Section VI
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

1. Interstate Relations
2. Federal-State Relations
3. State-Local Relations
Interstate Relations

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

1. ORGANIZATION

O
F, BY AND FOR THE STATES is proba-

bly the most apt shorthand term

available to describe the Council

of State Governments and its purposes.

Founded some 47 years ago as the Ameri-

can Legislators' Association, the Council

assumed its new name and also a

broadened scope of state-related activities

in 1933.

In concept and in practice, the goal of

the Council is to serve state government

in the broad sense. This was evident when

state laws were enacted recognizing the

Council as a joint instrumentality of the

States and creating "Commissions on In-

terstate Cooperation" with representa-

tion from the legislative, executive, judicial

and administrative areas of state

government.

Two well-established and highly re-
garded groups of state officials—the Na-
tional Governors' Conference and the Na-
tion Association of Attorneys General—
became early affiliates of the Council and
named it as their secretariat. The Coun-
cil's goal of serving the broad range of
state government needs was given further
impetus when the Council assisted during
the 1940s in the formation of the National
Association of State Budget Officers
(1945), the National Legislative Confer-
ence (1948), and the Conference of Chief
Justices (1949). Today a total of nine such
national organizations are served as af-
filiates of the Council.

In addition to the Governors, Attorneys

General, Chief Justices, Budget Officers,

and the Legislative Conference, the affili-

ates are the National Conference of Lieu-
tenant Governors, the National Associa-
tion of State Purchasing Officials, the

National Conference of Court Adminis-
trative Officers, and the Council of State
Planning Agencies.

There are also more than 25 cooperat-
ing organizations. The list of cooperating
organizations of the Council is on page

252.

THE GOVERNING BOARD

The Council is controlled by a Gover-
ning Board of delegate members, ex officio
members, and members at large. Each jur-
isdiction that contributes to the support
of the Council names a delegate member.
The ex officio members include representa-
tives of the associated organizations.
Sixteen members at large represent the
four Regional Conferences of the Coun-
cil; eight others represent various areas of
state government and interstate agencies.
Total membership of the Governing
Board is slightly over 100 persons, with
the "delegate members" always comprising
a majority.

The Board meets annually and at spe-
cial call. It controls the Council’s funds,
property and management, and it estab-
lishes Council policy positions, except
that the Executive Committee may act
for the Board during the interim between
meetings.
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee consists of 18 members. It includes the Chairman, who is a legislator; a Chairman-Elect; the President of the Council, who is a Governor; three Vice-Chairmen, who are legislators; three Vice-Presidents, all Governors; the Auditor, who is a state fiscal officer; an Attorney General; a Lieutenant Governor; four regional members; and two additional members. (The officers and Executive Committee for 1971-72 are listed on page 244.) The Executive Committee appoints the Executive Director. He selects all members of the Council staff, and they operate under his direction and supervision.

OFFICES

Central administrative functions for the Council are performed at the headquarters in Lexington, Kentucky. Regional offices are located in the East (New York City), the Midwest (Chicago), the South (Atlanta) and the West (San Francisco). Regional activities and structuring have long been basic to Council operations, complementing the nationwide scope of the organization and its affiliates. Today there are continuing organized Regional Conferences of the Council of State Governments in the East, Midwest, South and West—each with its own officers and committees. Similarly, several of the affiliated associations have established regional conferences. The four regional offices of the Council maintain close liaison with the Legislatures and state officials in the States comprising their regions, as well as staffing their respective regional conferences.

COMMISSIONS ON COOPERATION

As mentioned earlier, the Council works closely with Commissions on Interstate Cooperation or similar official bodies of the individual state governments. A typical commission consists of 10 or more legislators and a smaller number of administrative officials. The legislation creating the commissions customarily designates the Council as a joint governmental agency of the enacting State and the other States which cooperate through it.

The commissions play an important role in Council activities. They focus attention on interstate, state-federal and other intergovernmental problems facing the States, offer organized channels for communication among States and with other levels of government, and assist States in pooling knowledge and resources. (The officers of the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation or similar bodies in the individual States are listed on pages 253-56.)

2. ACTIVITIES

The Council works to help the States meet the multiple challenges of modern state government—the need for progress in internal state affairs, for solutions to problems that cross state lines; and the problems of state-federal relations.

As the agency of all the States, the Council contributes to the realization of these objectives by numerous means. They include:

- Serving as a catalyst to express the views of the States on matters of major concern.
- Acting as a coordinating agency to analyze legislation and programs of the federal government and for advancing the role of the States in state-federal relations.
- Working to improve intergovernmental cooperation.
- Conducting research on state programs and problems.
- Studying techniques of state administration.
- Arranging conferences and providing other services requested by legislators, state officials, and commissions on interstate cooperation.
- Promoting more effective regional cooperation.
- Holding training sessions and seminars for state officials, legislators and staff aides.
- Issuing publications, for use in the States, on many aspects of state affairs.
- Serving as the central research and
reference agency for affiliated organizations for the legislative service agencies of the various States.

- Encouraging cooperation of States with subdivisions of foreign governments, with the assistance of appropriate federal agencies.


**Service for Intrastate Progress**

Most of the work of every state government necessarily is concentrated on its internal affairs. But this does not mean working in isolation. Almost every intrastate task force has its counterpart in other States. Through the Council's meetings, research and publications, and through informal communication aided by the Council, the experience of all States in these matters is shared.

Through the years the Council has aided intrastate progress through extensive studies concerning higher educational systems, mental health, needs of the aging, state financing, judicial systems, executive reorganization and management, and legislative processes and procedures.

Although the Council publishes dozens of individual reports and books during each year, the following list of recent publications gives some idea of the variety of topics involved—*State Drug Abuse Control; Environmental Quality and State Government; Consumer Protection in the States; The States and Criminal Justice, State-Local Employee Labor Relations, The Age of Majority, Reorganization in the States, The States' Role in Land Resource Management, and Reapportionment in the States*.

In some instances studies and reports are produced by research specialists under Council supervision or by individual authors, in others by members of the Council's staff, in still others by Council committees or committees of Council affiliates assisted by staff members.

**Service for Interstate Action**

In the area of interstate action, the Council contributes its services in a number of ways. It works with interstate agencies in such functional areas as education, enforcement of family support, juvenile delinquency, and probation and parole.

In addition, the Council works with the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws to aid the States in this vital area. In a similar vein, each year the Council's Committee of State Officials on Suggested State Legislation, in consultation with other groups, prepares and sponsors a series of suggested legislative acts for consideration in the States. These deal with subjects on which similar or uniform laws may serve the public interest.

**Service in State-Federal Relations**

To aid the States in the increasingly important field of state-federal relations, the Council maintains a Washington office staffed by experts in various subject areas of government. This office prepares and distributes information on pending federal legislation and administrative actions that affect the States and assists in facilitating liaison between state officials and the national government. Staff members of the Washington office are in close touch with federal departments and agencies and with congressional committees on various matters of current interest to the States.

Council research activities, moreover, have contributed to various important reports on state-federal relations over the years, and the Council's periodical publications carry accounts on federal proposals and actions that affect or may affect the States.

The strength of our federal, democratic system requires self-reliance and strength at each level of government—local, state, and national. It also requires cooperation among all levels. The Council works for the effective operation of both these principles.
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INTERSTATE ORGANIZATIONS AFFILIATED WITH THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE


Purpose: To provide a medium for exchange of views and experience on subjects of importance to the people of the States, to foster interstate cooperation, to promote greater uniformity of state laws, to attain greater efficiency in state administration, and to facilitate and improve state-local and state-federal relations.

