Community Development Formula Axed

by John C. Murphy

Legislative Representative

The Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee brought to a close nearly four months of debate on new housing and community development legislation on February 7. The bill consolidates a number of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) categorical grant, community development programs and model cities, water and sewer, open space, neighborhood facilities, and public facility loans — into a single program.

In an 11th-hour decision, the committee decided to reject distribution of community development block grant funds on the basis of a formula proposed in S. 1743, the Administration's "Better Communities Act" and S. 1744, (Committee Chairman John Sparkman's (D-Ala.) "Community Development Assistance Act").

Instead, the $2.8 billion first-year authorization for block grants is to be distributed to communities on the basis of past participation (hold harmless). Amounts not used for this purpose are to be discretionary funds distributed by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

NAFCO has advocated distribution of operating grant funds to urban counties (over 200,000 in population excluding the population of cities over 50,000) and to metropolitan cities (over 50,000) on the basis of a formula.

A unit of local government would be eligible for hold harmless if, during the five fiscal years ending in June, 1972, it had conducted one or more urban renewal, model cities, code enforcement or neighborhood development programs.

Local governments meeting this threshold would be eligible for the five-year average of funds received under these programs as well as water and sewer, open space, neighborhood facilities and public facility loans.

In succeeding years, the secretary of HUD could raise or lower a community's hold harmless by 20 percent. Once a community received a discretionary grant that amount would become its hold harmless for succeeding years.

(Continued on page 10)

Operating Subsidies Included

President Proposes Transit Aid

President Nixon proposed an urban mass transit program last week that would allocate $11.7 billion over six years to metropolitan areas on the basis of population to help them buy or build bus and rail systems and to help subsidize operating expenses.

In addition, the plan Mr. Nixon sent to Congress includes $4.2 billion over six years for individual projects selected by the Transportation Department, projects which because of their size cannot be carried out under the regular program.

In a written message, the President said distribution on the basis of population would assure local governments of a steady flow of transportation funds.

"We are aware of the concerns voiced by some that our proposed formula should be altered to meet the unique problems of some of our largest cities," he said.

"We intend to work closely with the Congress, elected officials and others, in using alternative formulas," he said.

Under the President's proposal, $1.8 billion would be allocated in the 1973 fiscal year beginning July 1; $1.9 billion in fiscal 1976; and $2 billion in each of the following years through 1980.

For the first three years, local governments could use about one-third of their total allocation to subsidize operating costs, while the remainder of the funds would be used for capital programs such as the purchase of buses and rail cars and construction of subway systems. In the final three years, local governments would be permitted to use all the funds at their discretion.

Mr. Nixon's program would allocate money through each state governor's office with earmarking of funds for areas with total metropolitan populations over 400,000.

Transportation Secretary Claude Bratager said the legislation would require local governments to continue spending at least 20 percent of their own funds to receive federal funds.

Bratager said the intent of the bill could be used to subsidize lower fares or to avoid fare increases.

In the past, the Administration has opposed the use of federal funds to subsidize the operations of urban transit programs. He said he would continue to oppose individual project-by-project approaches, although he said local governments should be given the additional flexibility that his program would provide.

Congressional Reaction

The Administration's bill will be considered by the House and Senate Public Works Committees. Hearings have been announced but early action is expected.

The general Congressional reaction to the bill is favorable because it reflects a complete reversal in the Administration's position on transit operating subsidies.

However, there are questions in the Congress about: (1) the adequacy of funding for transit during the next three years; (2) the distribution of funds by a population formula as opposed to transit ridership; (3) the downgrading of local roads and street improvements in metropolitan areas; and (4) the earmarking of funds for metropolitan areas over 400,000 (or some other figure) in population, and the use of areawide agencies for allocating funds.

The most serious question is the level of funding, since the Administration's plan would provide only $800 million for transit operating costs during the next three years. Although $2.4 billion would be allocated, the

NAFCO Seeks Applications For 1974 County Achievement Awards

"In recognition of Distinguished and outstanding made available in the Living Continuing Contributions to the Cause of Library publication list.
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**New Air Pollution Rules**

**Counties To Get Greater Role**

by Carol Shaddox

Legislative Research Assistant

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will be issuing final air pollution control indirect source (formerly called complex source) regulations soon. All new regulations appear to give counties and other local governments a greater role than originally proposed by EPA on October 30, 1973. (See County News, Nov. 9, 1973). The changes were made in response to comments by NACO, other public interest groups, and environmental groups.

The regulations have been changed to specify that the Administrator of EPA, or an agency designated by him, conduct a review for each new or expanded facility which generate significant amounts of air pollution and may thus "indirectly" sources of air pollution.

Such indirect sources include, but are not limited to industrial and commercial parking facilities, retail and commercial industrial facilities, recreation, amusement, sports and entertainment facilities; airports, office and government buildings; apartment and condominium buildings; and educational facilities. The regulations originally provided that governors would review or designate the regulatory agency.

It is unlikely that the EPA Administrator will review on a departmental basis indirect sources other than those owned by the federal government. Therefore, EPA must be invited to designate state or local agencies to carry out this review process. EPA has indicated that this designation will be delayed until a more complete nationwide consultation with state and local agencies can be made to ascertain which agencies should be delegated the review authority.

NACO has urged that EPA consult with state and local governments on a state-by-state basis. The Administrator is required to consult with state and local agencies to seek such delegation through the appropriate EPA regional offices.

Counties wishing to be designated as the reviewing agency should contact their state air pollution control agency and EPA offices as soon as possible. Although the regulations are officially applicable January 1, 1975, the review process is not being implemented until 1974 for those projects which will be constructed after January 1, 1974.

Because of the potential impact of construction projects, which are indirect sources on land use, urban growth and development, EPA is encouraging local governments to request designation for review. However, if a state is given the review authority, the administrator encourages states to provide input to the affected local governmental units.

In addition, the regulations require that, where the designated agency is restricted to air pollution control, consultation must be made with the appropriate land use planning agency. In turn, if the designated review agency is not an air pollution control agency, the regulations require that the review agency consult with the appropriate state and local air pollution control agencies prior to making its determination. This provision takes into account the fact that indirect source regulations are strongly related to land use control.

