ARCHIVES
A-85

Rural Perspective on Intergovernmental Relations

The Tug Hill Experience

Prepared for

The National Conference of the American Society of Public Administration
held in New York City, April 19, 1983

by

Waring Blackburn
Director of Community Assistance
Temporary State Commission on Tug Hill

INTRODUCTION

John Naisbitt, in his best selling book "Megatrends", identifies ten new directions that are transforming our lives.[1] Based on my experiences with a program in the rural area of N.Y.S. called Tug Hill, eight of the ten seem to me relevant to a discussion of Intergovernmental Relations.

Industrial Society → Information Society
Forced Technology → High Tech/High Touch
Short-term → Long-term
Centralization → Decentralization
Institutional Help → Self Help
Representative Democracy → Participatory Democracy
Hierarchies → Networking
Either/Or → Multiple Option.

In New York State the Temporary State Commission on Tug Hill might be considered a laboratory for rural intergovernmental-relations. The Commission has taken an evolutionary approach and what has evolved fits Naisbitt's trends.

In this paper I plan to relate some of the Tug Hill experience and how it fits with the directions Naisbitt talks about, the friction points in intergovernmental relations, the opportunities that exist for beneficial change to government, and improvement of intergovernmental relations.

New York is a state of small governments. Of the 931 towns and 555 villages, 1,130 of these have population totals under 5,000, according to the New York State Office of the Comptroller. Thus, although the majority of the population in New York State is urban and suburban in nature, the majority of governments in New York State serve small population groups and usually are rural in nature. New York State has the third largest rural population in the country. This mixture of rural and urban interests is often a surprise to those not familiar with New York State, and leads to complex intergovernmental relations.

Background on the Tug Hill Commission

The Temporary State Commission on Tug Hill was formed in 1973 at a time when regional commissions were in vogue in New York State. The stimulus for the formulation of the Commission was a developer's option on 55,000 acres in the core of the Tug Hill area. Unlike the commissions established in the Hudson River Valley, the Adirondacks and the Catskills, the Tug Hill Commission was formed in response to the concerns of local people, rather than of constituents outside its area.

Since its inception, the Commission members have been local residents who have served as volunteers. The result has been a program with a high level of local government orientation and involvement by local residents.

Tug Hill is really a cuesta, a tilted plateau, which rises from an elevation of about 250 feet above sea level at Lake Ontario to 1900 feet above sea level before dropping to an escarpment along the Black River Valley. The core of the Tug Hill area is predominantly a wilderness where there are few roads - epitomized by the 65 square mile Town of Montague with 32 permanent residents. There are 39 towns and 20 villages that serve the 90,000 residents. The Tug Hill area covers parts of four counties and 2,000 square miles, about one and one half times the size of Long Island.

The mission of the Tug Hill Commission can be defined as assisting local government and its citizens to manage their resources, both now and in the future. Listed below are four main objectives summarized from the Commission's request for funding for the 1983-84 Fiscal Year.

- Provide continuing technical and organizational support to town and village government, with emphasis on cooperating groups of municipalities...
- Communicate the nature and extent of the Commission's work to people in the program area, receive public opinion on Tug Hill issues...
- Serve as a rural pilot organization communicating lessons learned from Commission operation and information gained from working with local groups for use in similar rural areas...
- Conduct policy and program research related to socio-economic and environmental aspects of the Tug Hill study area...[2]

Both the technical assistance and organizational support objective represents about 75% of the program effort. It includes community planning assistance, problem solving, training of local officials, community organization and contact, citizen education, development of new programs and locally based economic development activities. The major ingredient, of the Technical Assistance (TA) process, in the Tug Hill Commission approach, is the "circuit rider", who makes the rounds of communities and thereby provides a connecting link with local officials and their needs. The specific approach varies from circuit rider to circuit rider and depends on local needs, but it is the circuit rider out in the field who gathers the questions, provides the answer directly, or forwards them to our technical assistance researchers and carries back the answer. Our files contain over 1900 technical assistance requests and they're now coming in at a rate of about 500 to 600 annually. Our staff has developed "in-house expertise", as well as a network of experts to find the answers.

Technical assistance as defined by others is apt to be broader and may be viewed as the ..."transference of useful knowledge and information."[3] Most state agencies provide technical assistance as a routine part of their business under that broad definition, as do the Associations, Cooperative Extension and others.

