Thus, there is every reason to treat urban counties in the same manner as metropolitan cities and afford them a formula share of funds.

4. The intent of the community development block grant consolidation is to provide federal assistance on an annual basis, with maximum certainty and minimum delay, and upon which communities can rely. Yet, this advantage applies only to metropolitan cities, leaving urban counties to rely on the uncertainty of discretionary funds.

5. By providing a formula share of community development funds to urban counties, the Congress would not be reducing the amount earmarked for metropolitan cities, but simply guaranteeing urban cities a formula share.

The basic logic of NACo's policy is simply that an urban area citizen needing the benefits of a community development program should not be penalized because he lives across the street from a fellow citizen who is within the boundaries of a metropolitan city. This would especially significant since a metropolitan city will not, and legitimately so, annex such areas because of the liabilities they may present to the metropolitan city.

In another vein NACo's proposal is of special importance and of great value to metropolitan cities. If urban counties are not encouraged to address the needs of citizens in areas contiguous to metropolitan cities, then the opportunity for success of a metropolitan city's community development program could be placed in jeopardy.

Counties have traditionally been the major providers of human and social services. Most of them acting as administrative arms of the state, provide public assistance and supporting services on a countywide basis, that is, within cities.

In addition, counties provide a broad range of public safety, transportation, sanitation, health and land use activities in areas under their jurisdiction.

City involvement in physical development and housing activities is beginning. Yet there are many reasons why their activity may not have been very extensive in the past — too much red tap, lack of funding or lack of statutory authority. With the changes to be brought about by new community development legislation — local decision-making, certainty of funding, a comprehensive approach — affording counties a formula share of funds can be an incentive for them to increase their efforts and, where necessary, obtain the necessary state enabling legislation.

Just prior to the December Congressional adjournment, the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, nearing completion of its marker-up of an omnibus housing and community development bill, tentatively agreed to change the thrust of the legislation by throwing out the formula distribution of funds and replacing it with a hold harmless guarantee.

The hold harmless would credit local governments which during the fiscal years 1971 to 1972 50,000 grant for an urban renewal, model cities, neighborhood development or code enforcement program community — nearly all cities — would be guaranteed an amount equal to the five-year average of assistance received in these programs as well as that received under the open space, water and sewer, public facility loans and neighborhood facilities programs. Hold harmless in 1973 would pay up $1.7 billion out of a metropolitan area distribution of $2.0 billion leaving only $300 million to handle the needs of all other local governments.

The Senate committee's proposal serves to lock in the past, continuing to reward cities for being in an urban redevelopment program, regardless of their current needs or the needs of others.

It has forgotten that the purpose of new community development legislation is not only the elimination of slums and blighted areas but their prevention as well. This country simply cannot afford to spend most of its urban resources on curative efforts while paying little attention to prevention.

What's needed is to distribute formula resources in such a manner that balanced development and redevelopemen can go forward in our cities as well as our suburban areas.

The Senate committee's tentative action also flies in the face of a precedent already established in three federal laws — General Revenue Sharing, Law Enforcement Assistance and Manpower Reform — that counties are equal partners with cities in combating urban problems.

In summary, Mr. Congressman, NACo urges you to do all in your power to assure that urban counties are afforded a guaranteed share of urban community development block grant funds. Urge your colleagues on the Senate and House Banking Committees to report out new legislation only if it has such provisions. The urban counties in the nation and their citizens will be the better for it.

Respectfully,

Gil Barrett
President

Bernard F. Heilbrun
Executive Director
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The fiscal 1974 federal budget proposal provided the phasing out of OEO categorical grant programs into a variety of existing departments.

To the Department of Health, Education and Welfare went previously OEO-managed programs, such as Minority Opportunities, research and development programs, child care development programs, and several of the demonstration programs, as well as the Headstart program, which was actually transferred from the Department of Labor.

The Department of Commerce assumed administration of the Office of Minority Business Enterprise Services.

Shortly after Headstart programs were transferred to H.E.W., most of the OEO Manpower training demonstration programs (Neighborhood Youth Corps, Concentrated Employment Program, Operation Mainstream) were given to the Department of Labor's Manpower Administration. Carroll Administration proposals transfer all remaining OEO manpower activities to the Department of Labor's Employment Program.

Community Action Agencies, whose basic authority is associated in Section 221 of the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, were left to the funding discretion of state and local governments.

The pending Labor-H.E.W. appropriations bills extend the life of OEO through June 30, 1974. The bill calls for appropriation of $384.3 million to fund Community Action Agencies, legal services, special impact programs, general administration and emergency food and medical services programs (EFMS). The Senate bill originally called for $200 million to fund EFMS while the House bill did not mention any funds. The compromise legislation calls for $125 million for EFMS.

Furthermore, there have been several proposals generated from Congress to prevent the demise of OEO. The most recent proposal concerning the extension of OEO was offered by Rep. Augustus Hawkins (D-Calif.), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity, on October 11, 1973. H.R. 10865, better known as the Community Action Amendments of 1973, would provide financial assistance to states and local governments to enable them to assume responsibility for community services in a Community Action Agency special revenue sharing concept. It is expected that there will be no action on H.R. 10865 until early next session.

On the Senate side, Senators Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and Paul W. Douglas (D-Ill.) have introduced a bill which provides for the legal services corporation to be an independent agency. The bill (S. 2686) was reported out Nov. 10, 1973.

As of this date, the Office of Economic Opportunity has transferred five programs to three other agencies. The programs are: health and nutrition (to HEW); education (to HEW); research and development (to be shared by HEW and Labor); and seasonal farm workers (to Labor). The regular OEO staff has been reassigned to the respective agencies, leaving only a core administrative and program staff in Washington and the regional agencies.

Department of Transportation
The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1973 contains new programs to correct roadside hazards, new demonstration programs and studies for the correction of elimination of roadway safety hazards. These programs are separate and separately authorized in the act. The Roadside Obstacles program was created to eliminate roadside obstacles. For FY 1974, $25 million has been authorized, $15 million for FY 1976. The Highways Locations Program is established to eliminate or reduce those hazards at specific highway locations such as sharp curves, which have high accident potential. Authorities for this category are $20 million for FY 1974, $75 million for FY 1975 and $75 million for FY 76. Another program, Rail-Highway Crossing, would provide funds to eliminate hazards at rail-highway grade crossings at an authorization level of $25 million for FY 1974, $75 million for FY 1975, and $75 million for FY 1976.

In addition, two new roadway safety demonstration programs have been established. The Pavement Markings Program is designed to bring pavement marking projects of highways up to standards endorsed by the Federal High Highway Administration. Transportation. The authorization levels are $25 million for FY 1974, $75 million for FY 1975, and $75 million for FY 1976. The Federal Aid Road Safety Demonstration Program contains a test program for three types of projects that are intended to improve state and local roads. Funds go off the federal aid highway network, including roadside obstacles, improved highway markings and reduced hazards at rail-highway crossings. $50 million is authorized for this program for FY 1974, $100 million for FY 1975 and $100 million for FY 1976.