The final regulations clarify the information which must be submitted by an applicant. Where an environment impact statement has already been prepared, it may be submitted as a part of the application by a designated agency. The revised regulations call for review of indirect source regulations by NACO.

EPA will begin to implement the regulations July 1, 1974 and will consider comments until April 3, 1974. Copies of these regulations are available from NACO.

**Equal Employment Called Management Requirement**

by Holly Harris

Federal Affairs Staff

Equal employment opportunity is not a "social program," rather it is a management requirement under federal law which all counties must handle in a professional manner, participants in NACO's workshop, "The County and Equal Employment," were told.

The opening speaker, W. Ed Manfield, Affirmative Action Director of Hennepin County, Minn., set the conference's theme with that statement. Approximately 100 elected officials, county attorneys and personnel officers attended the two-day workshop held recently in Los Angeles.

Los Angeles County Board Chairman Kenneth Hahn welcomes Equal Employment delegates and advises them to make a greater effort to comply with the spirit as well as the letter of the recent Equal Employment Opportunity Law.

Counties are Vulnerable

Thomas Hunt, a public interest lawyer who has successfully brought suit against discrimination in local government warned that counties are vulnerable to discrimination suits because "most of your personnel systems are in violation." Public interest lawyers like Hunt are looking for lawsuits that will have an impact and bring jobs to minorities and women.

County personnel selection systems still rely heavily on written tests, and formal reviews of the quality of all personnel actions. These practices, according to Hunt, make it easy for an attorney to establish a pattern of discrimination. Private employers on the other hand, tend to follow more informal personnel procedures. This makes discrimination more difficult for a plaintiff to document.

Hunt concludes, is to hire more minorities and women, through more effective county selection and recruitment procedures. Los Angeles Manpower Division Chief Santos Zuniga explained the various techniques of applying manpower to affirmative action efforts. Many counties will soon become prime sponsors under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.

He suggested that they use their resources to recruit and upgrade minorities for the county work force. Job training, job analysis, and career counseling, as well as entry level and employment positions, were also spotlighted as appropriate manpower activities supporting equal employment.

In workshop sessions, county staff members shared their experiences in the areas of planning and compliance, financing information and reporting, selection and placement. Informal workshop sessions enabled conference attendees to participate and to discuss their own concerns.

They agreed that counties need to make affirmative action a part of the everyday business of the county and to think of it as a management rather than a social problem. The three presenting counties set forth different approaches to the problem and suggested that although they could serve as models, each individual county would be required to develop its own unique solution to equal employment opportunities for minorities and women.

Copies of information on the conference can be obtained from Rich Bartholomew and Barb Hatching of the NACO staff (202/785-9577).

The conference officially opens with the Congressional Reception at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday evening, Delegates will have the opportunity to meet informally with members of Congress, professional legislative staff, and administrative officials.

Wednesday, February 27, is a full day of discussions and workshops, with meetings of the General Session at 8:30 a.m. Seminars and panel discussions will be the focal points. Workshops will be held from 10 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

Registration for the conference will held on Wednesday afternoon from 2:30 p.m. Participants include county officials, administrative personnel, and legislative staff.

EPA will begin to implement the regulations July 1, 1974 and will consider comments until April 3, 1974. Copies of these regulations are available from NACO.
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR Jay Bateman (I) and Supervisor Virginia Newsome (R) of Pinal County, Ariz.

Pinal County, Ariz. Has First Woman Supervisor and County Administrator

Virginia Newsome has become the first woman Supervisor of Pinal County, Ariz. She was appointed by the Board of Supervisors following the resignation of Supervisor Jay Bateman who was appointed County Administrator.

Both Ms. Newsome and Bateman were sworn in January 15 and assumed their new duties immediately.

Bateman had been a County Supervisor from January 1, 1981 to January 15, 1974, a period of 23 years and 14 days.

He will administer all county matters subject to and responsible to the Board of Supervisors.

The board's primary objectives in establishing the new position is to update and modernize county operations to meet the many heavy additional requirements that continue to be imposed by state and federal governments, a board statement said.

---

the Ballot Box
by Richard G. Smolka

National Association of County Recorders & Clerks
American University Institute of Election Administration

The national voter registration agency and post card registration legislation now pending before Congress is only one of many bills which have a direct affect on the elections process and have a chance of passing this year.

The post card bill, H.R. 8053, was reported out of the house administration committee and is expected to be on the floor of the House by the end of the session. It has already passed the Senate.

Other legislation which has been acted upon by the Senate includes Senator Robert Byrd's (D-W.Va.) bill establishing the dates of federal primary elections.

The Byrd bill, S. 343, provides that no primary election for federal office can be held prior to 15 days before the primary election for federal office.

The election day holiday amendment has also been introduced in the House and is expected to be voted on before the end of the year. Prospects for passage are uncertain.

Senators Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.) and Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.) have introduced legislation enabling American citizens who reside overseas to vote in federal elections even though they do not maintain a residence in any state. The bill would permit such persons to vote from the state where they last lived or where they last had been registered voters.

Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) has introduced legislation providing for financial assistance to the states and local governments to assist them in their own efforts at increasing voter registration and easing the administrative burden of elections. Senator Charles E. Fenzel (R-Minn.) has introduced similar legislation but has not specified the grant categories as does Senator Kennedy. Kennedy's proposals have passed the Senate as part of the Pastore bill on energy and natural resources (S. 376). The Pastore bill's future in the House of Representatives is uncertain at best.

Some legislation on campaign finance is almost a certainty although the exact content remains to be seen. Pastore's bill is not likely to pass the Senate and it is presently drafted. A proposal of at least partial public financing of elections is likely to pass the Senate in the near future and the House may wait for this to consider it jointly with the Pastore bill. There are still constitutional amendments calling for the direct election of the president, an election in mid-term if the president fails to maintain the confidence of Congress, and for a six-year term for president. None appear to have much of a chance this year.

Senator Peter Dominick (R-Colo.) and Henry Belfon (R-Okl.) continue to press for legislation which would close all the polling places in the country simultaneously. The favored time appears to be 11 p.m. eastern standard time. This proposal has some possibilities of being enacted as an amendment to a bill likely to be passed.

As is evident from this summary, there may be some election law reform in the next Congress. Ballot box systems and right to vote reform could make the list.