The missing element in TA for most rural governments outside the Tug Hill Commission is the linkage between the local official and his final answer. Although many state agencies are quite willing to provide both formal and informal assistance, the communication linkage is missing.

Training needs are identified from TA activities and result in twenty to thirty sessions per year being conducted in the region.

The Tug Hill Commission has found it useful to try things on a small scale. With a pilot program one can afford to take the risk needed to improve government and to effectuate change. Last year for example, the Commission did a pilot study with three communities on improving cash management. Cash management practices were evaluated and recommendations made to enhance investment income. Not only did the study show that investment procedures could be improved, but it also showed a need for a bookkeeping system that readily shows cash position.

For the most part, the Tug Hill Commission is in harmony with the trends identified by John Naisbitt. Except for our word processor, the Commission has not yet moved into the high tech distribution of information; but we are in the communication and information business, bridging the gap between levels of government with personal communication.

When John Naisbitt refers to high tech/high touch he is referring to the counterbalancing of human response to the introduction of high technology.[4] High touch is our life blood. We've built up trust and communication on a person-to-person basis. It is one of the vital balancing ingredients of our high-technological society.

Just as there is increasing recognition in business that too much emphasis has been placed on the short-term and not on the long-term, the same is true with government. Government, by nature, tends to be short-term and crisis oriented; while the long-term implications are forgotten. There is increasing recognition that this cannot continue, either in the public or the private sector. The Tug Hill Commission, in its philosophy, is longer-term in its outlook, whether it be addressing issues of natural resources or assisting communities with long-range plans.

Decentralization, self help, and participatory democracy are adjectives that describe both John Naisbitt's trends and the Tug Hill Commission's approach to issues. The Commission staff are facilitators, not controllers; idea "planters," not policy makers. Networking is the essence of the Tug Hill Commission's technical assistance system. Networking is people talking to one another, sharing ideas, information, resources; it is the process by which..."rewards come by empowering others, not by climbing over them. It is similar to what some people call "capacity building."[5]

The purpose of this paper is not to promote the Tug Hill Commission but to share with you some of the elements that make up an approach to intergovernmental relations that has worked, at least on a small scale.

Friction Points of Intergovernmental Relations
From the Viewpoint of Rural Advocacy.

Without a doubt, one of the largest friction points in intergovernmental relations today between federal, state, and local government involves mandates. These can be legislative, administrative or court- ordered. The Legislative Commission on State-Local Relations in 1982 did a survey of elected officials, and posed the question:

> In the absence of additional monies, please indicate the priority you would assign to each of the following options which the State might adopt, with "1" being the highest priority and "4" being the lowest.

		Number of Responses by Priority			
		1	2	3	4
a.	Assumption of services	43	56	70	80
b.	Reduction of mandates	173	47	26	14
c.	Increased technical assistance	17	51	54	134
d.	Reallocation of current aid	65	78	69	42

> The highest priority, by far, given an "absence of additional monies", is for the reduction of mandates. In fact, the reduction of mandates received a "first" rating greater than all other choices combined--173 for reduction of mandates against 125 for all others combined. The lowest priority is for increased technical assistance, probably because such increases do not directly generate significant additional monies to meet rising budget needs. The fact that "reallocation of current aid" received the second highest priority is consistent with the support shown for updating of data for per capita aid computations.[6]

The number of mandates is staggering. In fact, at this point no one is sure just how many mandates there are in New York State. Last year the N.Y.S. Legislative Commission on Expenditure Review and New York State Association of Counties identified over 2,600 legislated mandates for counties with an estimated 15,000 rules on how to carry out those mandates. The Government Law Center in Albany has been working with the Legislative Commission on State-Local Relations so that further information will be forthcoming on mandates for cities, towns and villages. Mandates that don't provide resources to carry them out can be a particular source of annoyance to local officials.