In all, the act authorizes a total of $2 billion for highway safety programs for fiscal year 1974, 1975 and 1976. However, the funding of these safety programs has to be related to the total amount authorized for the regular road construction programs and demonstration programs. The Administration currently is investigating the separate authorizations for the highway safety programs. To promote the safety programs, the states and local governments would have to use part of their regular construction funds.

However, this whole question is before the courts. So far, the Administration has lost at the Federal Appeals Court level on the impounding of highway funds and the U.S. Supreme Court will have to decide. The Supreme Court could take one of several cases in 1974.

Counties should work with state highway departments to have safety projects to be ready to go if there is a favorable court ruling.

Urban Mass Transportation Capital Improvements Project Grants

Contrary to many categorical grant programs, there are ample funds in this program but counties have not made full use of these funds. In fiscal year 1974, there will be an increase of $15.6 million over FY 1973 to $800.3 million which compares to only $710 million in FY 1972. These figures will be reviewed and the size of capital grants. The most common use of funds by counties is the purchase of buses and related equipment.
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Outlook

On Issues Affecting Counties

'74 State Legislative Outlook

By Anona Teska

Over 60 percent of the state legislatures will meet in regular session in 1974 and several others in fiscal sessions. What kinds of issues will be discussed? What problems will the legislatures try to resolve? Crystal-ball gazing is full of hazards. But certain events of the past have cast their shadows before. And hanging heavy over the heads of all elected officials is their awareness of the concern of citizens about government and the current distrust of it at all levels, national, state, county, city and town.

The fact that more states are in the black than have been in recent years may allow for more time to look ahead to do some longer range planning. If the legislators have to spend the whole session in haggling over the budget and struggling to find ways to increase revenues, or in reacting to crisis situations, there may be little time to plan for the future.

Legislatures will be faced with finding solutions either as a reaction to court rulings or imminent crises. However, seldom is any legislation engendered by anything else. Pressures build around needs. Often these may be felt by powerful interests that wield enough political or economic clout to get responses. Sometimes they may be such broad-based, visible needs that enough of the electorate exerts pressure. However, there have been instances of forward looking legislation that has arisen in response to a need for which little pressure had been exerted. The first workmen's compensation laws in Wisconsin, for example, came at a time when workers as a whole had an attitude of acceptance of unremedied work-related accidents and deaths.

Legislative reaction to the whole range of current crisis situations should certainly not be merely finger-in-the-dike operations. Federal, state, and local efforts should be not coordinated to produce the best possible present response, but also cognizant of possible future needs and developments and effects of today's actions on areas other than those immediately affected -- the environment, employment, the economic base, growth, resources to meet future needs.

The issues that will be presented here are not listed in order of probability for legislative action or the universal importance of the issues, nor will all be of uppermost concern in every legislature.

Financing Education

The United States Supreme Court decision in Rodriguez v. San Antonio did not disqualify the property tax as a means to finance schools nor did it establish fiscal equality among school districts as a right protected by the United States Constitution. The case, however, did highlight fiscal imbalances among taxing districts and in essence returned to the states the problem of equity. In New Jersey, the state Supreme Court (in Robinson v. Cahill [1973] upheld the lower state court's contention that the state constitution made the state government responsible for public education, as had, even before the Rodriguez decision, the California state Supreme Court in Serrano v. Priest. A number of other state constitutions place responsibility for education and for equalization of opportunity on the state government.

So both for reasons of fairness and of present, or likelihood of future, state court decisions, legislatures will continue to look at ways to redress imbalances. An indication of the concern is revealed in the allocation by state governments of their revenue sharing funds. The Treasury Department's Office of Revenue Sharing reported on September 24, 1973 that, for the third entitlement period, state governments had put 60 percent of their revenue sharing funds into education. Possibly, as an adjunct, states will pursue more vigorously ways to make property taxes among and within jurisdictions more equitable.

Further, the circuit breaker kind of property tax relief for older and poor homeowners, as well as for renters, will probably be inaugurated or improved. Nine states now provide for relief also for renters, the figure used for how much of the rent goes for property tax ranging from 10 percent in Colorado to 30 percent in Vermont.

Land Use and Environment

Torn between energy shortages and the need to preserve the environment, some legislatures will need to withstand pressures to relax air pollution standards, to continue to allow, or to soften efforts to control, strip mining. But these shortages are also challenges to work out solutions that will not produce inequitable distribution of resources, faster depletion of what we have left, or high costs that discriminate against the poor. Some state legislatures will be trying for ways to conserve energy--whether hydro-electric or fossil fuel. Perhaps some states may begin to finance research in geo-thermal and/or solar energy sources.

The question of whether property owners have the right to use property as they please or are but the custodians of the irreplaceable land and its resources that they have bought is a hard one that will have to be resolved. People have come to accept local zoning and local and, in some places, state housing requirements. But they have not, in most places, required careful enough practices in mining, farming, forestry, construction, manufacturing to prevent erosion, despoiling of our land resources, and other preventable pollution of our lakes, streams, and oceans. State land and resource use policies and growth as it affects them will certainly be discussed, even in states where beginnings have been made.

Better ways to handle the prodigiously escalating solid waste disposal problems of communities before they become buried in the by-products of affluence have already been enacted. Banning of no-return bottles, encouraging of cooperative arrangements among jurisdictions for disposal and/or recovery and recycling are beginnings that have been made.

Strengthening the powers of the state agencies for water pollution abatement also seems in the cards, together with state grants for sewage treatment and other inducements for local construction of sewage treatment plants.

Transportation

Energy shortages and environmental concerns have escalated the number of people taking to bicycle riding (last year saw more bicycle than automobile sales) and public transportation. Many localities have already worked out special bus and bicycle laries to encourage more people to give up the one-in-a-car commuting-to-work practice. As an incentive for car pools, San Francisco provides toll-breaks for a car with three or more passengers.

(Continued on page 3)

Anona Teska is state and local government specialist, League of Women Voters' Education Fund.
Counties' changing role in transit issues

By Daniel Mikesell

Local officials for many years have been concerned with two issues which have now joined in one. We have been trying to get increased participation in the transportation decisions that affect us. We have also been paying lip service at least, to the idea of balanced transportation; that is, some effective mixture of the use of autos and public transportation. Now all those things have changed. If we have not the chance to do something about both those issues: the 1973 Federal Aid Highway Act has requirements for more decisions by local officials throughout the legislation, and has provided tools for the mix of transportation we feel we need in our own areas. Of course the energy crisis has made it imperative that we use our transportation most efficiently.

So we at the local level have the opportunity — and the necessity — for working closely with state and federal officials in developing the local transportation system. The challenge is directed to us: can we, the local officials, step up to that task, put aside in many cases the established ways of doing things, improving or, in some cases, developing new relationships, especially with the state. We must make our input felt in order to strengthen the counties role in transportation development.

Everything is not perfect and we all have a long way to go, but the opportunity is here. I suggest therefore it will be mainly our fault at the local level if we fail to make the relationships work.

What is actually happening now? Since the energy crisis is an ever-changing pattern and process and so much is being written and said about it, the following discussion centers around implementing the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1973.

The first steps have been taken already. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) have asked county officials to join them and the state and cities in implementing the 1973 Act. To do this, FHWA and UMTA staffs developed a series of issues which were presented to task forces of public officials and Washington representatives of NACo, National League of Cities and other organizations. Then, to make sure county officials addressed the problems, most important to counties, NACo’s Transportation Steering Committee met last November to determine cogent issues and actions which should be taken.