Officers, Executive Committee for 1970-71: Governor Warren E. Hearnes, Missouri, Chairman of the Conference; Governor Forrest H. Anderson, Montana; Governor William T. Cahill, New Jersey; Governor Luis A. Ferré, Puerto Rico; Governor Linwood Holton, Virginia; Governor Marvin Mandel, Maryland; Governor Robert D. Ray, Iowa; Governor Robert W. Scott, North Carolina; Governor Jack Williams, Arizona.

Officers, Executive Committee for 1971-72: Governor Arch A. Moore, Jr., West Virginia, Chairman of the Conference; Governor Wendell R. Anderson, Minnesota; Governor Cecil D. Andrus, Idaho; Governor Winfield Dunn, Tennessee; Governor J. James Exon, Nebraska; Governor Frank Licht, Rhode Island; Governor Thomas J. Meskill, Connecticut; Governor Richard B. Ogilvie, Illinois; Governor John C. West, South Carolina.

Secretary-Treasurer: Brevard Criehfield, Executive Director of the Council of State Governments. Director of Federal-State Relations: Charles A. Byrley.

Publications: Proceedings of the National Governors' Conference (annual), and numerous periodic and special reports.

Other Activities: For six decades the National Governors' Conference has been a strong and constructive force for the improvement of state government, the development of interstate cooperation, and sound progress of the federal system. At annual and interim meetings of the Conference, the Governors explore matters of common interest to all of the States. Between meetings, Conference committees study subjects of importance and prepare extensive reports on them. The Conference makes use of the Council's informational facilities and calls upon it for research studies and reports on major state problems. Since 1967 the Conference has maintained a Federal-State Relations Office in Washington, D.C. The Executive Committee of the Conference serves on the Council's Governing Board. Regional Governors' Conferences in the Midwest, South, West and New England also meet annually and work year round to deal with needs in their areas. The first three of these receive regular staff services from the Council.
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THE NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1948. Composed of legislative officials, members and staff of legislative service agencies, and others designated by the Conference.

PURPOSE: To cooperate for more effective service to the Legislatures, to assist in strengthening the role of the States and their Legislatures in intergovernmental relations, and to aid in improving legislative organization and procedures.


SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

PUBLICATIONS: Studies and reports relating to the work of legislators, legislative research and reference agencies, officials and librarians; two quarterlies, Legislative Research Checklist and The American Legislator, and Washington, comment on state-federal issues, published monthly when Congress is in session.

OTHER ACTIVITIES: Conference committees conduct studies and surveys and report their findings and conclusions to the Conference, prepare handbooks and recommend procedures for the improvement of the legislative process, and develop and sponsor in-service training courses for legislators and legislative staff personnel. The Committee and Task Force Committees on Intergovernmental Relations develop and publicize policy positions representative of state legislative views on key federal-state-local issues. The secretariat performs research and information services for the members. In particular, legislative powers, structures, procedures and service facilities are surveyed.
THE CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES


PURPOSE: To provide for the exchange of information and ideas on the operation of the judiciary and for consultation pointed to improvement of the administration of justice.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL FOR 1970–71: ROBERT W. CALVERT, Texas, Chairman; JAMES S. HOLDEN, Vermont, First Vice Chairman; WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON, Hawaii, Second Vice Chairman; FLOYD L. JACKSON, Oklahoma; OSCAR R. KNUTSON, Minnesota; JOSEPH R. MOSS, South Carolina; KENNETH J. O'CONNELL, Oregon; ROBERT T. PRICE, Kansas; HAROLD F. SNEAD, Virginia; DANIEL F. WOLCOTT, Delaware.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL FOR 1971–72: WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON, Hawaii, Chairman (replaced JAMES S. HOLDEN, Vermont, who resigned as Chief Justice January 1972); EDWARD E. PRINGLE, Colorado, First Vice Chairman (succeeded WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON, January 1972); (Vacancy), Second Vice Chairman; ROBERT W. CALVERT, Texas; ROSS W. DYER, Tennessee; LORNA E. LOCKWOOD, Arizona; JOSEPH R. MOSS, South Carolina; KENNETH J. O'CONNELL, Oregon; THOMAS H. ROBERTS, Rhode Island; ROBERT G. UNDERWOOD, Illinois.

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

PUBLICATIONS: Proceedings of annual meetings and various special reports.

ACTIVITIES: The Conference provides a forum for the exchange of experience, views and suggestions to improve the organization and procedures of state courts. Special committees study and report on court practices. The secretariat undertakes such research as the Conference requests.

The Chairman and First Vice Chairman of the Conference are members of the Governing Board of the Council of State Governments.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL


PURPOSE: To bring the Attorneys General into an organization through which they can become personally acquainted, exchange information with each other and cooperate together for the better carrying out the functions of their several offices.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1970–71: FRANCIS B. BURCH, Maryland, President; G. T. BLANKENSHIP, Oklahoma, Vice President; BERTRAM T. KANBARA, Hawaii, Second Vice President; DOUGLAS M. HEAD, Minnesota, Immediate Past President; HERBERT F. DESIMONE, Rhode Island; CRAWFORD C. MARTIN, Texas;
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GARY K. NELSON, Arizona; ROBERT H. QUINN, Massachusetts; ROBERT M. ROBSON, Idaho; A. F. SUMMER, Mississippi; RICHARD C. TURNER, Iowa; ROBERT W. WARREN, Wisconsin.

Officers, Executive Committee for 1971–72: CRAWFORD C. MARTIN, Texas, President; ROBERT W. WARREN, Wisconsin, Vice President; GARY K. NELSON, Arizona, President Elect; FRANCIS B. BURCH, Maryland, Immediate Past President; J. SHAPE CREAMER, Pennsylvania; ROBERT LIST, Nevada; DAVID M. PACK, Tennessee; ROBERT H. QUINN, Massachusetts; VERNON B. ROMNEY, Utah; WILLIAM J. SCOTT, Illinois; THEODORE L. SENDAK, Indiana; A. F. SUMMER, Mississippi.

Secretariat: The Council of State Governments.

Publications: Conference Proceedings of the National Association of Attorneys General (annual) and Newsletter (and Digest of Selected Opinions of State Attorney General) (quarterly), containing news of interest and noteworthy opinions of State Attorneys General.

Other Activities: Committees conduct studies and research and report their findings, conclusions and recommendations to the Association. The Association expresses its collective views through resolutions, communications and testimony on selected subjects to the executive and legislative agencies of the state and federal governments. The secretariat handles day-to-day correspondence, acts as a clearinghouse for information, publishes newsletters and reports of proceedings, and keeps members informed on topics of current interest. Also, the secretariat collects and disburses funds and accounts for funds of the Association. In addition to the National Association, regional groupings of its members, with their own organization and officers, have been established in the East, Midwest, South and West.

The President and one other member of the Association are members of the Governing Board of the Council of State Governments. An Attorney General regularly serves on the Council’s Executive Committee.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF LIEUTENANT GOVERNORS

Organization: Organized in 1962. Composed of the Lieutenant Governors of the States and Territories of the United States and of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In States and Territories which do not provide for the office of Lieutenant Governor, certain other officers are eligible for membership.

Purpose: To provide a medium for exchange of views and experiences on subjects of importance to the people of the States and Territories, to foster interstate cooperation, to promote efficiency and effectiveness in the office of Lieutenant Governor, and generally to improve the efficiency of state and territorial administration.