Credibility Is Theme Of NACIO Meeting

Government credibility will be the topic of a National Association of County Information Officers (NACIO) meeting and NACIO's annual legislative conference in Washington, D.C. February 25-28.

The meeting will begin at 5 p.m. Wednesday, Feb. 27, at the Shoreham Hotel, County officials who perform public information functions will exchange ideas about effective methods of telling citizens about county government, then obtaining citizen reaction and involvement.

The NACIO meeting previously scheduled for Friday, March 1, will be replaced by the Wednesday evening meeting and reception.
Worst Fears Confirmed

Late last week urban counties' worst fears were confirmed in an omnibus housing and community development bill approved by the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee. (See article on page 1.)

Despite intensive urging by NACO, the committee refused to reconsider its decision made in November to scrap a formula approach upon which there had been a general agreement by the Congress and the Administration since 1971. Instead, it opted for a "hold harmless" approach. NACO was advocating distribution of funds to rural urban counties (over 200,000 in population) and metropolitan areas (over 50,000) on the basis of a formula designed to objectively determine a county's or city's need.

The committee's decision, giving funds on the basis of past participation, lock-in the past, rewards cities for being in urban redevelopment programs, regardless of their success, current needs, or the needs of others. The only recognition given urban counties in the community development portion of the bill is a direction to the Secretary of HUD to encourage multi-jurisdictional, community development applications from local governments, one of which must be an urban county. Such applications would be funded from whatever discretionary funds remain once hold harmless commitments are met. The essential ingredient in making the multi-jurisdictional approach work, however, is lacking. That ingredient is financial incentive.

The House Subcommittee on Housing is now marking up similar legislation and is expected to retain formula funding. NACO is going all out to see that urban counties are amended into that legislation to qualify for formula funding.

Mass Transit Proposal

The transit proposal submitted to Congress by the Administration last week has a lot of promise. At least it breaks the stalemate over the issue of federal operating assistance. Until now, the Administration has been adamantly in opposition to any kind of transit operating aid.

Two big questions remain. How much should Congress authorize this year and next year? How should the funds be distributed?

The funding level is still a moot point. The distribution question hinges on the arguments of transit use (ridership) as opposed to straight population. It will not be easy to resolve. NACO's Transportation Steering Committee will be arguing these issues later this month at our annual Legislative Conference.

Groups of county officials will be meeting frequently with their Congressional delegations on transit legislation during the coming months. Earlier this month 15 elected county executives and mayors met with the New York State delegation.

Al DelBello, elected County Executive of Westchester County, N.Y., made a very telling point at that meeting. He argued that one of the most effective things Congress could do about the chronic huge deficits of mass transit systems would be to control the cost of fuel.

Operating subsidies now being discussed by Congress will not even begin to absorb the total additional cost of operating mass transit caused by the increased cost of fuel.

He has suggested that the situation should be dramatized by the President's declaring a state of national emergency and devising a meaningful action plan.

National Health Insurance

This country is facing a health care crisis. The problem is the availability of adequate health care, soaring costs, and quality of medical care.

Health care is becoming a privilege. Those who have access to care face large bills to cover expenses: $110 a day for a hospital room, $1000 for prenatal care and delivery and $20,000 (average) for treatment of terminal cancer. For those without health insurance — and even for those who are protected — a serious illness can mean financial disaster.

There is also a problem with the quality of medical care. We profess to have the best medical schools and the most advanced medical technology, yet the United States ranks 14th in infant mortality, 11th in maternal mortality, 22nd in life expectancy for men, 46th in life expectancy for women.

Given this crisis, the idea that the federal government must provide support in financing comprehensive health care coverage to all citizens is gaining popularity. Presently, there are several major pieces of legislation that propose national health insurance plans. One is the recently introduced Administration plan.

The Administration's Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan (CHIP) is broader than the one introduced in the last Congress. It has a cost-sharing provision between employers and employees and also has a government paid plan covering low income people, the elderly and anyone not eligible for insurance because of high risk.

The benefit package is broad and comprehensive with emphasis on preventive health and out-patient care. The plan, however, does have its drawbacks. CHIP relies heavily on private health insurance companies also, it proposes to let states assume responsibility for insurance regulation and enforcement. This provision places an administrative strain on state government, and more importantly does not ensure uniform development of program operations.

Under CHIP, people will have to pay a greater deductible (amount paid before the insurance policy pays). In an average group policy, the deductible is $100; CHIP's deductible is $150. Under a normal policy, the average family would pay $500 per year in deductibles; CHIP would require that family to spend $450.

In addition, CHIP would require poor people to pay more for their health care than they now do in most states under Medicaid.

Perhaps the most serious drawback of this proposal, as well as other national health insurance plans, is its failure to provide resources to beef-up this country's health manpower. We simply do not have sufficient trained medical care people (doctors, nurses, allied health and public health professionals) and facilities to handle the demand for services covered under national health insurance. The problem is not one of distribution of manpower to medically underserved areas; it is one of equal access of health care by all segments of the population.

Supervisor Ernie Debs, Los Angeles County and Chairman of the NACO Health Committee, has called a special meeting of the Health Task Force to look into CHIP and other health plans.

Western Region Round-up

More than $28 million has been distributed among 23 states and 15 counties that share in funds from federal lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton recently announced. The money came from mineral leasing revenue for the six-month period that ended December 31, 1973.

In addition to the allocations to the states, BLM paid over $251,000 to certain western counties under the $10,000 per city or town formula. The county share of revenue_is collected during calendar year 1973 from grazing fees, mineral leases, and other fees.

With the exception of Alaska, each state received a public lands' share. Per capita semi-annual payments of 75.5% of Federal revenue collected within that state for mineral leasing, federal land rentals, and royalties. Alaska, under its Statehood Act as amended, receives 88.2% of mineral leasing revenues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3,882.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>3,977,873.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>36,049.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>6,893.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1,272,906.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2,496,338.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1,151.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>286,658.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>6,866.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>86,609.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>11,339.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>5,051.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1,389,660.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,168.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>164,382.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>7,192,182.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>163,020.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>116,938.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5,325.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>31,597.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,876,330.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2,120.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>10,004,898.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,944,605.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report on New Welfare Program

by Caspar W. Weinberger
Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare

The new year ushered in a new era for millions of needy Americans who are old, blind or disabled.