The issues, discussed below, include a definition of local officials that counties can live with and some principles for regional cooperation, ways we develop our transportation systems — getting to that dilemma of balanced transportation; and even present problem of minimization of red tape; and finally, counties to clarify the counties position.

Issue: How do we define local official? The 1973 Act calls for cooperation with and decisions by “local officials” in improving county places; for example, urbanized area boundary changes, planning decisions, urban highway system selection, transfers of funds, decisions on funding for either roads or mass transportation.

The NACo transportation steering committee developed the following definition and transmitted it to federal officials:

**Responsible (appropriate) local officials are those who are elected and directly accountable to the public whom they serve and who have jurisdiction over matters relating to highways and transit.**

Such officials have capability to raise the required matching monies for federal funds. These officials may delegate their authority to act to subordinates or to regional or state associations.

**ACTION:**

1. Local officials must keep that definition before all agencies of government — particularly the state, as well as federal, regional and local. This definition does not exclude participation by others such as local business leaders, private individuals, chamber of commerce representatives.

2. Since transportation is a regional problem, local officials must act at the regional level. Therefore, it is important to recall to your attention the NACo American County Platform position on regional cooperation which states that county officials should be guided by four principles:

   a. Strengthen local government: The ability of county government to be a basic building block in solving regional problems must be strengthened by improved county government, cross county financial resources and functional authority.

   b. Recognize regional issues: Local governments must recognize issues which cross city and county boundaries and then deal with those issues on a cooperative basis. It is vital that local government cooperatively develop a regional-multipersonal approach.

   c. Support a regional council of local governments: The regional council is the means for local elected officials to identify regional issues, examine possible solutions and decide what agencies should be responsible for implementation. The regional council must be established by local elected officials who have decided the issues for membership, voting and funding. The council must be an advisory body and not another layer of government. It shall not have taxing authority or have operational or service delivery responsibilities.

   d. Organize to solve your regional problems. There are four structural ways local elected officials can solve their regional problems. They can do it by governmental organization, interlocal agreements and contracts, city-county cooperation, and strengthened counties, shared facilities and many other ways.

   In summation, elected county and city officials should determine their own policies and procedures for implementing regional decisions; should control all regional agencies; and should determine regional boundaries.

**Issue:** How do we develop our balanced transportation systems? The 1973 Act gives local government the opportunity to develop a balanced transportation system that fits our local needs, as requested in the NACo American County Platform. We must, of course, develop that system with other local agencies as well as state and federal officials from the planning process through construction and operation.

**Action:**

1. We must work with federal officials, as we are now doing with FHWA and UMTA, as well as the Federal Aviation Administration. The 1973 Act has given us the flexibility to spend funds for highways and mass transportation. We have the opportunity, under the legislation, to get additional planning funds to strengthen planning processes. FHWA and UMTA are asking that one agency at metropolitan levels be responsible for highways and public transportation planning. Make sure your governor selects the agency which will be most effective in your area.

2. There are many agencies at the local level, transit and airport authorities, state highway departments, city, county and even township agencies. Counties must be represented and must make sure participation is active and not simply names on the roster. Of increasing importance now, because of the energy crisis, many counties will have to augment public transportation. We have authority under the 1973 Act and we must follow actively the legislation now in Congress to provide emergency operational subsidies (called for in the NACo American County Platform).

3. If a NACo official asks you if your state associations know about your problems — they all can help. If it is possible, NACo will suggest someone who has a problem similar to yours and you can exchange ideas and experiences.

**Issue:** How can red tape be minimized? The 1973 Act calls for minimizing red tape. A reduction in delays caused by too many detailed authoritative regulations is part of the larger issue of development of equitable and understandable regulations.

If red tape is reduced, the larger issue also becomes simplified.

Since this is a many-sided problem, it must be attacked by working with the federal agencies, by changing federal legislation; by getting states to simplify their regulations; and, in general, by constant review and evaluation of processes.

**ACTION:**

The U.S. Department of Transportation is trying to standardize planning grant requirements. This means that FHWA and UMTA need similar requirements. This is not easy because of traditionally different working relationships: FHWA, by its, works with state highway departments; UMTA works directly with the local agency. A proposed solution is to have one agency designated in each metropolitan area to be responsible for both FHWA and UMTA activities. FHWA, UMTA and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) have recently asked the governor of each state to designate such an agency.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) has three additional problems: one, getting their own house in order— reviewing some of the wordy, involved regulations already in existence; two, conforming to the many requirements outside federal highway legislation (such as National Environmental Policy, Civil Rights, Davis Bacon, Equal Employment Opportunity); and, three, working with national highway legislation which is sometimes ambiguous and sometimes overly specific.

(Continued on page 4)
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Looking back, planning ahead

By Linda Ganschietz

As the nation draws nearer to commemorating its bicentennial anniversary, community programs and projects are being planned in the spirit of patriotism and, sometimes, commercialism by public and private organizations. Festivals of large and small grandeur, statues, stamps, medals, maps, picture shows, and the like are designed to highlight historic places and people who are being published, planned and produced as projects fitting a nation which in 200 years grew from a British colony to having the world's highest standard of living.

However, not all communities and citizens have adequate health care, water and sewer facilities, transportation, food employment, environmental quality, recreation facilities and housing.

County government came to America with the first settlers. When the United States celebrates its bicentennial in 1976, counties will celebrate the 324th anniversary of their establishment in America. Counties have grown with the states and the nation, and are providing many more services to their citizens than they did 342, 200 or even 3 years ago.

But inflation and rapid population changes have put a strain on county budgets. The three themes of the American Revolution Bicentennial Community Program are Heritage '76; Festival USA; and Horizons '76. Horizons '76 especially provides a means for counties to improve quality of life for their citizens. Horizons '76 as defined by the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration (formerly a Commission), "will reflect the African American, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian, minority, community development, communications, transportation, learning, health and safety, the economy and human values and understanding to assure a better future for all mankind."

According to the Bicentennial Administration (ARBA) established by Congress (PL 93-179, effective December 16, 1973) applications for federal funding of projects and programs designed as bicentennial commemorations "hopefully" will be looked upon more favorably by other federal agencies. This goal, to be continued by the new ARBA administrator could mean a better possibility of funding for county park and recreation area improvements, water and sewer grants to improve the quality of life for rural citizens, housing facilities for urban and rural residents and many other modernizations and improvements.

Congress should be encouraged to appropriate funds to achieve the goal of Horizons '76. The legislation creating the ARBA authorizes an annual appropriation of $25,000 to each state bicentennial commission, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. An additional $200,000 is authorized for matching grants to each state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico for distribution to local governments. The grants are part of a grants-in-aid program. Additional funds are available through special state applications.

In large states, the $200,000, when equally distributed among the local governments and the state, will not mean a substantial source of funding for counties and states with the least number of local governments will, of course, be able to distribute larger shares.

Since federal bicentennial funds probably will continue to be channeled through state bicentennial commissions, county officials who want assurance some for their programs should participate actively in state bicentennial commissions.