Officers, Executive Committee for 1970–71: GEORGE NIGH, Oklahoma, Chairman; ROGER W. JEPSEN, Iowa, Vice Chairman; RAYMOND J. BRODERICK, Pennsylvania, Immediate Past Chairman (until January 1971); EUGENE D. BOOKHAMMER, Delaware, Vice Chairman, Eastern Region; WENDELL H. FORD, Kentucky, Vice Chairman, Southern Region; PAUL SIMON, Illinois, Vice Chairman, Midwestern Region; JACK M. MURPHY, Idaho, Vice Chairman, Western Region; HAVEN J. BARLOW, Utah; BEN BARNES, Texas (replaced GEORGE T. SMITH, Georgia, who left office January 1971); J. JOSEPH GARRAHY, Rhode Island (replaced
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RAY C. OSBORNE, Florida, who left office January 1971); THOMAS L. JUDGE, Montana; RICHARD F. LARSEN, North Dakota; WILLIAM S. MORRIS, Missouri; MALCOLM WILSON, New York.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1971-72: ROGER W. JEPSEN, Iowa, Chairman; THOMAS L. JUDGE, Montana, Vice Chairman; GEORGE NIGH, Oklahoma, Immediate Past Chairman; J. JOSEPH GARRAHY, Rhode Island, Vice Chairman, Eastern Region; BEN BARNES, Texas, Vice Chairman, Southern Region; RICHARD F. LARSEN, North Dakota, Vice Chairman, Midwestern Region; ED REINECKE, California, Vice Chairman, Western Region; HAVEN J. BARLOW, Utah; DONALD R. DWIGHT, Massachusetts; RICHARD E. FOLZ, Indiana; BLAIR LEE III, Maryland; DAVID E. MAAS, Virgin Islands; PAUL SIMON, Illinois; JOHN S. WILDER, Tennessee.

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

PUBLICATIONS: Résumés of meetings and reports of interest to the members.

OTHER ACTIVITIES: The secretariat performs research services and makes available information for the members.

The Chairman and one other member of the Conference are members of the Governing Board of the Council of State Governments, A Lieutenant Governor regularly serves on the Council’s Executive Committee.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BUDGET OFFICERS


PURPOSE: To provide machinery for cooperation among state budget officers, to encourage study and research in state budgeting, and to foster more effective budget administration and management.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1970-71: WALLACE W. HENDERSON, Florida, President; WALTER WECHSLER, New Jersey, President Elect; WAYNE F. MCGOWN, Wisconsin, Immediate Past President; JACK C. BLANTON, Kentucky; JOSEPH T. CASHMAN, Delaware; RONALD E. W. CRISMAN, Vermont; THOMAS E. LAVELLE, Minnesota; ROBERT W. SMITH, Oregon; JOSEPH V. STEWART, Arkansas.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1971-72: WALTER WECHSLER, New Jersey, President; EDWIN W. BEACH, California, President Elect; WALLACE W. HENDERSON, Florida, Immediate Past President; RONALD E. W. CRISMAN, Vermont; RICHARD L. DUNHAM, New York; RALPH R. PERLMAN, Louisiana; ROBERT E. KIRKPATRICK, New Mexico; JOHN C. MURRAY, Rhode Island; JAY O. TEPPER, Ohio.

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

PUBLICATIONS: Résumés of annual meetings, reports of interest to budget officers, and a quarterly Newsletter.

OTHER ACTIVITIES: Committees conduct studies and report their findings and conclusions to the Association. Committee activities include special budgetary and fiscal research, facilitation of professional development and training, and cooperation with federal agencies when state-federal problems arise. The secre-
tariat performs research and information services for the members. In addition to its national activities, Regional Conferences, each with its own Director, have been established by the National Association in the East, Midwest, South and West.

The President and President Elect of the Association are members of the Governing Board of the Council of State Governments.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE PURCHASING OFFICIALS

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1947. Composed of purchasing officials, their assistants and deputies of all the States, Commonwealths and Territories.

PURPOSE: To promote cooperation for the more efficient exercise of state purchasing and for greater efficiency in administration.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1970-71: JOHN E. SHORT, Wisconsin, President; RAMON A. DAMERELL, Oregon, President Elect; THOMAS B. BLANCO, Illinois, Immediate Past President; IRA M. BAKER, Oklahoma; HUGH CARLETON, Pennsylvania; J. DOUGLAS CHRISTIANSEN, Utah; WILLIAM H. FINNEGAN, Connecticut; WILLIS HOLDING, North Carolina; LOUIS S. MIDDLEMIST, Colorado.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1971-72: RAMON A. DAMERELL, Oregon, President; FRANK J. PENNONI, Michigan, President Elect; JOHN E. SHORT, Wisconsin, Immediate Past President; IRA M. BAKER, Oklahoma; THOMAS B. BLANCO, Illinois; HERMAN CRYSTAL, New Jersey; LOUIS S. MIDDLEMIST, Colorado; SHEFFIELD C. SPRING, Louisiana; HAROLD F. WEGGENMAN, Montana.

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

PUBLICATIONS: Résumés of meetings, special reports of interest to purchasing officials, and quarterly Newsletter of the Association.

OTHER ACTIVITIES: Committees conduct studies and report their findings and conclusions to the Association.

The President and one other member of the Association are members of the Governing Board of the Council of State Governments.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COURT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1955. Membership is open to administrators of the state and federal courts, the courts of Puerto Rico, and the courts of metropolitan counties and other large jurisdictions.

PURPOSE: To facilitate cooperation and exchange of information among court administrative officers and to foster the use of modern business management methods in judicial administration.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1970-71: T. MACK BLACKBURN, Tennessee, Chairman; C. R. HUIE, Arkansas, Vice Chairman; JOHN P. COTTER, Connecticut; ROY O. GULLEY, Illinois; JAMES R. JAMES, Kansas; MARVIN LINNER, Arizona.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1971-72: C. R. HUIE, Arkansas, Chairman;
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HARRY O. LAWSON, Colorado; Vice Chairman; T. MACK BLACKBURN, Tennessee; ROY O. GULLEY, Illinois; MARIAN OPALA, Oklahoma; LAWRENCE J. TURGEON, Vermont.

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

PUBLICATIONS: Résumés of annual meetings and occasional special reports.

OTHER ACTIVITIES: The secretariat makes available information of general interest to the members of the Conference. Upon request the secretariat, alone or by arrangement with the Institute of Judicial Administration, undertakes research projects.

The Chairman and one other member of the Conference are members of the Governing Board of the Council of State Governments.

THE COUNCIL OF STATE PLANNING AGENCIES

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1964. Composed of the state agencies responsible for providing staff support for the formulation and coordination of comprehensive plans to guide state development. Historically, most state planning agencies have been part of state economic development departments but recent years have seen a marked trend toward the location of state planning agencies in Governors' offices, in executive departments, in departments of administration, or in other locations bearing a staff relationship to the Governor and/or the Legislature.

PURPOSE: To provide research, analysis and other staff assistance to policymakers in state government; to encourage improved planning of the activities of state governments; to encourage improved coordination and comprehensive development of programs for state governments; to attract to state government personnel trained in planning and other disciplines which can contribute to improved decision-making in state governments; and to provide a vehicle for collaboration with other state organizations of state officials.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1971-72: ROBERT H. MARDEN, Massachusetts, President; FRANK A. PATALANO, Illinois, Secretary-Treasurer; IRVING HAND, Pennsylvania; W. DON NELSON, Nebraska; PERRY F. ROYS, Montana; HOMER E. STILL, Jr., Florida.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1972-73: ROBERT H. MARDEN, Massachusetts, President; SHELLEY M. MARK, Hawaii, President Elect; FRANK A. PATALANO, Illinois; Secretary-Treasurer; SIDNEY L. WILLIS, New Jersey; ED GRISHAM, Texas; GERALD W. CHRISTENSON, Minnesota; JOHN S. TOOHER, California.

SECRETARIAT: The Council of State Governments.