In the first week of January, 1974, their checks came from State, county, or municipal welfare offices — as had been the case up until December 31 of last year — but from the Federal government.

And a new door to income support was opened for additional millions of persons who were not previously eligible under State and local regulations.

The new program bringing these advances, as NACo members know, is Supplemental Security Income, or SSI. The conversion was one of the largest peacetime efforts ever undertaken by the Federal government and was accomplished with the help of State and local public assistance staff who worked tirelessly in cooperation with Social Security Administration personnel.

SSI means more than Federalization of payments — it also means equitable treatment by the Federal government for all citizens, regardless of where they live.

The same eligibility requirements for the basic Federal payment now apply whether a person seeking assistance lives in Maine or in California, or in any other State.

Hence, each State had its own definition of the level of financial need. Each State or locality determined for itself what resources a person could retain and still be eligible for public assistance. Ineligibility by a State's standards meant that the aged, blind, or disabled person received nothing.

There were obvious inequities in the old system of 1,152 separate welfare programs. Ownership of an automobile is an example. One State required that a car be more than four years old; another, that it be worth less than $300. Some States had no restriction on either age or value. Under SSI, persons otherwise eligible, may own a car of "reasonable value" and "reasonable" is defined in the same way for every SSI applicant in every State.

In some States, an older person owning a home had to execute a lien on the residence in favor of the State as a condition for receiving financial assistance.

There were variations in the amount of life insurance a person was permitted to retain, variations in the way pensions and contributions from relatives were treated, variations in the way budgets were computed.

There were not only variations among States, but variations within States, some States computed a person's budget on the basis of the rent he actually paid, up to certain limits.

This created an artificial world, for in the real world, one receives fixed income in the form of salary or pension and one adjusts expenditures to reflect individual preferences. One retiree may make an old coat do for yet another season in order to go to a concert; another may scrimp on his own meals to feed a pet.

Many persons on public assistance preferred to pay more than the top amount allowed for rent and scrimp on food. But if they moved to housing which cost less than the maximum allowed, their checks were reduced.

SSI accords every eligible person identical treatment. The amount each receives depends not on expenditures, but on income.

If there is no income at all, an eligible aged, blind, or disabled person received $140 a month from SSI; a couple receives $210 a month — and by July, these minimums will be $146 and $219. These amounts may seem high to some and low to others, depending on the standard of living and the cost of living in the particular community or the part of the nation in which the reader lives.

The amounts, however, are actually higher than those paid by about half the States to needy residents who were aged, blind or disabled before the onset of SSI.

Federalizing payments has meant raising the level of the poorest of the poor. It has also meant that people who could not manage on what States with low welfare standards were able to allot them, will be less tempted to consider uprooting themselves to move to a State which offers higher welfare amounts.

"SSI is milestone legislation. For the first time in the history of the United States, the Federal government has assumed the basic responsibility for financial assistance to a sizeable part of the nation's needy population."

But what of the people in the States which were paying more than the basic amounts provided for by SSI? Their payments will not be reduced.

The law requires that States supplement the Federal payments up to previous levels, for all persons who were receiving assistance as of December 31, 1973.

Some States are going beyond the requirements of the law and are also supplementing the Federal payments for persons who are newly added to the rolls. Some States are increasing the level of payments for all SSI beneficiaries because of the increased costs of living.

About 30 States have opted to have the Federal government administer all or part of their supplementary payment program, thus saving the administrative cut incident to issuing their supplementary payments.

SSI has meant that no recipient is the loser, but that many old and handicapped people gain.

The taxpayer gains too. The costs of administering the SSI program by the Federal government will be substantially less than the total former costs when each of the States had to establish eligibility under complicated manuals and to prepare and mail checks.

The Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is administering the SSI program.

The expertise it gained from years of experience and the electronic computers available for its use combine to produce efficient management.

The Social Security staff readily accepted the challenge to tool up for the new program. It meant long hours of

(Continued on page 8)
From County Commissioner

Mecklenburg County (N.C.) Board of Commissioners.

The county-to-Congress move is unusual. When Biden tells his colleagues that he was a county councilman before his election to the Senate, they look at him as if to say “what the hell is a county councilman?”

But after a year in Congress, both men have some insight into the relationship and roles of national and local government.

Apologist and Advocate

James Martin was introduced to Mecklenburg County when he attended Davidson College there, graduating in 1967. He earned a PhD in chemistry from Princeton University in 1970, then returned to the faculty of Davidson College.

He was an “apologist and advocate” for local government in campus debates for several years, he said. So when members of his political party asked him to run for county commissioner, the local government advocate found himself in a “put up or shut up position.” He was elected to the five-member board of commissioners in 1966.

He soon found himself immersed in decisions about air and water pollution and landfills. “We gave a landfill to everyone,” he joked “one went in an upper class area, another in a lower class area, and a third in an economically mixed area. “Nobody was happy,” he said.

In 1968, as county board chairman, he chaired a multi-county meeting to “organize a pretty strong protest” to federal regulations which required a regional planning organization before federal water and sewer grants would be authorized for the area. Meeting participants registered their protest, but then decided it might be a good idea to get together informally anyhow. The Centralina Council of Governments emerged from that meeting and Martin served as its president during its early growth. Today the Centralina COG plans area-wide transportation, water and sewer, and health services, employs a traveling city-county administrator, and handles tax reevaluations for its members. In 1970-72 Martin was vice-president of the National Association of Regional Councils.

Martin was also a strong supporter of a Mecklenburg County consolidation attempt with its central city, Charlotte, but the referendum failed two to one. He did successfully promote inter-county cooperation in planning, health and education services, though. In 1970-71, Martin was president of the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners.

Political Advisor

Martin was already a county commissioner when Biden earned his law degree from Syracuse University in 1968. After admission to the bar, Biden became a public defender and trial lawyer in New Castle County. His political interests were directed toward advising elected officials, he said. He himself had no intentions of running for public office.

Friends urged him to run for the state legislature, but he turned them down because he did not wish to give up his law practice. But when they urged him to run for County Council, a part-time position close to home, his wife muttered his favorite quote from Plato: “The price good men pay for not getting involved in government is being governed by men less worthy than themselves.” He was hooked.