Counties which are interested in becoming designated as "Bicentennial Communities" should first write to NACO for the appropriate application forms. Once these have been received the county governing board can arrange to designate either themselves or a private group to coordinate the activities being planned to celebrate the year 1776 in the community. This official sanctioned group will file their name on the official Bicentennial community application form, and at the same time announce the project plans in one of the three official ARBA thematic areas (Horizons '76; Festival USA; Horizons '76). The county must then pass a formal resolution indicating these facts and forward the application to the State Bicentennial Commission. Once received and reviewed by the state, the information from the local community's application will be forwarded to the National ARBA office which will be responsible for informing that county that it has been designated as a "Bicentennial Community." Once this designation has been made, the county then becomes eligible to apply to the state Bicentennial Commission for matching grants and to the federal government for assistance in major Bicentennial projects. ARBA officials hope that federal agencies will consider local Bicentennial project applications as a priority in funding; however, it has been no federal communication to this extent.

(Continued from page 1)

The continuing struggle to commit some of the state's earmarked highway funds to mass transit subsidies will go on. A transportation bond issued in New York failed in the 1973 elections; nevertheless New York and other states will need to turn their attention to improving hard-pressed and inadequate intercity and intra county transport systems. Energy shortages, air pollution, traffic congestion, parking space consumption, and sometimes public interest. There may be more popular support for governmental action. Everybody-the farmer, construction manufacturer retailer, homeowner-will feel the impact of gasoline, fuel oil, and electric power shortages.

Health and Welfare

Many problems exist in these two areas, but perhaps the most pressing is the need to provide low-cost housing. What federal help there will be will hopefully be determined early in the upcoming second session of the 93rd Congress. The President's proposal of mid-September seems to opt for using existing vacant housing as the best solution with perhaps cash payments, housing allowances, to help the poor, but building in this area and scarcities in rental properties, forcing rents upward, have put great pressures on not only the poor but the middle-income class as well. With few exceptions, states have not ventured far into the housing field. About half the states have housing finance agencies; forty-nine states have Departments of Community Affairs or their equivalent, some of which include housing authorities but not even in the state of New York, which has made the most comprehensive commitment, has the problem been solved.

Paring of commitment in some states to welfare programs has come at a time when inflation has greatly increased living costs. What kinds of federal-state-local arrangements can be worked out is going to depend on some state, as well as local initiatives.

Citizen Access to Government

The government that's "closest to the people," however, elicits the lowest voter turnout when it comes to electing the people's representatives. Historically school elections, then city and county elections bring the fewest citizens to the polls.

In the light of the apparent apathy and distrust, there are a number of problems to which legislators profitably might turn attention:

1) Removing statutory and administrative obstacles to voting to make it easier to register and vote.

2) Limiting or regulating campaign financing; requiring disclosure of campaign funds and financial holding stronger conflict-of-interest legislation.

3) Requiring open committee hearings and recorded votes on all bills; encouraging public hearings at sub-state levels. (Some reports indicate that less than half of the local general governments holds public hearings on budgets. Public interest in use of general revenue shared funds could spur the 1974 legislative sessions to consider ways to open up not only budgetary but all governmental procedures at state and local levels to more public participation.)

4) Providing better, easier-to-understand, more accessible information about government and services to citizens.

5) Shortening the ballot or simplifying it to provide more meaningful citizen choices and pinpointing where responsibility for performance rests.

6) Working toward elimination of at least some special districts that have taxing power but over which citizens have little or no control and about which they have little knowledge.

7) Continuing to grant more home rule powers and more flexibility in structure and financing of local governments. In this area there have been some rather good beginnings. A number of states have granted counties wider leeway—home rule charters (with vote approval), the right to have elected or appointed executives, and city-county consolidation (a movement begun many years ago but with slow acceptance, even in states that have long permitted it.)

This is a big country with infinite variety. Each of the fifty states has its own political, social, and economic history. Perceptions of problems and possible approaches vary in relation to these differing factors. These differences make it possible for the states to produce alternative solutions, adapted to each locality's needs and to realistic chances for citizen support.

Around the country the legislators are younger and, over all, represent a wider cross-section of the population than they did ten years ago. In the last three or four years, most experts agree that legislative performance has improved. There are indications that again it may be true that states are laboratories for change.

State legislative outlook

Getting Recognition

State Bicentennial Commission approval is needed before a county can receive national approval for a bicentennial project. ARBA designation as a bicentennial county means national recognition of the county, allows use of the official bicentennial symbol and includes listing in a national catalog of all activities planned by bicentennial communities. Designation might also inspire similar movement, stimulate new resources, encourage existing support, and possibly enhance favorable consideration of requests for assistance, according to the former bicentennial commission staff.

Bicentennial Administration officials hope through total community involvement, support for programs and projects will be enhanced and provide a means for the movement begun from local sources. The rules governing the approval for national designation require "broad (Continued on page 4)
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Examples of different county projects are highlighted below.

Jefferson Parish, La.
Jefferson Parish (County) is part of the New Orleans Metropolitan Area. The Lafreniere Park project will provide a central parks area for Jefferson Parish as well as the whole metropolitan area. The cost of park land purchase and improvement is estimated at $10 million. Citizens have already taxed themselves by passage of a bond issue to provide $5 million.

In addition to the Lafreniere Park Project, Jefferson Parish is planning a master plan for the classification and preservation of the county's historic sites; and is establishing a historical society, a tourist and development commission and a written history of Jefferson Parish.

written history, the county points out will bring to light, among other things, that local citizens led what can be considered the first revolution against a foreign power in the country.

King County, Wash.
One of the thrusts of King County's bicentennial program will be a comprehensive system of primarily pedestrian trails linking major park sites. The trail system will offer the county's urban population a variety of outdoor experiences in both developed and undeveloped sites, including direct exposure to the natural topography of the county.

King County is joining with the City of Seattle and other municipalities to form a combined bicentennial commission. Among other King County bicentennial projects one is the Action Program, made up of a multitude of projects which collectively represent all three bicentennial themes (horizons, festivals and heritage); and the Indian Center (a cultural/educational exhibit center).

The goal of the Downtown project is "a vital inner city ... through recognition of Seattle's settlement as a port city and its close relationship to the many bodies of water within and along its borders ... through development of urban amenities which complement private and other public development of this decade and which reinforce historic ties."

The Indian Cultural/Educational Center will provide a comprehensive cultural center, including arts and crafts building with studios and workshops for traditional and contemporary Indian artists; a theatre for performances.

Gloucester County, Va.
Gloucester County will publish an 18-page pamphlet illustrating the six periods of the county's history; and a book of 80 pages with 60 photographs of the county's historical buildings. Two issues of reproductions of the Gloucester Token of 1714 (the first coin minted in America) will be sold.

The three themes of the Bicentennial Commemoration are Heritage '76 which focuses on activities which recall the Nation's heritage and gives an historical perspective to the community. Festival U.S.A. involves an expanded effort to share with other Americans and the people of the world; the traditions, the culture, the hospitality and the character of the U.S. and its people. Festival USA includes the areas of the arts, athletics, education, travel, hospitality, exhibits, fairs and festivals. Horizon '76 covers activities through which Americans can commemorate their past by looking to the future as the United States enters the Century III.