Many mandates just don't fit rural government. A present draft of the State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code is a good example of this. Senator Charles Cook, in part, had this to say about the proposed code:

> I am torn between referring to these regulations, as an impossible dream, or an improbable nightmare.
>
> In reality, they are both - because they are so impossible that their actual implementation becomes improbable. I begin with the confession that I voted against the original bill which authorizes this code. I did so not because I want people burning up in fires, but because I feel that the code attempts to plow the sidewalks with a bulldozer; and in most of the state we don't even have anyone who can run the bulldozer.[7]

In short, what might work for New York's urban cities, or suburban towns and villages, doesn't meet the needs of rural New York, its part-time government and its rural citizens. The problem of a law like this is exacerbated when the rules and regulations and codes are drafted. What may have started out to be a good concept in theory becomes a nightmare to administer and carry out. It becomes even more serious when the State fails to follow its own mandate, as in the case of the uniform code. Today with the uniform code, the SEQR review process of the uniform code has not been followed, while the Regulatory Impact Statement dated December 8, 1982 only stated that there would be "little cost effect on a community in carrying out the code provisions." This statement doesn't begin to address the impact of the code.[8]

It is fairly commonplace for local elected officials to call for the end of mandates, especially without financial aid to implement them. Many have argued that unfunded mandates "contradicted the concept of local home rule."[9] Certainly there needs to be some type of review of mandates before they are implemented and periodically thereafter. Legislative and administrative mandates are not the only mandates that negatively affect rural government. Some courts have interpreted the one man, one vote decision into a mandate for a County Board of Legislators rather than a Board of Supervisors with weighted voting. In New York State the chief elected official of a town is the Town Supervisor who traditionally had served as a member on a County Board of Supervisors. A Board of Legislators is, on the other hand, elected purely to decide on county matters. There are, of course, pros and cons to each arrangement. It could be argued that it is difficult to find people who have time to serve both as chief elected official of a town and serve on a board of supervisors, and that it is easier to see the big picture if one has only the job of looking after county matters. However, what has been gained

has been at the high cost of less communication and cooperation between a county and its municipalities. For many rural counties this cost has been too high.

The fact that 'the rewards for change are few' has a negative effect on improved intergovernmental relations. It's worse than that; in fact, the opposite is true. Municipal consolidation, in effect, is penalized by the federal and state aid formulae.

Local Planning Assistance as a goal oriented change process is no longer supported by Federal and State funds. If we are going to improve local government and intergovernmental relations, a certain amount of risk must be taken. It helps to share the risk. Through Tug Hill's experimental programs, we are able to share this risk, by contributing seed money, time and expertise. Local Planning Assistance could be reviewed as a small risk sharing program. Greater sharing of risk by state, county and towns in plan implementation would have been helpful in effectuating improved intergovernmental relations.

Our deteriorating infrastructure creates another friction point. Part of the reason must be traced to the absence of comprehensive planning at most levels of government and of a mechanism to relate planning and budgeting at one level of government to action at another.

It is conventional wisdom that we live in a pluralistic society. The values of yesterday are no longer the values of today. There are special interest groups from A to Z, in numbers that just a few years ago would have seemed staggering. This is not without its influence on intergovernmental relations. There are more interests competing for less money. The complexity and diversity of the demand has outstripped the mechanism to allocate resources. The problem is further exacerbated by the marketing of new programs, often by federal and state governments. They offer a program, a constituency develops, and then they withdraw support. Although there was a time when rural interests had more than their share of influence, the pendulum seems to have swung to the other side, with rural interests lost among many more powerful competing interest groups.

Our systems in local government were designed in the preelectronic age. Although local officials are apt to be very competent individuals, they have neither the time nor the expertise to develop management systems and to search out answers to complex questions.

New York State small town/village government does not have the tradition of trained managers, nor have the counties, or the state, taken the lead and developed modern management systems and structures that could be adopted by local government. The lack of suitable software for smaller computers that could be used by smaller municipalities is a good example. The financial management tracking system developed by the Office of the Comptroller is an example of a system that is made available to local government. It is, however, designed for the larger municipality not the smaller municipality. Designing simpler systems for smaller communities could improve intergovernmental relations.

The small percentage of aid that goes to local highways assistance in New York State works to the disadvantage of rural areas since highways constitute a higher percentage of expenditures for them than is the case in urban areas. In the United States the percentage of state aid declined from 14.6 percent in 1957 to 5.3 percent in 1980 while in New York during the same time it declined from 5.2 percent to 1.2 percent.[10] The second part of the point relating to the high percentage of expenditures that goes to highways in rural areas can be seen by examining one of our rural counties. Very rural Lewis County spent 12 percent of its budget on its highways during the four years 1977-1980 compared to 4 percent for counties statewide. During the same period Lewis County's small towns spent 71 percent vs 24 percent for towns statewide, while Lewis County villages spent 19 percent vs 12 percent statewide.[11]

I don't plan to go into much more detail but there are other areas relating to finance that work to the disadvantage of rural areas: the difficulty of rural areas competing in categorical programs; aid formulas based on population; aid formulas based on type of government; the assumptions that cities should get more per capita aid than villages, and villages more than towns.