After a surprise win in a dominant Republican district, Biden, too, began to face the “big, but not very glamorous issues of sewers and drainage basin.” He became a well-known advocate of controlled growth in a county which had grown by more than 25 percent since 1960.

Based on his belief that “people who live in a city or county should not have to pay the price for development until their glaring problems have been eliminated,” Biden stressed the need to include provisions for adequate public facilities in development plans.

His demands for adequate sewage facilities led to a huge sewage overflow basin being named after him. The basin was constructed because sewer lines could not handle the increasing amount of sewerage during peak periods. However the overflow basin was causing a leak into a nearby marsh, so Biden argued that development must be stopped until adequate sewers and sewage treatment facilities could be built. He won a partial victory, and the overflow basin became known as the “Biden bowl.”

Biden was a strong supporter of mass transit in the metropolitan New Castle County area, and advocated action to tighten tax loopholes.

County-to-Congress

Martin decided to run for Congress when his friend, Charles Jonas, retired from the House of Representatives. His belief that Congress would face the issues of decentralization of the federal government, and the continuation of revenue sharing was a factor in his decision.

Martin literally “ran” for office. His opponent was a track star who was the first person to run an indoor mile in less than four minutes. “My best time was 5 minutes, 32 seconds, but I had staying power,” he joked. Although his experience as a county commissioner hadn’t given him general name recognition in the Mecklenburg, Iredell and Lincoln County district, he did know a few influential people in each county. Those acquaintances, along with his support of President Nixon, contributed to his comfortable victory.

For Biden, the election was tougher. He was running against a popular incumbent senator, and Biden was associated with an unpopular presidential candidate, George McGovern. But New Castle County includes almost 70 percent of Delaware’s population, and Biden had become known in other parts of the state through a leadership role in the Democratic party.

His county experience had also given him some expertise and identification with two of his major campaign issues.

Eileen Hirsch

Eileen Hirsch is Associate Editor of Outlook
to U.S. Congress

(Continued from preceding page)

issues—environmental quality and tax reform. With energetic supporters and a positive campaigning image, he won what most political observers termed an "upset election."

National, Local Effectiveness

Are Martin and Biden more effective problem solvers as Congressmen than they were as county officials? Martin hasn't given that question much thought. He considers himself "still basically a local government oriented." His Congressional interests center around legislation which "shifts some of the responsibility from central government." And Martin is making his mark—as a member of the House Interior Committee’s environment subcommittee, he was the key person in strengthening the local government's role in national land use legislation.

Biden, although he noted: "I was really proud of my record in the county," achieves more satisfaction as a senator. The decisions he made in New Castle County only affected 380,000 people, he points out, while Senate decisions may change the lives of 210 million people.

Biden sees many parallels between local and national government: "I firmly believe the problems at a county level are equally difficult and as insoluble as problems at the national level." Just the placement of a sewer line, he commented, can have tremendous social implications for a community. But he worries about the quality of local government leadership. "There is a real need for quality leaders at the local level of government," he asserted, but elected posts are considered part-time and unimportant. "We just don't give enough credit or blame at the local level," he concluded.

Concern about the quality of local leadership is one of the reasons Biden favors a strong national government role. "New Federalism is a 1970 word for states rights," he says with distaste.

He has several reasons for his opposition to New Federalism and general revenue sharing. They center around his belief that local government has not responded well to social reform and social progress. "If it hasn't been for federal presence, my black brothers might still be sitting in the back of the bus," he said. And he is disappointed with use of general revenue sharing funds for capital improvements instead of "people programs."

Close, day-to-day contact with citizens makes it difficult for local government officials to support unpopular social programs, Biden added. So a president, senator, or congressman's slight insulation from the voters makes it possible to exercise more political courage and leadership.

Reliance on a difficult property and sales tax base makes program funding hard for counties, Biden said. But the federal government's transfer of funds to counties through general revenue sharing causes problems of accountability, he added. If the federal government collects the funds, the governments disburse them to should be accountable to the federal government, he concluded.

Although exact statistics are very difficult to obtain, about 75 of the 535 members of Congress have been county officials—15 are now in the Senate and 60 in the House of Representatives.

A majority, 40, served as county attorneys. About 18 were elected officials such as supervisors, commissioners or administrators. Other county positions ranged from sheriff to treasurer to county planner. Approximately 23 members of Congress moved directly from their county posts—including Biden, Martin, and two other freshman Congressmen: Andrew Hinshaw, a former Orange County (Calif.) tax assessor, and Angelo D. Roncallo, a former Nassau County (N.Y.) comptroller.

A Computer Evaluates Health Care Delivery

By Peter E. Trainer, M.A., M.P.H.

Policies governing medical assistance programs in New York are set by the state but administered at the county level. Eligibility and reporting standards, fees for medical services and supplies, licenses, and review procedures are all established by the appropriate state agencies, and carried out within the appropriate county government.

In 1967, Albany County (N.Y.) received a contract to administer the state health department's responsibilities relating to availability, utilization and utilization review of services provided under Medicaid.

This article describes the computer system developed to accomplish these objectives:

In the development stage our basic philosophy was to develop a simple system relatively quickly, so that the necessary claims review work could be done, but to structure it in such a way that it could grow and accept continual refinement.

The system screens some 40,000 Medicaid claims per month for both client and provider eligibility, including specific services and fees, and frees the county medical director to concentrate on those situations that require his expertise. In 1972 there were 42,118 enrollees in the Albany County Medicaid Program, of which 24,500 were "active" during any one week. During this same year, 26,600 recipients received medical care services at a cost of $12 million.

The accumulation into a single database encompassing all Medicaid-related data makes possible a variety of analyses, sheds new light on many aspects of health care delivery systems, and provides a basis for realistic programs to improve both the delivery and quality of health care. Since this system operates by automatically approving claims that meet requirements, while isolating situations that do not, we believe it can readily become a processing prototype for the Professional Standards Review Organization (PSRO) which has been mandated by Congress to oversee handling of Medicaid funds. PSROs will need some sort of exception processing to operate efficiently.

In the past, the system has uncovered over-utilization of health services by providers; potential drug abuse situations and a trend by our Medicaid population toward use of clinics and hospital emergency rooms, rather than private physicians, for routine medical services. It even found one elderly lady who used her Medicaid authorization card for eight taxi trips on the same day, for multiple visits to hospitals and clinics. (On investigation, it turned out that she was lonely.)