NACO is vitally interested in the Bicentennial project plans of designated counties. Officials are encouraged to correspond with Margaret S. Seeley, Director of Special Services at NACO in order that they might share their plans and learn of activities in other counties.

Linda Ganschienitz is managing editor of Outlook.
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Hud Funding

The HUD 1974 Appropriations (P.L. 93-137) appropriated funds for three hundred community development programs which the Administration sought to terminate. Included are $600 million for urban renewal $150 million for model cities and $20 million for open space.

The Administration, however, has determined that it will spend only $100 million for urban renewal and impose the other cuts announced.

The HUD funding bill also appropriated $75 million for Title I and II grants and loans, $20 million for Title V.

Although Congress is intent on carrying the program beyond fiscal 1975, a lot will depend on the Administration’s willingness to spend funds appropriated for the Economic Development Act.

Rural Development Funding

The Administration’s fiscal 1974 budget proposed funding only the loan provisions authorized by the Rural Development Act of 1974. No funds were requested for water and waste disposal grants, planning grants or industrial park development grants.

The fiscal 1974 Agriculture Appropriations Act (P.L. 93-135) appropriates $470 million for water and sewer loans (up to 40 years at 5% interest), $50 million for other community facility loans, $200 million for industrial development loans and $10 million for rural development community facilities grants and technical assistance. The Administration is not expected to spend the grant funds.

Crime and Public Safety

LEAA Extension

In August the President signed P.L. 93-83 containing a three-year extension for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) program. The administration authorized $1 billion for fiscal 1974, $1 billion for fiscal 1975 and $1.2 billion for fiscal 1976, and increased the federal matching share to 90%. One-half of the local match must be provided by the state.

The proposal requires that regional criminal justice planning boards be composed of a majority of local elected officials, and amongst cities and counties of over 250,000 population to submit comprehensive criminal justice plans to the state for approval or disapproval. Local applications submitted to the state for approval must be acted upon by the state within 30 days.

The President has also signed the fiscal 1974 appropriation act for LEAA which appropriates a total of $870 million of which $855 million will be used for law enforcement programs.

Eighty-five percent is available for distribution to the states, and 15 percent is retained in discretionary money by LEAA.

Environmental and Energy

Energy Bills

Although a conference committee had resolved the differences between the Senate-passed version and the House-passed version, of the Energy Emergency Act the conference committee took a position controlling windfall profits which might accrue to the oil industry as a result of the new law.

The provision, opposed by the Administration, was deleted by the Senate. The House, however, refused to go along with the Senate’s action, and the bill was returned to the conference committee to be debated after Congress returns in January.

The original conference committee report would authorize, but not require, the President to institute gasoline rationing without prior Congressional approval. Other energy conservation measures – such as transportation control plans or limiting the hours of operation of commercial facilities - would be subject to prior Congressional approval before taking effect.

Congress has also agreed to a one-year delay in implementing tighter auto emission control standards and to suspend through November, 1974 federal, state and local clean air standards where pollution forecs not available.

The bill also permits the Environmental Protection Agency to require industrial and pollution control plants to convert from less plentiful oil and natural gas to more plentiful coal.

The bill authorized $500 million to provide unemployment compensation to workers who lose their jobs as a result of the energy shortages (part of President Nixon’s request to reorganize the federal
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The following legislation will be reviewed by the next Congress. The Congress is expected to clear a final bill for the President's signature shortly after its adjournment.

The Congress also enacted year-round daylight savings time through April, 1975, and raised the states to impose a statewide 55 mile-per-hour speed limit.

Water Pollution Funding
Two bills of legislation (P.L. 93-234, P.L. 93-207) were passed by Congress concerning funding for sewage treatment. P.L. 93-234 (amending Sec. 205 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act) allocates fiscal 1975 funds for wastewater treatment based on a two-part formula derived from an EPA survey of water pollution funding needs. No state will receive less than the amount it received in fiscal 1972.

P.L. 93-207 (amending Sec. 306 of the Water Pollution Control Act) provides funds for reimbursement to localities which constructed and completed treatment works between June 30, 1966 and July 1, 1972. The legislation extended the application date and extended the authorization level to $2.6 billion, and speeded up the reimbursement process.

Although $18 billion was authorized by Congress for fiscal 1973, 1974 and 1975 in the Water Pollution Control Act passed in October, 1972, the President has imposed over half the funds, and the battle over spending is still in the court.

Local Lands
The major action involving public lands was the passage of the Alaska Pipeline Bill, P.L. 93-153, "Rights-of-way Across National Lands," was signed by President Nixon on November 16, 1973.

Action was not completed on either a Senate or House bill to extend for ten years the authority of the Bureau of Land Management to develop some two billion acres of public lands. The Senate action involved the redefinition of the "net state" lands which would come under the jurisdiction of the BLM. The House bill, S. 425 (Jackson, D-Wash.), was introduced by the Senate (S. 1111, 93-763), which was last debated in committees of conference. The bill consolidates several categorical programs into two broad-purpose programs, one for federal recreation and outdoor instruction programs and the other for innovative strengthening state agencies of education. The Administration's special education recreation sharing proposal has been dropped in the Congress. However, many of its concepts are influencing the final design of the ESEA. The heart of the ESEA remains to be solved: that of aid to disadvantaged children. The Senate completed its action on the ESEA Extension bill (S. 1539). The House is expected to continue markup early in the 1974 session.

Land Use
The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry plans to report S. 2286, "The Forest and Rangeland Environmental Management Act of 1974," to the Senate for approval of the second session of the 93rd Congress.

The bill would require that the Forest Service make a comprehensive and detailed assessment of the renewable resources (trees, plants, fish, water and soil) in the nation's forests by 1975 and periodically thereafter. The goal of the bill is to ensure that by the year 2000, the demand for forest products will be met without depleting the country's renewable resources.

President Nixon also began on a similar version of this measure in the House Agriculture Committee, D.C. Home Rule
P.L. 93-146, "D.C. Home Rule Act," was signed by President Nixon on December 24 grants partial home rule to the District of Columbia and permits D.C. citizens to elect a mayor and 13-member council for the first time in 99 years.

If voters approve the charter in a May 7 referendum, the District will have most of the powers enjoyed by other local governments. Congress, however, retained complete control over the city's expenditures and could veto city council acts by concurrent resolution.

NACO strongly supports home rule legislation for all American cities and counties, and urges its passage for D.C. home rule legislation.

Manpower Reform
After a three-year struggle for manpower legislation, President Nixon signed the "Comprehensive Manpower and Training Act of 1973" on December 18. The measure is expected to provide $1.8 billion per year in financial assistance to state and local governments so that they may create the necessary employment incentives.
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responsibility for job training, community services, and public service employment programs.

The "grant consolidation" measure eliminated over 10,000 direct grants and contracts with public and private organizations. Instead, provided block grants to 500 "partnerships" who will be responsible for administering comprehensive services.

Prime sponsors are defined as all states and those local government purposes (Title I) (with 250 counties) all with a population of 100,000 or more. This approximates LIAP cities and 275 counties throughout the United States.