The problems and the conflicts regarding money are projected to continue due to a shrinking pie, unless corrective action is taken. Both the Federal Government and New York State are facing continuing deficits.

The future outlook for new revenue and easy solutions is not bright. Steven Gold, Director of the Intergovernmental Finance Project for the National Conference of State Legislatures, stated:

- The fiscal outlook for state governments over the next five years is not good. With states hard pressed to maintain their own programs, the growth of state aid is likely to slow...federal aid to state and local governments would probably be declining in real terms - regardless of which party is in the White House or in control of Congress... aid will often be accompanied by limitations on local spending or tax revenues. One of the main political arguements for increased aid is to hold down property tax increases, but unless limitations are in force aid is often not very effective in this regard.[12]

A final friction point that I want to mention relates to the current, and probably continuing, uncertainty of revenues. Local government can no longer ignore financial management and capital improvements programming. The state of New York should enable these improved procedures to occur; at present sound financial management seems almost impossible for small communities with their annual budget ritual and the shifting policies for state aid to local government.

PROSPECTS AND OPPORTUNITIES IN INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

One should not conclude, however, that all is lost for rural communities in the area of intergovernmental relations. In fact, there are many hopeful signs and opportunities if we can take the time to identify, nurture, and develop them.

The Tug Hill Commission recently had an opportunity to look at the highway systems in one of our counties at the town, village and county level.

The study is showing many opportunities for sharing in the area of intergovernmental relations! It reveals an interesting form of these relationships. The existing division of county, village and town roads is not based on function but historic tradeoffs. Towns with smaller populations tend to have a higher percentage of county highways than larger ones and hence get more county service. The villages as well as the cities tend to have fewer miles of county highways. This amounts to a system of subsidies for the smallest towns. There is opportunity to functionally classify highways and, by shifting responsibilities to where they can be carried out most efficiently, to save money.

In the countywide study, it appears that county government is the best qualified to provide functions such as coordination, engineering, purchasing, capital planning, bookkeeping and keeping of equipment maintenance records.

The expense of purchasing highway equipment can be staggering but there are many alternatives to the old choice of either fixing up the old equipment or buying a new piece of equipment. These alternatives include: renting for just part of the year, leasing, contracting for the service, doing any of the above cooperatively with other municipalities.

Recommendations from a series of the energy audits conducted on town and village buildings and financed by the Tug Hill Commission have already saved considerable money for towns and villages, particularly with regard to highway barns and garages; in many cases the payoff has come in less than a year.

Although every case requires its own evaluation there are economies of scale available to various multi-town/village and town/village/county arrangements. These arrangements

do not have to sacrifice the advantages that small governments can have - giving people a real say in local decisions.

Although local officials often feel inundated with mandates, many of which are no longer needed, there are opportunities to circumvent or eliminate mandates. N.Y.S. Municipal Home Rule Law offers local government considerable latitude by allowing a municipality to pass a local law that eliminates a requirement of state law. For example through Municipal Home Rule Law, the review periods required by town and village law can be modified so that a joint planning board and ZBA can operate under one set of regulations. I believe the potential of Municipal Home Rule Law is just now being discovered. This may not be without hazards of its own, but at least in terms of land use planning law it should be considered a challenge to the state to update and simplify its enabling legislation.

Article III-B of N.Y.S. Town Law was amended in 1976 to authorize towns to "establish the office of town manager, provide for his appointment and delegate to such office such powers and duties as may be prescribed, modified, or revoked from time to time by the town board." This amendment to town law became effective in June 1976. The potential benefits of this authorization have not even begun to be discussed for small rural towns acting either individually or in cooperation with others, though the multiple town manager has been a concept trend with some success in some other states. There are a number of new structures and forms that have promise of improving the efficiency and the effectiveness of local government. Examples include hiring a manager:

- on an individual town basis;
- as a circuit rider for several towns; or,
- as a circuit rider provided under a contract with a private management company.

Under this last alternative, a town or group of towns might hire a private company who would provide a manager with professional backup and expertise in a variety of areas, just as has been done in the health care area, where a private company provides a hospital administrator and controller on their payroll with backup expertise in a variety of specialized fields.