The computer used is an IBM System/360 Model 40 (to be replaced, late this year, by a System/370 Model 145) with associated equipment, including a direct access magnetic disk units, key-to-tape units, and a number of visual display terminals located within the State Health Services Department. One terminal is in the intake area where people apply for public assistance, another is in the food stamp section, a third in the Medicaid eligibility section, a fourth in the medical unit, and six more in the welfare section. Welfare client data is entered directly into the computer from visual display terminals, as in the inpatient data at the Albany Medical Center Hospital; other terminals are used for quick inquiry, and to retrieve information.

The system utilizes the database concept; all information required for day-to-day work is maintained on magnetic disk units where it is available to people working at online terminals, and also to computer programs processing daily transactions. The database includes the following Medicaid master files:

Client Eligibility File, name and complete personal data, social security number and income indicator, insurance carrier (if any), current and past program eligibility; prior Medicaid card issuance and expiration data; work incentive code, grant amounts and the date of the last welfare check sent.

Provider of Vendor File, including name, address, license number, vendor's
Report on New Welfare Program

(Continued from page 5)

painting work not only because the liberalized eligibility standards made many more persons eligible for financial assistance, but also because State and county assistance rolls had to be converted to SSA responsibility.

The partnership character of SSI is designed to preserve for the States the greatest degree of flexibility consistent with law and sound administrative practices and to utilize existing resources for the sake of efficiency. The States were given options in relation to Medicaid, to permit them a measure of control over cost and caseload increases. States will continue to provide social services. State Divisions of Vocational Rehabilitation will determine the degree of blindness or disability. Decisions regarding referrals for vocational rehabilitation services will be made by the States.

The SSI population brings to the Social Security Administration needy persons who may require a wide range of social services. Agreements have been made by SSA in most States to refer SSI recipients who need services to local Departments of Social Services for appropriate assistance. Federal funding will continue so that departments can provide a wide range of social services to aged, blind and disabled SSI recipients, including children.

In an effort to strengthen referral procedures which will assure that beneficiaries receive needed social services, we have initiated a number of demonstration projects. These include an escort and transportation service to demonstrate methods of helping clients who might otherwise be unable to reach a service; a follow-up study to determine if the individual referred actually obtained service, and a program which gives part-time employment to senior citizens to handle a variety of related services in Social Security Offices. We have realized that no program — no matter how carefully designed or how conscientiously implemented — can be of value unless the persons potentially eligible for its benefits are made aware of its existence.

Project SSI-Alert is one such effort. The Social Security Administration, the Administration on Aging, and eight national voluntary organizations are helping to assist potentially eligible persons to apply for SSI benefits. In a parallel effort, SSA’s central computer capability is being used to identify potential beneficiaries. By June 30, it is anticipated that approximately five million people so identified will have been contacted by mail or phone. Preliminary results indicate that 25 percent of these persons are probably eligible for SSI benefits.

SSI is milestone legislation: For the first time in the history of the United States, the Federal government has assumed the basic responsibility for financial assistance to a sizable part of the nation’s needy population.

For the first 150 or so years of our Republic, relief payments were the responsibility of local government. This had been the system which the Colonists carried with them from Mother England. No until the beginning of the Great Depression did the Federal government step in to share costs with the localities.

Importantly, the extent of that Depression did the Federal government step in to assure the near-bankrupt States, through Federal financial participation in the costs of the welfare program.

Now we have completed the progression for the needy, aged, blind, and disabled. Responsibility moved from local government to local-State, then to Federal-State, and now to Federal government — as far as costs and administration are concerned.

This assumption of responsibility is part of the New Federalism, which seeks to place power and independence at the proper level of government — with the States and localities — in matters which are best handled by them, but it also relieves the States and localities of burdens and responsibilities which are more efficiently, more effectively, and more equitably administered by the Federal government.

In keeping with the new Federalism we have returned power and independence to State and local governments through revenue sharing.

And also in keeping with the new Federalism we have taken administrative responsibility for SSI. By assuring every aged, blind, and disabled person basic income, we have taken an important stride in the march of social progress.

A Computer Evaluates Health Care Delivery
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type (whether a physician, dentist, hospital, or non-medical provider, such as a taxi company).

Fee File, with service description and effective date and up to six fees or price changes for each service.

Drug File, including 17,000 drugs listed according to the National Drug Code, for both prescription and over-the-counter items.

Claims History File, with claims data for every client including client ID, number, name, date of service, provider, fee service code, diagnosis, social service payment, date of check, check number and claim batch number.

Inpatient Utilization Table, which indicates diagnosis, diagnosis and surgery codes (ICDA 8th Revision) with acceptable length of stay for each.

The database briefly described here covers 95,000 clients, 4,400 providers, 5,000 service descriptions allowable by New York State Medicaid, 17,000 drug items and personal history data on 3 million claims. We also have a hospital admission/discharge subsystem, and a complete hospital and nursing home payment subsystem.

The procedure starts when prospective client applies to the Department of Social Services for assistance. A phonetic name check is performed at the terminal, and any history data displayed for immediate review if the client was previously on welfare. An eligibility examiner determines which categories of assistance are applicable and establishes Medicaid coverage. When all Social Service requirements have been fulfilled, authorization information is entered into the system directly through the terminal. Each eligibility authorization automatically causes a Medicaid card to be produced monthly, which the client uses to obtain services. Any allowable insurance coverage, such as Medicare Part B for Public Assistance recipients, is kept alive through automatic premium payments. Vendors record the client’s name and identification number from the Medicaid card onto a multiple claim voucher describing services performed, with fees.

As these vouchers flow into this office, all claims received from a vendor on a given day are batched, and numbered. They are key-taped, and the magnetic tapes run against the database during the second or evening computer shift. During this step, the system automatically:

- Checks client validity and eligibility at the time of service;
- Establishes the type of benefits due the client, whether full, in-hospital only or cost sharing;
- Checks vendor eligibility and qualification to perform the services reported;
- Checks the service charge to assure it is within the maximum allowed for that vendor type;
- Checks to determine whether the claim was previously paid or submitted;
- Deducts any insurance or cost-sharing payments.