ACTIVITIES: Committees arrange for the exchange of studies and other data among States; collaborate with budget officers and other state officials to help coordinate planning with other staff activities; cooperate with federal agencies in efforts to improve and simplify the federal grant-in-aid system; and provide technical assistance as requested by other organizations of state officials.
INTERSTATE ORGANIZATIONS COOPERATING WITH THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws
National Conference of State Legislative Leaders
Parole and Probation Compact Administrators’ Association
Association of Juvenile Compact Administrators
Interstate Conference on Water Problems
Adjutants General Association of the United States
National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors
National Conference on Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support
Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators
National Association of State Boating Law Administrators
National Association of State Civil Defense Directors
Association of State Correctional Administrators
National Association of State Units on Aging
National Association of Extradition Officials
National Association of State Juvenile Delinquency Program Administrators
State Personnel Administrators Association
Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation
National Association for State Information Systems
National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners
Coastal States Organization
Federation of Tax Administrators
National Association of Tax Administrators
National Society of State Legislators
Conference of State Sanitary Engineers
National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards
National Association of State Departments of Agriculture
National Conference of State Criminal Justice Planning Administrators
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Officer Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA (a)</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor Jere Beasley, Chairman; Representative Miham Turner, Jr., Vice Chairman; Louis G. Greene, Jr., Director, Legislative Reference Service, Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA (b)</td>
<td>Senator Robert H. Ziegler, Sr., Chairman; Representative Gene Guess, Vice Chairman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA (c)</td>
<td>Senate President William G. Jacquin, Chairman; House Speaker Timothy A. Barrow, Vice Chairman; Harry Gutterman, Executive Director, Legislative Council, Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>House Speaker Ray S. Smith, Jr., Chairman; Senator Knox Nelson, Vice Chairman; Marcus Halbrook, Director, Legislative Council, Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Houston I. Flournoy, State Controller, Chairman; Glenn Paschall, Assistant Deputy Controller, Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>Senate President Pro Tem Fay DeBerard, Chairman; Representative Ray Black, Vice Chairman; Lyle C. Kyle, Director, Legislative Council, Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT (a)</td>
<td>Senator Charles T. Alfano, Chairman; Senator Alden A. Ives, Vice Chairman; David B. Ogle, Executive Director, Joint Committee on Legislative Management, Administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>Senator Allen J. Cook, Chairman; Senator Margaret R. Manning, Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>Chairman to be appointed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>Representative Glenn S. Phillips, Chairman; Senator Render Hill, Vice Chairman; Frank H. Edwards, Legislative Counsel, Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>No commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO (c)</td>
<td>Senate President Pro Tem James Ellsworth and House Speaker William J. Lanting, Co-Chairmen; Myran H. Schlechtie, Director, Legislative Council, Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS (a)</td>
<td>Representative William D. Walsh, Chairman; Senator Robert W. McCarthy, Vice Chairman; Representative Joseph G. Sevcik, Secretary; John Lattimer, Executive Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>Senator Wilfrid J. Ullrich, Chairman; Representative John Thomas, Vice Chairman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>Senator Vernon H. Kyhl, Chairman; Representative John Sevcik, Vice Chairman; Sergeant H. Garrison, Director, Legislative Service Bureau, Secretary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KANSAS
Lieutenant Governor Reynolds Shultz, Chairman; House Speaker Calvin A. Strowig, Vice Chairman; Arden Ensley, Assistant Revisor of Statutes, Secretary.

KENTUCKY (d)
Lieutenant Governor Julian M. Carroll, Chairman; James T. Fleming, Legislative Research Commission, Director.

LOUISIANA (e)
Senator Michael H. O'Keefe, Chairman; Kendall Vick, Executive Director.

MAINÉ
Senator Albert W. Hofsnes, Chairman; Representative James T. Dudley, Secretary.

MARYLAND (a)
Senator Steny H. Hoyer, Chairman; Delegate John S. Arnick, Vice Chairman; Odell M. Smith, Department of Fiscal Services, Chief Staff Assistant.

MASSACHUSETTS
Senator Philibert Pellegrini, Chairman; Representative John J. Toomey, Vice Chairman; Marie Carney, Executive Secretary; Senator Stanley Zarod, Director.

MICHIGAN (a)
Representative William R. Copeland, Chairman; Senator Gilbert E. Bursley, Vice Chairman; A. E. Reyhons, Director, Legislative Service Bureau, Secretary.

MINNESOTA
Senator Jerome V. Blatz, Chairman; Representative Carl M. Johnson, Vice Chairman; Richard L. Brubacher, Commissioner of Administration, Secretary.

MISSISSIPPI
Representative Clarence A. Pierce, Jr., Chairman; Senator Carroll Ingram, Vice Chairman; Representative Kenneth O. Williams, Secretary.

MISSOURI
Senate President Pro Tem J. F. Patterson, Chairman; Representative Donald J. Gralike, Vice Chairman; William R. Nelson, Director, Committee on Legislative Research, Secretary.

MONTANA (f)
Representative Francis Bardanouve, Chairman; Senator Antoinette F. Rosell, Vice Chairman; Representative Matt Himsl, Secretary.

NEBRASKA (a)
Senator Eugene T. Mahoney, Chairman; Senator Fern H. Orme, Vice Chairman; Vincent Brown, Clerk of the Legislature, Secretary.

NEVADA (g)
Senator James I. Gibson, Chairman; Senator B. Mahlon Brown, Vice Chairman; Arthur J. Palmer, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau, Secretary.

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Senate President John R. Bradshaw, Chairman.

NEW JERSEY (h)
Chairman to be elected.

NEW MEXICO (i)
House Speaker Walter K. Martinez, Chairman; (Vacancy), Vice Chairman; Clay Buchanan, Director, Legislative Council Service, Executive Secretary.
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NEW YORK (j) Senator John J. Marchi, Chairman; Assemblyman Edwyn E. Mason, Vice Chairman; Senator Jeremiah B. Bloom, Secretary.

NORTH CAROLINA Representative Larry P. Eagles, Chairman.

NORTH DAKOTA (c) Representative Bryce Streibel, Chairman; Senator Robert M. Nasset, Vice Chairman; C. Emerson Murry, Director, Legislative Council, Secretary.

OHIO Lieutenant Governor John W. Brown, Chairman; Miss Donna Salvatore, Staff.

OKLAHOMA Senate President Pro Tem Finis W. Smith, Chairman; House Speaker Rex Privett, Vice Chairman; Jack A. Rhodes, Director, Legislative Council, Secretary.

OREGON Senate President John D. Burns, Chairman; Cleighton Penwell, Director, Executive Department, Secretary.

PENNSYLVANIA Senator Thomas F. Lamb, Chairman; Representative Warren H. Spence, Vice Chairman; Representative Harry R. J. Comer, Secretary; Senator Richard C. Frame, Treasurer; Blaine C. Hocker, Executive Secretary.

RHODE ISLAND Senator Frank Sgambato, Chairman.

SOUTH CAROLINA Senate President Pro Tem Edgar A. Brown, Chairman.

SOUTH DAKOTA (a) Lieutenant Governor William J. Dougherty, Chairman; Senator Joe R. Dunmire, Vice Chairman; Michael P. Ortner, Director, Legislative Research Council, Secretary.

TENNESSEE (a) Chairman to be appointed.

TEXAS Governor Preston Smith, Chairman; Lieutenant Governor Ben Barnes, First Vice Chairman; House Speaker Gus Mutscher, Second Vice Chairman.

UTAH (c) Senate President Haven J. Barlow, Chairman; House Speaker Richard C. Howe, Vice Chairman; Lewis H. Lloyd, Director, Legislative Council, Secretary.

VERMONT Senator Charles L. Delaney, Chairman; Representative George H. Sloan, Secretary.

VIRGINIA Robert Kirby, Director, Department of State Planning and Community Affairs, Chairman.

WASHINGTON (c) House Speaker Thomas A. Swayze, Jr., Chairman; Senator William A. Gissberg, Vice Chairman; Senator Harry B. Lewis, Secretary.

WEST VIRGINIA Senate President E. Hansford McCourt and House Speaker Lewis N. McManus, Co-Chairmen; Earl M. Vickers, Director of Legislative Services, Secretary.