How does one get a rural town to consider such a move? Alternative strategies must be developed and evaluated. Here are several possible ways to stimulate communities to consider change:

- Use circuit rider to act as change agent.
- Demonstrate success in one town so that others can follow.
- Use cooperative planning boards as change agents.
- Appoint "Blue Ribbon" committee to explore alternatives and make recommendations.
- Use existing problem or crisis as an opportunity.

Improving "systems" offers potential for improved governmental relations. I believe that the local officials in our area are better than the systems available to them. To change systems requires commitment, time, money and expertise which rural government doesn't often have. The availability of tested systems would do much to improve intergovernmental relations as well and local efficiency and effectiveness. State and federal agencies and the counties to a lesser degree, as well as private enterprise have an opportunity to fill this gap by developing and marketing tested systems or services that local officials can use. Examples include: simplified financial management methods, record keeping microcomputer programs, risk management analysis, purchasing procedures, capital planning programs and availability of data bases.

Technology offers opportunities for improved intergovernmental relations. The communication that the Tug Hill staff does occurs either on the telephone or face-to-face. Technical assistance statewide could be extended by a toll-free technical assistance telephone number. Many local officials are reluctant to spend money on long-distance telephone calls, even if the town provides a credit card or reimbursement for its officials. "High touch" is needed so the phone system can be tied to a person they know and can relate to.

Communication could also be done by a computer network using small personal computers located in each town or village. This offers opportunities for electronic mail, doing annual reports and keeping records and books electronically. A computer based technical assistance service could provide both answers to questions and phone numbers for specialists to contact. Although the computer might seem frightening at first to most people, with proper programming it could offer opportunity for high touch.

The 1982 report of a national advisory council on rural development entitled: Better Country: A Strategy for Rural Development cited improved rural facilities and services, more effective application of national policy and programs servicing rural America, better housing and more private sector jobs and higher income as concerns most often listed by rural Americans.[13] The Reagan administration's approach in addressing these concerns outlined four basic principles:

> To restore political authority and flexibility at the levels of government most accountable to the people. To streamline the federal establishment, to make it more responsive to local and state priorities, rather than the other way around; to exploit the ability of private enterprise as well as government programs to benefit the people, and to build more effective partnerships between public and private efforts toward rural and national progress.[14]

One of the specific proposals in this report calls for the development of a Technical Rural Assistance Information Network whose acronym would be "TRAIN."[15] Train calls for the

> ...joint sponsorship of local, state, regional and national authorities - including educational, commercial, philanthropic and advocacy organizations as well as government - the creation of state level Technical Rural Assistance Information Networks would be supported. State trains would link technical assistance services with local rural development leaders.[16]

Other proposals from within N.Y.S. that would deal with the problems of rural intergovernmental relations include a report by Department of Agricultural Economics at Cornell entitled: Productivity Improvement in New York State Local Governments: State Actions to Assist Local Governments.[17] This report called for the creation of a local assistance outreach program to act as an advocate ombudsman for local government as well as a device to improve communication between levels of government and provide local input on matters which affect local government.

Ben Coe, Executive Director of the Tug Hill Commission, in a paper delivered for the Region I and II Conference of the American Society of Public Administration held in Buffalo in October 1982, suggested expanding the Tug Hill approach statewide. He proposed the following:

1. Establish a division (or office) to provide technical assistance of all kinds to local officials of small communities. This division would be charged with organizing and supporting a network of "circuit riding" technical assistance services. It would also provide expert backup support to these field offices (a function filled today by the Local Government and Community Services Division of the N.Y.S. Department of State).

2. The division should probably not build its own network of state employees to "ride the circuit." Instead the state could provide partial support to groups of communities, counties, or groups of counties to establish independent "offices of town and village assistance."

   I estimate that after a testing period, requiring on the order of two million dollars annually to develop additional trial Offices of Town and Village Assistance, the program could be gradually scaled up to cover most of New York's 1100 small municipalities at an annual cost of about eight million dollars. Ultimately this would result in a 20-fold scale-up of the local assistance portion of the Tug Hill program. More specifically it would involve 100-120 circuit riders handling over 10,000 information requests. Fortunately, we are in an era when the communications and information technology exists to service a network of this type and size.[18]

Counties have long been a source of technical assistance to local government. Often it is the county planning office that provides the more generalized type of technical assistance. County planning offices perform a variety of non-traditional planning functions and their expertise and potentials are often underutilized. County planning offices tend to be restricted in the amount of assistance they can give to local government by budget, politics, and the risk involved in stepping out of their traditional domains. Nevertheless, county planning offices are an important communication link to other levels of government. County planning, with an increased level of assistance, could provide the kind of services proposed by Coe.