Among the major reports produced is a daily validity check listing all prior-day claims that did not meet the system’s eligibility and related criteria. In each case, an audit trail points to the original documents or historical medical findings.

Stemming from these cost and eligibility concerns, aspects of our system touch directly on quality of care, and thus tie into requirements for PSROs.

The number of people coming to the hospital’s emergency room or the county clinic for total medical care services increased by 375 in 1971, and by another 400 in 1972, highlighting the trend away from physician visits, both because of the shortage of family practitioners in this population’s home areas, and the low fees for services paid by Medicaid.

Using the same basic data, we prepare, as part of our Outreach Program, a quarterly list of youngsters who have received no Medical Care Services during the past twelve months. An Outreach Program, making available an early and periodic “medical” screening of these children, is mandated in the Medicaid program. In December 1972 we identified 1,000 such youngsters. We provided their names to caseworkers for face-to-face follow up, thus providing a meaningful application of the federal government’s Early and Periodic Screening Program.

It is in the quality area, of course, that new techniques and criteria must evolve. By the very nature of the problem, it will be no simple matter. However, we have the necessary mechanism on hand, and have already taken the first steps in this direction.

This system is ready, right now, to begin implementing PSRO requirements in this county. Difficult though the development of quality criteria and evaluation may be, we are in position to effectively pursue this goal.

Peter Trainer is administrative officer for Albany County’s Medicaid program and developed the system described in this article.

OUTLOOK
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Final Federal Regulations

The following proposed federal regulation has been released by NACO for review and comment. The regulation is currently being analyzed by county officials and NACO staff to determine its impact on county operations. For copies, please write to Carol Shaskan of NACO. 745 S. Main St., Suite 450, Madison, WI 53703.
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The Region IV NACo Council of Intergovernmental Coordinators (CIC) Federal Aid Briefing will be held March 20, at the Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel in Atlanta.

The meeting is designed for county officials in Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, South Carolina, and North Carolina. Based on preferences expressed by CIC members throughout the region, the program will concentrate on the implementation of key legislation which has been signed into law this year.

**Region IV Federal Briefing**

**ROOM RESERVATION FORM**

**NACo/CIC Region IV Federal Aid Briefing**

March 20, 1974
Sheraton Biltmore Hotel
817 W. Peachtree St. N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Phone (404) 881-9600

Name:
Title:
County/Organization:

Address:
City: State Zip

Please reserve a room for me for the night(s) of:
Arrival time — p.m. Departure Date

Single room ($16)

Twin bed

Double room ($21)

Double bed

Return to: Sheraton Biltmore by March 6

The meeting will begin at 9 a.m., March 20 and end at 5:30 p.m.

Registration fee of $15, which will include a reception, materials will be collected at the briefing.

Regional and national federal officials will discuss the implementation schedule and guidelines of the Older Americans Act, Federal Aid Highway Act, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, Crime Control Act, and the Flood Insurance Protection Act.

Also included on the program will be an update of federal energy regulations and a presentation by the Federal Regional Council.

The intensive one-day session will begin at 9 a.m. and will close with a reception at 5:30 p.m. where CIC members can relax and exchange ideas with one another and Federal Regional Council members. The meeting is being organized by DeWayne Little, President, Region IV CIC and Federal Aid Coordinator, Dade County Fla. The CIC briefing is being coordinated with a General Services Administration (GSA), General Accounting Office (GAO), and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) workshop to be held at the Sheraton-Biltmore on March 21-22.

The GSA conference will concentrate on administrative requirements of federal grant programs, particularly financial management requirements such as utilization of Circular A-87, implementation of Circular A-86, and auditing of federal grants. More details on the GSA workshop will be contained in future issues of County News.

Region IV county officials are encouraged to make their reservations early for the Federal Aid Briefing. The $15 registration fee will be collected at the briefing and includes the cost of the CIC program and the reception. There is no charge for the GSA conference.

For further information on the CIC briefing contact DeWayne Little, Federal Aid Coordinator, Dade County Courthouse, Miami, Fla. 33130, Telephone (305) 377-5211.

Please use the registration form below.

**EPA Makes Changes**

The Environmental Protection Agency has reorganized its air and water programs under two separate assistant administrators.

Robert Sansom, Assistant Administrator of Air and Water Programs, who was responsible for administration and operation of air and water programs, has left EPA to join the Rockefeller Foundation.

There will now be an Assistant Administrator for Water and Hazardous Materials (Charles Elkins is Acting); and an Assistant Administrator for Air and Materials Disposal (Roger Stelwien is Acting). The Assistant Administrator for Water and Hazardous Materials has responsibility for the following offices: Water Planning and Standards; Water Program Operations, Pesticides; and Toxic Substances.

**Mass Transit Aid**

(Continued from page 1)

Administration's proposed restrictions would effectively limit federal operating subsidies to about one-third of this amount.

Other Congressional Action

Meanwhile, Congress has been trying to decide what to do with the bill (S. 386) passed last year which provided $800 million in transit operating assistance. A House-Senate conference committee agreed on a bill before the Christmas recess but held it up because of an anticipated pocket veto by President Nixon. It later was agreed by the Congress to further wait for details of the Administration's proposal.

Hoping for a compromise acceptable to the Administration, the conference committee tentatively agreed last week to a two-year $700 million program to provide immediate help until Congress decides on a longer-range program. The funds would be distributed to states and local governments on a three-part basis formula based on population, transit ridership, and revenue vehicle miles. Also, local governments would have an option of using the funds for capital improvements or operating costs.

Whether this Conference Committee compromise will be approved by both the House of Representatives and ultimately by the Senate is a wide-open question. There may be other versions before a bill finally goes to the White House.

**Railroad Aid**

Also in his message to Congress, the President called for a $2 billion program of federal loan guarantees to help railroads improve their rights of way, terminals, operational facilities and rolling stock.

The President called for relaxation of Interstate Commerce Commission regulations of the railroads to make it easier for the companies to abandon routes they consider unprofitable and to give them more flexibility in raising or lowering rates.

"If rail managers are truly to direct their own affairs, the ability to raise or lower rates without engaging in a protracted and complex rate-making process is essential," he said.