WISCONSIN Representative John E. McCormick, Chairman; Senator Ernest C. Keppler, Vice Chairman; Bonnie Reese, Executive Secretary, Legislative Council, Secretary.
WYOMING (a)

G. Keith Osborn, State Planning Coordinator, Chairman.

(a) Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation.
(b) Commission is currently inactive. The Legislative Council presently performs functions of the commission.
(c) Legislative Council functions as Commission on Interstate Cooperation.
(d) Legislative Research Commission functions as Commission on Interstate Cooperation. All members on the commission are ex officio.
(e) Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.
(f) Legislative Council appointed by statute to be Commission on Interstate Cooperation.
(g) Legislative Commission of the Legislative Counsel Bureau functions ex officio as the Commission on Interstate Cooperation.
(h) Intergovernmental Relations Commission.
(i) Legislative Council functions ex officio as the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation.
(j) Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation.
INTERSTATE COMPACTS

BY FREDERICK L. ZIMMERMANN AND MITCHELL WENDELL

Recent editions of this biennial article have noted that compacts are now being utilized for a very wide range of subject matter areas. The 1971 Council of State Governments' compilation of interstate compacts evidences steady growth in their number with 160 such instruments now in operation. Because of both the number and variety of these interstate agreements, it is now as important to report trends in the employment and procedure of existing arrangements as to identify wholly new uses for the device. Although it would seem that precedents are now numerous enough so that entirely novel compact arrangements are bound to become infrequent, the period covered by this article has witnessed some developments which again emphasize the versatility of compacts in effecting joint interjurisdictional action, organization and administration.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

In recent years possibly the most innovative development was the interstate-federal Delaware River Basin Compact which, since it is both the law of the party States and of the federal government, produces both interstate and interlevel integration. When it was adopted in 1961 this agreement was characterized, at the federal level, as an "oddball" form of intergovernmental river basin management organization which would not be repeated. It is significant that similar instruments have since been formulated for two other river basins, the Susquehanna and the Potomac. Since river basin management organization has been a notoriously controversial issue not only in federal-state relations but also in federal administrative organization, this imitation is not only a tribute to the specific accomplishments of the Delaware Commission but also to the value of this new type of intergovernmental institution.

In December 1970, Congress enacted the Susquehanna River Basin Compact (New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland and the United States) and the President signed it into law so that there are now two interstate-federal river basin management compacts. A third; the Potomac River Basin Compact (Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, the District of Columbia and the United States) has been enacted by Virginia and Maryland. Action by the other two States and by the Congress to effect membership of the federal government and on behalf of the District of Columbia has not yet occurred and consequently, at this writing, the compact is not in operation. Possibly even more important than these innovative provisions are some of the circumstances surrounding federal joinder in Susquehanna.

When in 1961, the Delaware Compact gained the endorsement of the then national Administration, it was carefully specified that the action was not to be...
regarded as a precedent. Of course no such statement can be taken literally. It must have been clear then as now that if this first example of an interstate-federal compact made its own way, others were likely to be considered. Nevertheless, the basic principle of the Delaware Compact—coordination of federal, state, local and private actions affecting the interstate resources of a major river basin—was still questionable in the minds of some federal agencies which may prefer a more independent position for themselves. The Susquehanna Compact came to Congress at the start of a new federal Administration. Its members were largely unfamiliar with the interstate-federal compact idea and with the history of the Delaware experience. As part of a comprehensive study of federal-state relations undertaken at White House level, the proper attitude of the Administration toward such compacts in general and toward the Susquehanna instance in particular was subjected to lengthy examination. In April 1970, speaking through the Secretary of the Interior, the Administration announced its support of interstate-federal compacts and of the Susquehanna River Basin Compact. Nevertheless, there were still accommodations to be worked out in the reservations portion of the federal enacting legislation.

The most stubborn bone of contention was a provision desired by the Federal Power Commission to the effect that regardless of what the compact said, the independent federal regulatory agencies and their licensees were to be amenable only to those agencies. Nevertheless, as enacted, the federal statute specifically provides that the compact procedures of project submission and approval by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission must be followed.

A somewhat similar problem arose on the eve of the passage of the compact in Congress. A provision was inserted relating to the Susquehanna River Basin in the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Bill just before that measure went to the floor. It authorized the Army Engineers to continue and expand a study of the Susquehanna Basin that was thought to be at an end. It further directed the Corps to report any projects that might eventuate from the expanded study directly to Congress for authorization. However, in conference committee the language of this provision was modified to require that only projects approved by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission be presented to Congress for authorization. The conference report specifically explained the change by noting that the principle and purpose of the compact were to be honored.

In an entirely different field, there is now an example of compact participation by the United States as a full party. The Agreement on Detainers has been enacted by Congress both for the United States and for the District of Columbia. By the time of the 1970 congressional enactment, 28 States were participants in this compact which had been developed by the States some years before.

It should be noted that this compact had gone into operation among the parties with the first state enactments. It was not necessary for States to consider whether the Agreement on Detainers required congressional consent because the Crime Control Act of 1934 already provides consent in advance in broad terms to crime control compacts. While the congressional action of 1970 was concerned only with making the United States a party to an agreement among the States, it transformed that instrument into an interstate-federal compact open to membership by all the States, Territories and possessions—in short, a potentially nationwide, interlevel, interjurisdictional agreement. Considered together with river basin development this new use of interstate-federal compacts raises the possibility of the employment of such instruments in other fields, regulatory and administrative as well as facilitative, in providing better structured integration of federal-state coordination, not only regionally but available to all States.

INTERNATIONAL USE

Besides the growing range of the compact as an instrument of interlevel or vertical coordination, it has recently achieved a new dimension in interstate or horizontal coordination. Back in 1949
the States of the Northeast joined in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact which, among other things, established an essential legal base for rendering aid by stipulating the powers and immunities of aiding forces acting in the territory of another compacting jurisdiction. The agreement consented to by Congress at that time authorizes joinder by Canadian provinces. In 1970 New Brunswick and Quebec, the two Canadian jurisdictions most concerned, joined the compact. By that action they became members, together with the six New England States and New York, of the Northeastern Forest Fire Protection Commission established by the agreement.

INTERSTATE ENVIRONMENT COMPACT

A proposed Interstate Environment Compact is a novel interstate agreement in that it contains no substantive provisions but is designed solely to provide an expeditious means in stipulated situations for state enactment of and congressional consent to compacts to protect the environment. A criticism which has been made of the use of the compact device is that it entails a slow process of enactment. While any such broad generalization on this point is, of course, subject to many qualifications, as for example the character of the agreement, the environmental compact would assure prompt action at two vital points: enactment by State Legislatures and consent by Congress. Under its terms, Governors of States which become party to the compact are empowered to enter into supplementary agreements, which upon their signatures become immediately binding, to combat "interstate environmental pollution." The compact defines this term as pollution of a body of water crossing or marking a state boundary, pollution of a federally designated air quality control region, a solid waste disposal program participated in by more than one State or "land use practice affecting the environment of more than one State." The Legislature in the State whose Governor enters into such an arrangement is to review the agreement at its next session "competent to consider the same" and "approve, disapprove or condition the agreement."

Congressional consent to compacts has been criticized by the States and specifically by a 1957 study of the State Attorneys General both as delaying the compact effectuation and occasioning uncertainties in the consent process. The proposed federal consent legislation for this compact seeks to solve that problem with relation to the supplementary agreements it authorizes by a clause stating "Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to limit the right of Congress by Act of law expressly enacted thereafter for that purpose to disapprove or condition such a supplementary agreement."

It is interesting that in considerable degree this compact was shaped at the national level in the form of a Congressional Consent Act largely anticipating rather than following state action. The procedures it set forth with respect to state enactment of and congressional consent to supplementary agreements are not a new development. The Interstate Civil Defense and Disaster Compact enacted by all but three States and consented to by Congress in the early 1950s authorizes gubernatorial entrance into supplementary agreements without any legislative action or congressional review but includes other substantive provisions. The Interstate Environment Compact, however, is the first compact with the sole purpose of providing an expediting procedure for agreements entered into under its aegis.