Regional planning agencies are another source of expertise that should be looked upon as a potential opportunity. Since the phase-out of the 701 program, the regional planning agencies have gone through tremendous upheavals - both the Upstate New York and Downstate New York chapters of the American Planning Association have urged the state to take the leading role in rethinking state planning as well as relationships between state, regional county, and local planning. Recognition of the resources in all planning agencies as well as the willingness to examine the existing structure by the professional planner should be viewed as an opportunity.

Newly elected N.Y.S. Governor Mario Cuomo has assigned Lt. Governor DelBello overall charge of intergovernmental relations. I look at this as a positive sign that improving intergovernmental relations will be given some priority by the new administration.

The New York State Legislative Commission on State-Local Relations in a short period of time has produced a wealth of information and insight on the subject of Finance and Intergovernmental Relations. The commission's reports and questionnaires have been an important source of documentation for this paper. Its work shows the value of having an independent legislative group studying local government-state government relations.

Formation of an Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) has been proposed by N.Y.S. Assemblymen Kremer and McCabe in a January 1981 bill, (Assembly Bill 1643-A). Governor Mario Cuomo has also called for an ACIR. State ACIR's serve the following functions:

> They may be utilized by appropriate central management units in the executive branch and pertinent legislative committees, to conduct reviews of duplicative and outlived program and to revise outdated State aid formulas;
>
> By systematically reassessing State legislative and executive programs, they may enable the curbing of growth in the number of State aid programs;[19]
>
> On an ongoing basis, a State ACIR would assess and review the relationship of the State with its local governments;
>
> They may study and report on power and functions of local governments, including their fiscal powers; and
>
> On a broader basis, a State ACIR would be capable of analyzing "the existing, necessary, and desirable allocation of State-local fiscal resources."[20]

The concept of an ACIR has considerable merit and potential. I would like to suggest several changes to the Assembly Bill. There needs to be some assurance that rural interests are adequately represented. Hopefully we have learned some important lessons since this Bill was drafted from the testimony on the Proposed Uniform Code. Too often we forget that the business community is part of the New York family. The business community has a viewpoint and expertise that could contribute much to improved intergovernmental relations. I am therefore also suggesting that there should be representation of the business community on any such advisory council.

Michael J. Kami, former head of planning for the Xerox Corporation and President of Corporate Planning Associates, Inc., explained his "risk" theory of planning in a talk I heard a number of years ago. The theme of his talk was: Planning For Change. "Risk" was an acronym: "R" stood for the revolutionary times that we live in; "I" for the need for revolutionary innovation; "S" for a systems approach, and "K" for knowledge.[21]

I believe we need to take the "risk" in intergovernmental relations. If we don't take the "risk" in the long run we will risk even more. We must acknowledge the revolutionary times we live in.

We must understand the trends that John Naisbitt and others such as Alvin Toffler have written about. We must acknowledge the fact that we live in revolutionary times that call for major innovation in our governments and the way they interact with citizens and with other governments. I am not suggesting just a rural perspective, because the dramatic changes that are occurring affect us all. We must work together or face chaos. I'm not proposing a blueprint, but I would like to suggest some parameters that should be considered in any new system of intergovernmental relations:

Adequate communication networks and management systems for all levels of government using high technology where appropriate with high touch to make it work.

A long term planning and decision-making process that involves assured state aid for more than one year at a time by going to a multiple-year state budget.

More management functions decentralized with enabling and assistance type services to make them workable.

A system of true home rule that promotes participatory democracy and permits multiple options in meeting local needs and carrying out statewide goals instead of mandates.

A system of partnership for change that shares risk and enhances the payoff and chances for success.

How do we start? We've discussed a few of the opportunities and positive signs but there are others. John Naisbitt states that..."Change occurs when there is a confluence of both changing values and economic necessity, not before."[22]

Economic necessity is upon us; seizing the opportunities to help build rural capacity and responsibility will help bring the "confluence" together more quickly.

Foot Notes

1. Naisbitt, John, Megatrends, Ten New Directions Transforming our lives, (N.Y., N.Y, Warner Books, 1982)

2. New York State Temporary State Commission on Tug Hill, Request For Funding For The Temporary State Commission on Tug Hill For Fiscal Year 1983-84. Memo from James McMahon, Vice Chairman and Acting Chairman to the Honorable C. Mark Lawton, Director of the Budget.