It is anticipated that public service employment funds will start flowing to state and local governments as soon as the end of March. Funds for comprehensive manpower programs (Title I) will be available on a transitional basis through the end of FY 1974, with full funding beginning on July 1, 1974.

Pension Reform

The passage of a bill which will affect private (and, perhaps, state and local government pension plans) appears to be a major accomplishment in 1973. Last year the Senate passed the "Repayment Income Security for Employees Act" by a vote of 93-0.

The measure does not require private employers to contribute to their plans, but for where employees do provide such plans, the bill would correct many abuses and underfunding of pension plans.

On the House side, the Ways and Means Committee is considering the Senate bill and a few amendments to the bill as an amendment. They are also considering whether or not to include public pension plans under the reform measure. NACO has called for further study of public pension plans since little is known about their operation.

Taxation and Finance

Tax Reform

Although expected enactment of major tax reform legislation did not become a reality last year, The House Ways and Means Committee held three months of hearings on various tax reform proposals early in 1973. Toward the end of the hearings, the Nixon Administration introduced a limited reform package which did not address most tax preferences for businesses and property investment.

In May, the Ways and Means Committee suspended consideration of tax reform and concentrated on the President's trade reform proposals, with the hope of returning to tax reform in September. But delays on the trade legislation and the illusory of Ways and Means Committee's ability (D-Ark.) to delay the Committee's consideration of trade reform and, therefore, tax reform.

Revenue Sharing

No legislative action took place with respect to general revenue sharing in 1973. However, during the 1974 session, there will probably be a number of proposals to amend the five-year authorization-appropriations general revenue sharing measure into an annual appropriations measure.

This threat, which was a major point of debate when the measure was originally introduced, remains a threat made by House Appropriations Chairman George Mohon (D-Texas) and Senate Appropriations Chairman John MclLlean (D-Ark.).

There will be no major move to extend the current revenue sharing measures beyond December 31, 1976 expiration date this year, such a move will most likely be formulated in 1975 during the first session of the 94th Congress.

Budget Reform

Legislation to reform the federal budget process (HR 7120) passed the House in December. Senate action is expected early in 1974 on a similar bill (S. 2899) which has been held up by the Government Operations Committee and is now pending before the Rules and Administration Committee.

Both bills establish a budget committee in each house, a legislative budget staff and a timetable for congressional budget action. To provide more time for consideration of the budget, the bill changes the fiscal year to October 1. Both bills would allow multi-year funding for federal aid programs.

The "New Coalition" of governors, county officials and mayors has made this legislation its top priority.

Funding Simplification

The Senate has approved S 2299 the "Joint Funding Simplification Act of 1973" very similar to legislation passed by the House in the 91st Congress. The same legislation (HR 11236) is pending before the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. S 2299 simplifies funding and other procedures in those cases where a grantee receives assistance from two or more different agencies or programs within an agency.

The Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee will be holding hearings on New Federalism, (including Joint Funding) beginning January 28.

Payments-In-Lieu

No action was taken on the subject of payments-in-lieu of taxes. However, as soon as Congress reconvenes on January 21, House Public Works Chairman John A. Blatnik (D-Minn.) will introduce a payments-in-lieu of taxes measure to compensate county governments for revenues lost due to the presence of federally-owned, tax-exempt lands within those counties.

Congressman Blatnik's bill reflects the policy that has been developed and endorsed by NACO's Western Plains Development District and contained in the "American County Platform." Hopefully, hearings will be held on this important measure during the spring of 1974.

Transportation

1973 Highway Act

One of the real achievements of this session was the move by Congress to provide more funds for state and local roads and highways. The House passed a $2.5 billion bill (HR 3153) which included $1.6 billion provision for local roads. NACO and other public interest groups pushed for social services legislation which limited HEW's authority.

The Senate, late in the session, approved a $2.8 billion bill (HR 3153), but the House Ways and Means Committee refused to take action on the Senate-passed bill due to the apparent lack of support for welfare amendments. As a compromise, House and Senate leaders agreed to support the restrictive HEW legislation until January 1, 1975, and to hold hearings early in the new session on HR 3153.

Social Services

Social Services legislation includes the President's 94th Congress priority (HR 5133), which includes a 7 percent across-the-board increase effective immediately and 4 percent annually, July 1, 1974. The law also contained technical changes in the Food Stamp program, a disaster security income program for adults (SSI), a six-month suspension of regulations determining eligibility for SSI and an increase in use of Medicaid funds for SSI recipients.

Older Americans

In May, the President signed the Older Americans Act (P.L. 93-68) which restructured the Act to allow local governments to be directly involved in the delivery of aging services (Title III) and authorized new Special Adult Training Programs, offered new employment opportunities for the aged in community services jobs (Title IX) and expanded the food program (Title VIII).

Funding for this act was increased to $540 million through June, 1975. In July, Congress passed additional appropriations which funded Title VII of the Older Americans Act for Nutrition Programs for the Elderly and reduced the SSI benefits effective January, 1974.

Food Stamps

Major changes in the Food Stamp Program were made in the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-68). Food stamps are to be issued every two months, instead of every two weeks. States must distribute and spend the funds by January 1, 1974 and the Department of Agriculture must report semi-annually the value of the funds on a state-by-state basis. Changes are outlined in the August 24, 1973 County News.

HEW Funding

For the first time in two years the President has signed an HEW Appropriations bill of $2.25 billion. The bill was $1.2 billion over the President's budget request.

The bill allows the President to increase the budget up to five percent of any given line item for any fiscal year. The President is required to modify all other funds amounts for expenditure.

This should avoid further impoundments. Several programs across-the-board were not approved. Administration were approved. For further information see the December 28, 1973, County News.

Aid Briefer

(Continued from page 3)

programs in energy and environment, transportation, community development, and land use.

The luncheon speaker on January 25 will be James S. Wright, Jr., Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The CASC meeting will continue until noon on January 26 with luncheon, with Rep. Charles E. Hyde, Undersecretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Pamphlets in the Region IX Briefer are invited to attend all sessions on January 24 and 26, 1974. There is a reservation fee for the CIC Region IX Briefer is $2.50 which includes the January 24 luncheon and reception. The luncheon fee to a CASC luncheon on January 25 which those attending the Region IX Briefer may attend by purchasing a ticket.
Manpower
(Continued from page 1)

The following list includes the states that may apply for prime sponsorship must include: name and address of applicant; title of the act (Caregiver Employment and Training Act); geographic area to be served; population of area to be served; criteria for obtaining federal government authority; and certification that planning will be developed according to regulations; signature of appropriate state or local official.

Regarding consortia, the draft anticipates that bonuses of 10 percent will be available to consortia which include units in reasonable proximity with an eligible prime sponsor and include at least 75 percent of the population of the labor market area.

The Manpower Administration's list of eligible prime sponsors follows:

Alabama: Calhoun, Jefferson, Mobile, Tuscaloosa.
Alaska: Greater Anchorage Borough.
Arkansas: Monroe County.
Arkansas: Faulkner County.