MASS TRANSIT

Because of the interstate character of many of our largest metropolitan areas, mass transit is a likely subject for compact activities. At various times through the years, it has been appropriate to report on developments in several urban regions, including those centering on New York, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and Kansas City. No new mass transit ventures via compact were initiated during the past two years. However, most of the metropolitan areas just mentioned saw one or more occurrences of interest in the time covered by this article.

The operation of Port Authority Trans
Hudson (PATH) by the Port of New York Authority, and that agency's activities in guaranteeing certain obligations of the Long Island Railroad are of some years standing. Nevertheless, the Port Authority has been under increasing pressure from the Governors of the two party States and local interests to become more heavily involved in mass transit. Accordingly, a study has been launched by the Authority to determine what additional role it can play. A specific example of a project which 1971 legislation in both New York and New Jersey authorized the Port Authority to undertake in this field is the development and operation of rapid rail links to Kennedy and Newark airports.

The Delaware Port Authority has continued its activities in mass transit and now operates an interstate rapid rail line.

Financing of mass transit is an omnipresent problem. The past and present pressures on the Port of New York Authority have centered around this problem. The undertaking for the two Kansas Cities also faces the need for funds, and the Missouri Legislature has responded by providing for a special tax to be used for the benefit of the interstate transit program.

**PLANNING**

Regional planning and policy formulation has been given some attention in the past as a subject of compacts. New England undertook two efforts, each of which was reported in previous editions of this article for the appropriate time periods. The Northeastern-Water and Related Land Resources Compact (1959) was a proposal for a cooperative planning mechanism in an important but limited subject matter area. Several years after it failed to come into operation, the New England States formulated a comprehensive planning compact, the New England Interstate Planning Compact (1965), but its functions were largely assigned to other interstate and interstate-federal cooperative mechanisms before it could be placed in operation.

The New York, Philadelphia and Lake Tahoe regions have actually embarked upon compacts for comprehensive planning. Several of these developments will be discussed briefly. However, major attention is given here to the Southern Growth Policies Agreement because it is new and so has not been previously explained in these pages.

In April 1971, former Governor Terry Sanford of North Carolina made a speech to the L. Q. C. Lamar Society in Atlanta proposing a regional compact agency to assist the state governments of the South with policy formulation in matters of areawide concern. The emphasis was to be on problems related to growth. Traditionally, undertakings of this sort on the state and local levels have had an industrial development orientation. The Sanford proposal, which during the months following the April meeting was developed as an interstate agreement, has a different emphasis.

The Southern Growth Policies Agreement establishes a board of five members from each of the party States. A staff and appropriated funds requested on a formula basis also are authorized.

The Southern Growth Policies Board membership is noteworthy in that it consists of the Governor, two state legislators, and two citizen appointees of the Governor in each party State. The intention is clearly to facilitate high-level staff assistance in policy formulation on a regional basis.

Problems associated with growth patterns and phenomena constitute the Agreement's central theme. In many instances, the problem is anticipated to be how population shifts and attendant social, economic, natural resources and community affairs can be arranged to promote healthy expansion. In other instances, the limits of sound growth may have been reached or continued growth may be best on a selective basis only. The board is charged to consider all of these matters and to make studies and recommendations. An interesting feature of the Agreement is its requirement that within two years of the commencement of operations, the board is to have formulated a "Statement of Regional Objectives." This document is to be revised no less frequently than once every six years.

The means of placing the Agreement in
initial operation is the same as that followed for the Compact for Education under which the Education Commission of the States was established. Ultimately, legislative action is required, but a State may adopt the Agreement for an initial period not to extend past December 31, 1973, by gubernatorial action.

The Southern Growth Policies Agreement is open to participation by the 17 States from Delaware and Maryland on the Northeast to Texas and Oklahoma on the Southwest. The agreement became effective November 1971 when nine States adhered by the executive order route.

**Tahoe**

The 1969 California-Nevada Tahoe Regional Planning Compact is notable for the weight it gives to representation of local governments and for the considerable measure of joint land-use regulation of Lake Tahoe and environs it envisions. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, formed in March 1970, "is directed to adopt and enforce a regional plan of resource conservation and orderly development and to effect the environmental controls through 19 ordinances as defined in the compact." It says of its role, "The basic concept is a simple one—to provide for the region as a whole the planning, conservation and resource development essential to accommodate the people within the region's relatively small area without destroying the environment." For the purposes of planning and implementation the agency is comprised of a governing body and an Advisory Planning Commission. Upon the basis of a massive environmental study, a plan was developed and presented in May 1971 which would affect all levels of government although, since the compact is interstate, federal lands are not subject to agency control. The plan, which among other things envisioned approximately 34,000 acres of private lands being removed from urban development and a limit on population, occasioned controversy with the California members favoring broad acceptance immediately and those from Nevada arguing that the legal notice prior to hearing did not cover adoption of all the proposals at this juncture. The compact, its jurisdictional composition, procedures, powers and plan together constitute a remarkable planning approach.

Several other developments related to regional planning and coordination deserve notice. In 1971 the Tri-State Transportation Commission (New Jersey, New York and Connecticut) became the Tri-State Regional Planning Commission. The compact under which the agency functions was amended to convert it from a transportation study commission to a comprehensive planning agency. Another significant change is that the commission, which until now has been a temporary agency, was made permanent.

The provisions of the Air Quality Act of 1967 relating to the delineation of air quality control regions by the Environmental Protection Agency were an invitation to state-federal and interstate-federal cooperation of a specialized kind. Under the act, designation by States of a coordinating agency for an air quality control region makes the agency eligible for federal grants to support the coordinating work. In June 1970, the Interstate Sanitation Commission (a joint agency of New Jersey, New York and Connecticut for water and air quality management) was designated by the three States to perform this function for the Greater New York air quality control region and applied for a grant. To date it has not yet been awarded despite the fact that the applicant commission is the only such coordinating agency in existence designated pursuant to the act.

Clearly, the compact instrument offers a valuable tool for planning and land-use controls in interstate areas. With approximately half of our 20 largest metropolitan areas interstate in character, increasing use of this constitutional instrument for these purposes seems both desirable and likely.
REPRESENTATIVE INTERSTATE COMMISSIONS

ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

Organization: Organized in 1942 under the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact.

Purpose: To promote the better utilization of the fisheries—marine, shell and anadromous—of the Atlantic Seaboard by the development of a joint program for the promotion and protection of such fisheries, and by the prevention of physical waste of the fisheries from any cause.

Member States: North Atlantic Section: Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut; Middle Atlantic Section: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania; Chesapeake Bay Section: Maryland, Virginia; South Atlantic Section: North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida. The representatives of the individual States on the commission comprise: ex officio, the executive officer of the State’s fisheries agency dealing with marine species; a member of the Legislature, appointed by the Commission on Interstate Cooperation; a citizen having knowledge of and interest in the marine fisheries, appointed by the Governor.

Executive Director: Irwin M. Alperin.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Organization: Organized in 1961 under the Delaware River Basin Compact.

Purpose: To plan, develop and manage the water resources of the four-state Delaware River Basin for flood control, water supply, pollution control, water-based recreation, fish and wildlife, hydroelectric power, soil conservation, forestation and watershed management.

Compact Signatories: Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and the United States. Each has one representative. The state members, serving ex officio, are the Governors. The federal representative and alternate are appointed by the President. Each Governor designates his alternate, who serves with full voting powers.

Chairman, 1971–72: Russell W. Peterson, Governor of Delaware.
Executive Director: James F. Wright.
Commission Headquarters: 25 State Police Drive, P.O. Box 360, Trenton, New Jersey 08603.
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DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY

Organization: Organized in 1952, succeeding the Delaware River Joint Commission, under the Delaware River Port Authority Compact.