3 New York State Legislative Commission on State-Local Relations, New York's System of State Aid - Perspectives on the Issues, (Albany, NY, 1982) p.75

4 Naisbitt, John, op.cit. p.39

5 Naisbitt, John, op.cit. p.204

6. New York State Legislative Commission State-Local Relations, New York's System of State Aid - Perspectives on the Issues, (Albany, N.Y., 1982). p.119

7. Cook, Charles D., Senator, Testimony on the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code before the State Fire Prevention and Building Code Council (Albany, NY, January 18, 1983).

8. The New York State Register, Vol. IV, Issue 49, December 15, 1982, p.7

9. New York State Legislative Commission on State-Local Relations, Summary of Proceeding, (Albany, N.Y., 1982), p.168

10. New York State Legislative Commission on State-Local Relations, Summary of Proceedings from the Conference on New York's Fiscal System: Reviewing the Blueprint, Strengthening the Partnership, (Albany, NY, 1982) p.76

11. Comptroller's Special Report on Municipal Affairs: 1977-1981 and Tug Hill Commission staff calculations.

12. New York State Legislative Commission on State-Local Relations, Summary of Proceedings from the Conference on New York's Fiscal System: Reviewing the Blueprint, Strengthening the Partnership, (Albany, NY, 1982) pp. 95,96

13. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Better Country: A Strategy for Rural Development in the 1980's, (Washington, D.C., 1982, unbound report)

14. ibid p.iii

15. ibid p.iv

16. ibid

17. Pomeroy, Robert, Productivity Improvement in New York State Local Governments: State Actions to Assist Local Governments (Department of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., undated and unbound).

18. Coe, Benjamin P., "Building Rural Local Official's Capacity: 'Circuit Rider' and Technical Assistance Programming" (New York State Temporary State Commission on Tug Hill, (Watertown, NY, Revised November 18, 1982, unbound report)

19. ACIR, The States and Intergovernmental Aids, (A-59, Washington, D.C., 1977) p.77

20. ACIR, The Challenge of Local Government Reorganization, (Washington, D.C., 1974) p.5

21. Kami, Michael J., Planning for Change (Family Service Association of America, N.Y., N.Y., 1969 Unbound speech presented at the Biennial Conference of the Family Service Association of America, (Philadelphia, November 18, 1969)

22. Naisbitt, John, op.cit. p.183

Temporary State Commission on Tug Hill

F A C T S H E E T



The Tug Hill Region

2,000 square miles — 1½ times the size of Long Island

39 towns, 20 villages in parts of four counties

Population: 90,000

Wilderness forest and watershed core, surrounded by rural communities.

Economy: Forest products and agriculture (dairy products).

Legislative History

Original enabling legislation, 1972.

Program financed and staffed, October 1973.

Report, outlining recommendations, to Governor and Legislature, February 1976.

Report to Governor and Legislature on program implementation, December 1980.

Legislation extending commission for five years, July 1981.

Program

See "Request for Funding" October 15, 1982 for accomplishments measured against targets set for 1982-83.

Recognition

- Henry Heisenbuttel Award for outstanding contribution to planning in New York State, New York Planning Federation, October 1980.
- The Tug Hill Program: a Regional Planning Option for Rural Areas, Cynthia D. Dyballa, Lyle S. Raymond, and Alan J. Hahn, Cornell University, published by Syracuse University Press, September 1981.
- Cooperative Rural Planning: a Tug Hill Case Study, Elizabeth R. Marsh, Stockton College, Pomona, New Jersey, November, 1981.

Independent Cooperating Groups

Cooperative Tug Hill Planning Board, 10 towns, Francis Yerdon, Chairman

Salmon Rivers Cooperative Planning Board/Conservation Advisory Council, 4 towns, 2 villages, S. Arthur Mattison, Chairman

North Shore Cooperative Planning Board/Conservation Advisory Council, 3 towns, 1 village, Ernest Manchin, Chairman

Jefferson County Snowbelt Coop. Planning Board, 3 towns, Carlton Sleight, Chmn.

Northern Oneida County Council of Gov'ts., 11 towns, 7 villages, C. Bintz, Chmn.

T.H.R.I.F.T. (Tug Hill Resources - Investment For Tomorrow) — a nonprofit forest association, Tim Engst, Chairman