District of Columbia.
Florida: Jacksonville City.
Georgia: Columbia/Muscogee, Cobb, DeKalb, Fulton, Richmond.
Hawaii: Honolulu.
Idaho: Ada.
Illinois: Champaign, Cook, Du Page, Kane, La Salle, Lake, Macon, Madison, McHenry, McLean, Rock Island, Sangamon, St. Clair, Tazewell, Will.
Indiana: Indianapolis/Marion, Allen, Delaware, Elkhart, La Porte, Lake, Madison, St. Joseph, Tippecanoe, Vigo.
Iowa: Black Hawk, Scott, Woodbury, Winn.
Kansas: Johnson.
Kentucky: Lexington/Fayette, Jefferson, Kenton.
Louisiana: Baton Rouge.
Maine.
Maryland: Baltimore City, Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Harford, Howard.
Massachusetts: Boston.
Minnesota: Anoka, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, St. Louis.
Mississippi: Harrison.
Missouri: Jackson, Jefferson, St. Louis.
Montana: none.
Nebraska: none.
Nevada: none.
New Mexico: none.

1975 Water Pollution Funds
Allocation of Fiscal 1975 funds for wastewater treatment construction work under Section 231(b) of P.L. 93-245, enacted by the President on Jan. 2, 1974. The bill provided that no state would be allocated less than the amount it received in FY 1972.

The following chart listed each state's allocation which is based on the EPA survey of needs. Although Congress authorized $7 billion for FY 1975, it is not known what amount the President will release. Therefore, the chart provides figures based on partial allotments of $3 billion and $4 billion as well as full allotment of $7 billion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>$3 Billion Allotment</th>
<th>$4 Billion Allotment</th>
<th>$7 Billion Allotment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>165.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>470.2</td>
<td>470.2</td>
<td>710.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>357.2</td>
<td>457.3</td>
<td>813.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>122.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Col</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>164.4</td>
<td>292.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>125.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>225.4</td>
<td>253.3</td>
<td>440.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>113.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>121.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>188.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>156.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>188.8</td>
<td>356.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>116.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>123.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>160.5</td>
<td>254.7</td>
<td>454.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>194.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>357.5</td>
<td>486.0</td>
<td>832.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>120.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>344.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>178.3</td>
<td>300.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>110.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>143.7</td>
<td>297.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>173.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers are in millions of dollars.

Federal Aid Review

by Carol Shaskan, Legislative Research Assistant

Proposed federal regulations have been received for review and comment. These regulations are currently being analyzed by county officials and NACo staff to determine their impact on counties. Due to the size of some of the regulations, NACo is unable to provide copies of all issues. At the end of each description it is noted whether or not copies are available.

If copies are available, please write to Aliceann Fritzchel at NACo. As an added service, we will separate federal and state issuances which are available from agencies.

Federal Housing Administration (FHA)

1979 Housing and Urban Development Act: Incentive Grant Standards for State Housing Assistance Grants.

1975 Department of Health, Education and Welfare

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has issued final regulations concerning eligibility for the Medical Services Section of Title 42 of the U.S. Code, which was appropriated by P.L. 93-245, enacted by the President on Jan. 2, 1974. These regulations clarify regulations issued by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare which were published in the Federal Register on December 31, 1972. Copies of these regulations are available from the H.E.W. offices.

New Regulations

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has issued final regulations concerning the requirements for state Medicaid programs issued by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare which were published in the Federal Register November 1, 1972. Copies of these regulations are available from the H.E.W. offices.

All numbers are population-based minimum.
**Feds Announce Carpooling Grants**

The U.S. Department of Transportation has launched a vigorous national program to encourage the use of carpools. Under the authority of the "Emergency Highway Information Conservation Act" signed by President Nixon on January 2, 1974, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to approve demonstration projects for carpools in urbanized areas.

Carpooling projects may include:
- Systems for locating potential riders and informing them of their carpool opportunities.
- Designating existing highway lanes as preferential carpool lanes or shared bus and carpool lanes.
- Designating existing publicly-owned facilities for use as preferential parking for carpools.

Some types of projects supported by FHWA are construction of fringe parking lots for carpools and buses, and development of small parking lots within the right-of-way of Interstate interchanges for carpools only. Federal officials compare the project to TOPICS projects.

Urban System and Urban Extension (of Primary and Secondary systems) funds will be available for these projects. The federal share will be 90 percent, and will exceed $1 million for a single project.

According to the law projects shall be originated by local officials, working through metropolitan planning agencies, and state officials and submitted through normal channels for federal funding. The program will run through December 1, 1974.

In addition to funding various other types of federal assistance will be available to help states and other local authorities initiate their carpool programs. These include developed and tested carpool matching (both computer and manual) programs, appropriate user manuals, and other associated materials, free of charge. Field personnel, trained in energy-saving transportation planning techniques, will be available to assist local officials. Specialized technical assistance as well as manuals for use in public information programs will be available from the Washington headquarters.

The Federal Highway Administration has developed a computerized carpool matching program that is now being used by over 125 government and private groups.

The act also establishes a national maximum speed limit of 55 miles per hour, and after March 2, 1974, federal funds may be withheld in any state that has a legal maximum speed limit in excess of this limit.

In the near future, a series of seminars will be held in the federal regions to brief federal and state officials on all aspects of the new program.

Contact the FHWA Division Engineer in your capital city for additional information on this program.

---

**Is your county prepared to deal with an Equal Employment Controversy?**

County Attorneys, Personnel Directors and Manpower Planners can prepare a professional response to this complex issue — COME TO

**NACO's National Workshop on The County & Equal Employment Opportunities**

JANUARY 31 - FEBRUARY 1, 1974

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

**NACO's Equal Employment Workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>County/Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single room</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double room</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrival Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrival Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Government Job Opportunities**

**Hospital Administrator** — Kem County Calif. Salary: $30,066 to $36,500. Immediate opening in Bakersfield, California — 332-bed community medical center, and related teaching programs for doctors, nurses, and medical technicians. Applicants must have master's degree and five years of progressive responsibility in general hospital administration. Interested persons are urged to contact the Kem County Personnel Director 920 Golden State Ave., Bakersfield, Calif. Applications being received through January 18, 1974.

**Director of Nursing** — Johnson County, Kan. Salary: $12,504. Immediate opening — Johnson County Health Dept., population of 236,000 in Mission, Kansas — requirements are B.S. in Nursing from an approved school with three years of public health nursing experience, including one year of nursing supervision or consultation. Staff of 17 PHNs, 2 LPNs and a Nursing Superintendent. Please send and or interview by contacting Dr. John A. R. Acteuring, Director, Office of Dept. of Health, 600 Langford Ave., Mission, Kansas.

**Economic Planning Coordinator** — Cecil County, Md. Salary commensurate with background. Individual will be coordinating a one year joint county state effort in developing an economic plan concerned with the closing of a factory installation. Bachelor's degree in economics, planning or related field and management experience is preferable with two years experience. Further experience can be substituted for higher degree. Reply to Commissioners of Cecil County, Rm. 101, Courthouse, Elkton, Md. 21921 by February 1, 1974.

**Executive Director** — Palm Beach County, Florida. Experience in Florida Superintendency Authority, Salary open. Responsible Administrative Position. Organize and develop Executive Office by-pass road project and other transportation facilities. Must be self-starter, able to deal with government officials and agencies. Experienced in transportation, engineering, or business administration. Reply: Dan Channen, 530 Sost Rd., New Port Richey, Fla. 33704.