Purpose: The port authority is a public corporate instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey for public purposes deemed essential to improved governmental functions. It operates and maintains the Benjamin Franklin and Walt Whitman Bridges across the Delaware River, is concerned with port problems and operates the Philadelphia-Lindenwold Rapid Transit Line.

Member States: Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Their representatives on the port authority are appointed by the Governors and approved by the Senates, except that in Pennsylvania the Auditor General and State Treasurer are members ex officio.


Acting Executive Director: C. H. McWilliams.

Authority Headquarters: Administration Building, Benjamin Franklin Bridge Plaza, Camden, New Jersey 08101.

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

Organization: Organized in 1966 under the Compact for Education.

Purpose: To serve as an interstate body in which governmental leaders and educators can jointly explore means for improvement of education at all levels in each of the States, and to sponsor studies and make recommendations pointed to those objectives.

Member States: As of December 1971, 41 States and two Territories were members as a result of legislative action adopting the compact. The commission is composed of seven members from each of the party States; these include the Governor, in most cases two legislators chosen by the Legislature, and four appointees of the Governor.


Executive Director: Dr. Wendell H. Pierce.

Commission Headquarters: Suite 300, Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.

GREAT LAKES COMMISSION


Purpose: To coordinate management of the water resources of the Great Lakes Basin and to make recommendations with respect to their use.

Member States: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. Each State designates from three to five members of the commission, and each State has three votes in the commission.


Executive Director: Col. Leonard J. Goodsell.
GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

Organization: Organized in 1949 under the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Compact.

Purpose: To promote better utilization of the fisheries—marine, shell and anadromous—of the sea board of the Gulf of Mexico, by development of a joint program for their promotion and protection and for prevention of physical waste of the fisheries from any cause.

Member States: Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas. The representatives of each State on the commission comprise the head of the state administrative agency charged with conservation of the fishery resources to which the compact pertains; a member of the Legislature, designated by it or by the Governor; and a citizen with knowledge of marine fisheries and interest in them, appointed by the Governor.


Executive Director: Joseph V. Colson.

Commission Headquarters: 521 St. Louis Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Organization: Organized in 1941 under the Interstate Compact on the Potomac River Basin.

Purpose: To conserve the water and land resources of the Potomac River Basin through water pollution control.

Member States: Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia, in addition to the District of Columbia and the federal government. The States' representatives on the commission are appointed by the Governors of the respective States.


Executive Director: Carl J. Johnson.


INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION

Organization: Organized in 1935 under the Interstate Oil Compact.

Purpose: The conservation of oil and gas by prevention of physical waste.


Executive Secretary: W. Timothy Dowd.
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INTERSTATE SANITATION COMMISSION

Organization: Organized in 1936 under the Tri-State Compact.

Purpose: Created for the control of future water pollution and abatement of existing pollution in the tidal and coastal waters of the signatory States. In 1961 the commission was authorized to engage in certain activities with respect to interstate air pollution of New York and New Jersey. In 1969, Connecticut joined the interstate air pollution activities. In 1970, the States designated the commission as the planning and coordinating agency for the Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York air quality control region.

Member States: Connecticut, New Jersey and New York. There are five Commissioners from each State, appointed by the Governors with the consent of the Senates, except a few Commissioners who are named ex officio.


Executive Secretary: Thomas R. Glenn, Jr.

Commission Headquarters: 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

MULTISTATE TAX COMMISSION

Organization: Organized in 1967 under the Multistate Tax Compact.

Purpose: To promote uniformity and equity in the administration of state and local tax laws with respect to multistate business. The commission provides a state-level agency which receives multistate tax problems from both business and the States, studies those problems, holds hearings, and adopts and puts into operation rules and regulations for the purpose of solving those problems.


Associate Member States: Alabama, Arizona, California, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia.

Chairman, 1971-72: Charles H. Mack, Director of Revenue, Oregon.

Executive Director: Eugene F. Corrigan.

Commission Headquarters: 1909 26th Street, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

NEW ENGLAND BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION


Purpose: To provide greater educational opportunities and services through a coordinated program for the persons in New England. The board assists the States, institutions and agencies concerned with higher education in efforts to advance the academic, social and economic level of New England.

Member States: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Is-
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land and Vermont. Members of the board are appointed in accordance with legislation adopted by the individual States. A few are ex officio, others appointed by the Governors, Speakers of the House, and Presidents of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND DIRECTOR: ALAN D. FERGUSON.
BOARD HEADQUARTERS: 20 Walnut Street, Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181.

NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1947 under the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Compact.

PURPOSE: To coordinate the work of the member States in the control of pollution of interstate waters; to establish water quality standards and approve classifications for such waters.

MEMBER STATES: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont. There are five representatives from each of the signatory States, appointed in the manner and for the terms provided by the ratification legislation of the States.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: ALFRED E. PELOQUIN.
COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS: 607 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116.

NORTHEASTERN FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMMISSION

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1949 under the Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact.

PURPOSE: To promote forest fire prevention and suppression; including mutual aid in time of emergency and uniform training of personnel.

MEMBER STATES: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, and the Provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick. There are three Commissioners from each State: (1) the State official in charge of forest fire protection; (2) a representative of the State’s joint committee on interstate cooperation; and (3) a personal representative of the Governor.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: MILTON C. STOCKING.
COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS: 196 Bushy Hill Road, Simsbury, Connecticut 06070.

OHIO RIVER VALLEY WATER SANITATION COMMISSION

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1948 under the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Compact.

PURPOSE: To control future pollution and to abate existing pollution of the waters of the Ohio River Valley.

MEMBER STATES: Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia. The States’ representatives on the commission are ap
pointed by the Governors of the respective States. In Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio and West Virginia, the Director of Health serves as one of the State's three Commissioners, ex officio. In New York the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Conservation serves ex officio. In Pennsylvania the Secretary of the Department of Environmental Resources serves ex officio. The three Commissioners for Virginia are appointed by the Governor from the membership of the State Water Control Board. Commission membership also includes three Commissioners representing the United States government, appointed by the President.


EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND CHIEF ENGINEER: Robert K. Horton.

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS: 414 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1947 under the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact.

PURPOSE: To promote the wise management, development and utilization of marine, shell, and anadromous fisheries which are of mutual concern, and to develop joint programs of protection, enhancement, and prevention of physical waste of such fisheries, through coordinated research and management projects, development of compatible fishery regulations based on sound ecological principles, and communication of joint positions on current issues to Congress, the legislative bodies of the compact States, concerned agencies of government, and the private sector.

MEMBER STATES: Alaska, California, Idaho, Oregon and Washington. Their representatives on the commission are selected on the basis designated in the enabling legislation of each State.


EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: John P. Harville.

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS: 342 State Office Building, 1400 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97201.

PALISADES INTERSTATE PARK COMMISSION

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1937 under the Palisades Interstate Park Compact, succeeding the Commissioners of the Palisades Interstate Park.

PURPOSE: To exercise jurisdiction over the Palisades Interstate Park in New Jersey and New York, and the Palisades Interstate Parkway in New Jersey and New York, to provide recreational facilities in the park and to preserve its natural beauty.

MEMBER STATES: New Jersey and New York. There are ten members of the commission, five appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate of each State.


GENERAL MANAGER: Nash Castro.

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS: Administration Building, Bear Mountain, New York 10911.
PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY

Organization: Organized in 1921 by compact between New Jersey and New York.

Purpose: To operate as a self-supporting agency of the two States, which plans, finances, develops and operates terminal, transportation and other facilities of commerce in the Port of New York District and promotes and protects the commerce of the port district.

Member States: New Jersey and New York. There are six Commissioners from each State, appointed by the Governors.