**Information Meeting**

INFORMATION MEETING: The state of county automated information systems was the subject of a recent day-long meeting at NACo headquarters. Among those attending, from l to r, were Kenneth Omlid, Chairman, Board of Commissioners, Lane County, Ore.; Malcho L. Wallington, Assistant to the County Manager, Forsyth County, N.C.; Joe Mayfield, Assistant County Manager, Maricopa County, Ariz.; John Dediches, Associate Administrative Officer, Orange County, Calif.; Bernard Wilcox, Principal Planner, Indianapolis-Marion County, Ind.; Ralph Young, Computer Systems Development Supervisor, Fairfax County, Va.; Zachary H. Guten, Federal Coordinator, and Dave Manser, Information Systems Planner, both of Jefferson County, Ky.; Dale Folstad, Director, Department of Management Services, Hennepin County, Minn.; and Robert W. Bratton, Deputy County Executive, King County, Wash.
Virginia Association Names Energy Committee

The committee recommends that each county appoint an energy board and an administrator to address, among others, the following items:

- Request an estimation of all fuel and energy and gasoline needs from all departments of the county.
- Fix priorities for allocation of county fuel to county facilities.
- Survey police functions in anticipation of brown-out/break-out electrical power situations;
- Recommend implementation of energy-saving techniques such as extended vacations for public school system; closing and consolidating under capacity schools and putting schools on split shifts; moving athletic contests to late afternoon; curtailment of public library functions.

The committee also made a number of emergency expectation recommendations. Chief of these were:

- Locate any available fuel storage facilities such as inactive service stations that may be leased or purchased to store a reserve fuel supply as fuel becomes available in the future.
- Locate any available fuel in the area and establish the county's own emergency reserves (stockpiling is currently being investigated by the federal authorities. Clarification should be obtained before embarking on this recommendation).

The Virginia Association's response to the energy crisis through the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Energy is an excellent example of local government responsibility.

Other state associations have also become deeply involved with the energy issue and have primarily served, as the Virginia Association of Counties, as an information vehicle.

The main point to be made is aptly stated by Lozen: "By perfecting their own organization and operating procedures, the counties will, in effect, present to the state and federal governments a fait accompli of established organization and procedures to cope with the energy crisis."
Dear County Official:

We learned from the Federal Energy Office that asphalt will not be subject to the quota system, as are most other petroleum products. In fact, FEO is encouraging reduction of asphalt production. This is extremely bad news for states, counties, and cities. This will affect both construction and maintenance of roads and airports.

With the tremendous strain on our crude oil supplies, we could be in a position where, theoretically, there would be no asphalt available.

Quick action is required. Call or write your Congressman now and impress upon him the urgency of controlling asphalt as other petroleum products.

Legislative Conference

This year’s Legislative Conference promises to be the biggest and best yet. We are completely out of rooms at the Sheraton Park Hotel, but we still have rooms at the Sheraton Park which is across the street from the Sheraton. If you have not made your reservation, phone the Sheraton Park at 202/265-2000. As we go to press we have received acceptances from 25 Senators, 110 Congressmen; and 110 Administration and agency people for our Congressional Reception, February 26. Thursday morning, February 28 all delegates will arrive at Capital Hill to meet with the Congressional delegation to brief them on four major issues affecting counties: county role in health services; county government block grants; increased transit funds; and funding of Rural Development Act. There is still time to sign up for this important conference.

Federal Budget

As we have pointed out in our news stories, President Nixon is proposing federal assistance to states, counties and states on the magnitude of $52 billion during this coming year. This amounts to $1 billion per week. This is very dramatic evidence of the need for a strong National Association of Counties to insure that county officials receive their fair share of these allocations.

On another matter, we are very hopeful that there can be a change in the current draft of budget reform legislation currently before the Senate to insure that general revenue sharing funds will not have to face annual appropriations. As we have pointed out in our news columns and editorially, annual appropriations would create an enormous uncertainty for county, city and state officials. We have some encouraging responses from our county officials who have contacted their Congressional delegates.

Hotline

We are both amazed and gratified at the warm reception that we have had for our "Hotline". This is a two-minute, 55-second recording that can be listened to by direct dialing (202) 785-9591. Our purpose is to give the very latest information on Washington developments that require action by the counties at the county governing board meeting. This includes such items as legislative developments; new ideas with respect to the energy crisis; meetings, conferences, and study sessions that are important to counties; and drafts of rules, regulations and other items that may require the attention of the county governing body.

The response (up to 100 calls a day) has been so overwhelming that we’ve had to double the transmitting equipment, and we are hopeful that the delays, in the form of busy signals, that plagued us in the opening weeks of the "Hotline" are now behind us. We are now working on an approach that would give our county officials better insights into when to call. At the present time we update the message as often as two or three times a week depending upon Congressional developments and other events.

Many counties are making transcriptions of the broadcast and distributing them to key people in the county. In other counties, they make a tape and play it in the county board room.

In any event, it has proven to be a very successful program and we are most gratified with our progress to date and certainly welcome suggestions for improving it.

NACo Membership

Active county membership in NACo increased by 16 percent last year. At the end of 1972 we had 1,003 member counties and as of December 31, 1973 our membership numbered 1,166. Alabama became a 100 percent membership state joining Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Utah on that Honor Roll. Twelve more counties have become active members of the Association since January 1, 1974, bringing the total number of member counties to 1,178. Our goal for this year is to reach 1,320. Every county that joins NACo makes our voice in articulating county needs stronger.

Election Seminar

Right after our Legislative Conference the end of this month, NACo’s affiliate, the National Association of County Recorders and Clerks is sponsoring a seminar “Revolution in Campaign and Election Laws”, with American University’s Institute of Election Administration. Dr. Richard Smolka, the Institute’s Director and author of the weekly “Ballot Box” column in County News is putting together an information-packed, three-day seminar on post card registration, absentee ballots, regulations on campaign financing and federal grants to local officials to help pay for election administration. Although NACRC and Dr. Smolka are limiting attendance, and 50 state and county officials have already reserved places at the seminar, there may still be room. Call Florence Zeller at (202) 785-9577 to reserve a place.

Recovering

Mayor W. W. "Woody" Dumas is recovering nicely at the Baton Rouge General Hospital, Baton Rouge, La from back surgery.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard F. Hillenbrand
Executive Director