**NACO, New County Center Field Coordinator** — Salary: $16,000 - $20,000. The National Association of Counties, New County, U.S.A. Center is currently accepting application for the position of Field Coordinator. Position is one of implementing in conjunction with the project director and Directors of State Associations of Counties the provisions of a recently funded project to improve the management capabilities of local government officials.

Responsibilities include: field contact, coordination among management related communications, training, and program analysis. In addition, this person will serve as much of the internal administrative and management activities associated with this project, such as: periodic report, financial management and record keeping, audits and related administrative tasks.

The position requires knowledge of and experience in local government administration and public management. A particular emphasis is being placed on understanding of local government finance.

Deadline for submittal of application is January 25, 1974.

**NACO New County, U.S.A. Center** — Resource Coordinator Salary Range: $12,000 - $14,000. Immediate opening — County, New County, U.S.A. Center is currently accepting applications for the position of Resource Coordinator. Position is one of implementing in conjunction with the project director and Directors of State Associations of Counties the provisions of a recently funded project to improve the management capabilities of local government officials.

Responsibilities include: identification of technical assistance, information and advisory service of a management nature available from existing NACO program, and related organizations. The position is one of working with the person responsible for collection and dissemination of information on county management required to support field administrators and support services. The individual will respond to field inquiries and prepare appropriate information for NACO publications.

The position requires knowledge of and experience in local government administration and public management.

**Director of Personnel** — San Diego County, Calif. Salary Range: $28,260 - $31,056. Requires combined five to seven years related experience. Personnel administrator with ability to manage and coordinate personnel affairs involving 10,000 plus employees. Serves as secretary to Civil Service Commission, responsible for selection, classification, compensation, employee relations, negotiation, training, safety, and worker's compensation insurance programs, and provides counsel and advice to county officials with regard to personnel problems and compliance with state, local and federal ordinances, regulations and practices. Also responsible to Chief Administrative Officer for certain labor relations and management activities by January 17, 1974 to County of San Diego, Department of Civil Service. Reply: Personnel Administrator, County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highway, San Diego, Calif. 92101.

**Chief Engineer** — Monroe County, Mich. Salary Open Engineer to work out of Drain Commissioner's Office, to coordinate countywide water and sewer improvement program, direct work of new operating county utilities. Requires 5 years experience in water and sewer public utilities plus degree in civil engineering and a P.E. license in Michigan or ability to obtain same. Send resume and salary history to James R. Collins, Board of Auditors, Courthouse Monroe, Mich. 48161.

**Inter-governmental Relations Coordinator** — Lake County, Ore. Salary Range: $946 - $1280/mo. Requires college degree in business administration, economics, public administration or related field and minimum of two years related experience or the equivalent combination of experience and training. Experience in or exposure to governmental accounting, budgeting and to financial analysis. Apply to Personnel Office, Lake County, Courthouse, 4th Floor, Eugene, Ore. 97401.
Dear County Official:

We think it's time to stop fiddling with the energy crisis and to promptly institute the equitable system of rationing as proposed as "stand-by" by the Administration.

Presently, the President does not have the power to order rationing but, as soon as Congress passes the energy legislation, he will have that power and should then immediately exercise it.

We are unperturbed with the argument that rationing is wicked and wasteful. On the contrary, the present system of "cosmetic adjustments" such as 10-gallon-sales-limitations and the Sunday sales is most wicked and extremely wasteful. Motorists often must drive miles to find an open station and then wait in line (engine running) for service.

We wonder aloud how many millions of barrels of gasoline are wasted daily in "gasoline traffic".

The government has told us that World War II rationing was a bureaucratic mess and that people resorted to widespread cheating. It seems to us that the government is talking out of both sides of its mouth. If the American public will "cheat" in a ration system how come the same American public will not "cheat" in the present voluntary system?

For our part we can find very little wrong with selling gasoline coupons to the licensed drivers and then allowing unused coupons to be sold on the "free" or "white" market.

We are told that this would cost $1.5 billion per year, and this is meant to shock us out of our minds. It doesn't seem anywhere near as frightening, however, when we realize this is 25 cents per week per driver and that the proposed rate of the coupons will or can absorb all the costs. It also seems a pitance when we consider that the price of gasoline has already increased tremendously and will continue to increase.

Our county officials are deeply dedicated to justice and freedom of choice. An equitable rationing system meets both tests. A rationing system that compensates for demonstrated need (taxis, mass transit, aviation) and then divides the remainder equally among each driver is just. Or his or her decision on how to use the ration meets our test of freedom of choice.

NACO has no official position on rationing and cannot have one until our board meets in February. We base our judgment on discussions with hundreds of officials both at our December energy crisis meeting and in other contacts.

Good News and Bad News

First the bad news. Edwin G. Michaelian, past president of NACO, has wound up 16 years as county executive of Westchester County. He did not run for reelection.

Now the good news. His successor, Al Del Bello, is an excellent man and is already getting active in the State Association of Elected County Execs and in NACO.

Michaelian has been appointed as the first director of an institute for the study of suburban-urban governments at Pace University in Westchester. In his new position, which we believe to be unique in the United States, he will be working with county officials, businessmen and others on the impact of media in suburban and urban affairs and will be conducting courses for managers of business firms, private agencies and organizations about their relationships with local government. Now being planned is program of activities which is almost certain to involve many of the hundreds of friends that Ed has accumulated throughout the whole United States. He and his wife Joyce (1 Heather Lane, White Plains, New York) are as excited as they can be about Ed's "second career."

Program Evaluation

We have just come across a publication called Priority One News published by an OEO agency in Onondaga County, N.Y. which contains some very good guidelines for program evaluation. They may be helpful when you consider your next county budget.

1. is the program working in an orderly manner in some specific ways toward achievement of goals and objectives?
2. Are the goals and objectives of the program directed to a priority need in the community?
3. In evidence that the particular facets of the program are accomplishing what they are supposed to do or other specific approaches about their relationships with local government.
4. Are there any complaints from the program? How do they benefit? Should the outreach of the program be adjusted so additional persons may be reached?
5. Can the cost-benefit ratio be determined? (Care should be taken to avoid utilizing the cost-benefit ratio as an indicator of the quality of the program since an agency could show a low cost-benefit ratio by not working with the hardest and more time-consuming cases.)
6. Does the program offer more or less potential for long range success than other types of approaches to the same need?
7. What would be the consequences if the program were eliminated completely? Who would complain? Why? Would anyone like to see it fail? Why?

Administrative Issues for consideration include:
1. Is the budget realistic?
2. Are expenditures managed carefully?
3. Does the independent financial audit indicate that the money was handled honestly?
4. Is the staffing adequate (too many or too few to do the job)?
5. Does the staff need outside training?
6. Does the staff have management and work planning consultation?
7. Is the staff functioning in a manner that demonstrates accountability to the goals of the board of directors?
8. Is the board of directors in control of the basic policy decisions of the agency?
9. Does the board of directors represent a good cross-section of the community, including those being served?
10. Is the board attempting to evaluate the program and make appropriate changes as needed?

Sincerely yours,

Bernard P. Hillenbrand
Executive Director

Hillenbrand's
Washington Report
202/785-9591