Executive Director: Austin J. Tobin.

Authority Headquarters: 111 Eighth Avenue at 15th Street, New York, New York 10011.

SOUTHCENTRAL INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT COMMISSION


Purpose: To promote prevention and control of forest fires by the development of integrated forest fire plans and providing for mutual aid in fighting forest fires among the compacting States.

Member States: Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma and Texas. The commission is composed of five members from each State: the State Forester, or officer holding the equivalent position, who also serves as Compact Administrator for the State; and four persons who serve as advisors to the Compact Administrator. Advisory members from each State include one State Senator, one Representative, the Chairman of the State Forestry Commission or comparable official, and one member associated with forestry or forest products industries.


Permanent Secretary: Lambert H. Romero, Louisiana.

Commission Headquarters: Louisiana Forestry Commission, P.O. Box 15239, Broadview Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70815.

SOUTHEASTERN STATES FOREST FIRE COMPACT COMMISSION


Purpose: To promote prevention and control of forest fires by the development of integrated forest fire plans and providing for mutual aid in fighting forest fires among the compacting States.

Member States: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia. The commission is composed of the Compact Administrator of each of the member States, who is usually the State Forester, and members of advisory committees in each of these States.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

COORDINATOR-SECRETARY: JAMES E. MOORE.

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS: The Chairman's office serves as commission headquarters during his term of office. Mr. Lack is State Forester, Mississippi Forestry Commission, 908 Robert E. Lee Building, Jackson, Mississippi 39201.

SOUTHERN INTERSTATE NUCLEAR BOARD

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1961 under the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact.

PURPOSE: To foster cooperation among signatories of the compact for obtaining statewide and regional benefits from the use of nuclear, space and related technologies.

MEMBER STATES: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

CHAIRMAN, 1971–72: DANIEL S. EPPLESHEIMER, MISSOURI.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: JAMES T. GOODWIN.

BOARD HEADQUARTERS: Suite 104, 7 Dunwoody Park, Atlanta, Georgia 30341.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1949 under the Southern Regional Education Compact.

PURPOSE: To assist States, institutions and agencies concerned with higher education in their efforts to advance knowledge and to improve the social and economic level of the Southern region.

MEMBER STATES: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia. The board is composed of the 14 Governors and four persons appointed by each of them.

CHAIRMAN, 1971–72: JIMMY CARTER, GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA.

PRESIDENT: DR. WINFRED L. GODWIN.

BOARD HEADQUARTERS: 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION

ORGANIZATION: Organized in 1919 under the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact.

PURPOSE: To represent the Upper Division States of the Colorado River Basin in interstate matters pertaining to the Colorado River.

MEMBER STATES: Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming. Their representatives on the commission are appointed by the Governors of the respective States. The Chairman is appointed by the President of the United States.

CHAIRMAN, 1971–72: H. P. DUGAN, COMMISSIONER FOR THE UNITED STATES.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: IVAL V. GOSLIN.

COMMISSION HEADQUARTERS: 355 South 4th East Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.
VEHICLE EQUIPMENT SAFETY COMMISSION


Purpose: To study research and other data relative to vehicle equipment safety, issue reports on equipment studies, hold hearings on proposed recommendations, and make recommendations to the member States for legislative or administrative action.

Member States: Forty-three States and the District of Columbia.


Executive Director: Harry H. Brainerd.

Commission Headquarters: Room 412, 1026 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Organization: Organized in 1951 under the Western Regional Education Compact.

Purpose: Regional cooperation to increase educational opportunities; to help colleges and universities improve their academic programs and institutional management; to aid in expanding specialized manpower for the West; and to inform the public on higher educational needs.

Member States: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming. Their representatives on the commission are appointed by the Governors.

Chairman, 1971–72: Dr. Francis A. Barrett, Wyoming.

Executive Director: Dr. Robert H. Kroepsch.

Commission Headquarters: University East Campus, Thirtieth Street, Boulder, Colorado. Direct mail to: P.O. Drawer P, Boulder, Colorado 80302.
Federal-State Relations

SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS IN FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

By Sylvia V. Hewitt and Margaret W. Wilhide*

THE INDICTMENT of the States has been both serious and long lasting. States have been accused of timidity and indecisiveness. They have been accused of being unresponsive and uninterested in the plights of other units of government. They have been accused not only of ignoring the problems of others but of the inability to face their own problems.

They have been, at varying intervals, guilty of all of these. But so have all levels of government. The States, as a vital force within the federal system, must continue as viable organs or the entire system will collapse.

With this realization, the States began in the sixties to take a hard look at their role within the federal system. State government had reached a crossroads. Doleful predictions about the demise of state government abounded. But change was in the wind. The States began to realize that they must play a major role within the federal system. Federal programs which had bypassed the States were achieving no regional or statewide success. Hundreds of small categorical grants were having little nationwide impact.

At this point, federal officials started to look again toward the States. The States, in turn, recognized the vital coordination role which they must play and a trend toward decentralization began.

This trend will continue through the seventies. The States are now not only asking, but demanding, a more influential role within the system. State politicians want a voice in federal decisions which affect the States and many Washington politicians are actively seeking ways to return to the States and localities the power and resources for dealing with urgent domestic problems.

Both general revenue sharing and welfare reform measures are pending before Congress. While neither became law in 1971, both measures have retained far more support than was possible in the early sixties. Late in 1971, Congress did pass a limited welfare reform by establishing work requirements for welfare recipients.

Sharing of federal revenues with States and local governments in the form of unrestricted general revenue sharing funds, combined with broad-purpose special revenue sharing grants without matching requirements, were major points of the President's budget request for 1972.

Also included in that request was fundamental reform of the welfare system in 1973 by applying national eligibility standards, improving work incentives, broadening coverage to the working poor, and providing fiscal relief to the States.

Both revenue sharing and welfare reform received the support of the National Governors' Conference.

State and local governments have been faced with critical financial problems in recent years. "Money" has been the prime source of frustration to state governments.

*Mrs. Hewitt and Mrs. Wilhide are members of the staff of the Washington office of the Council of State Governments.
across the country. An imbalance between demands for higher levels of public services and funds available to finance these services has plagued the States for years. State and local governments now collect only 36 percent of the tax dollars but make 70 percent of the outlays for domestic programs.

State governments have not been negligent in raising funds to support their own budgets. During the 11-year period from 1959 to 1969, the 50 State Legislatures enacted some 36 new taxes and increased tax rates on existing levies on over 300 occasions. Thirty-six States raised rates of at least one tax or submitted revenue-raising proposals to the voters in 1969. This augmented tax receipts by $4 billion. An additional 12 States raised taxes in early 1970. In 1971, more than 30 States raised tax rates. In the last 10 years State tax revenues have risen from $19 billion to an estimated $51.5 billion in 1971.

From 1958 to 1968 percentage increases in tax revenues in all three levels were: federal government, 73 percent; state government, 144 percent; local government, 101 percent. Tax collections by state and local governments in 23 States are now past the $1 billion per year mark. State and local government receipts from their own sources rose from a wartime low of 4.8 percent of the gross national product in 1944 to 10.5 percent in 1969, but the demand for expanded services rose even faster.

The response of the federal government to these fiscal problems has been to increase federal grants from $2 billion in 1950 to $24 billion in 1970. Federal aid, as a portion of state and local revenue, has risen from 13 percent in 1960 to an estimated 22 percent in 1972. The results have been profound—federal grants greatly contributed to raising the standards and levels of state services, improved the national highway network, and helped professionalize state and local government personnel. While effective in many instances, this rapid growth in categorical federal grants—in the neighborhood of 1,000 separate grants—has, in itself, created many undesirable problems.

Problems overlap at the state and local level. Red tape and program delays are frequent. The federal government has placed unnecessary limitations on the authority and responsibility of Governors and has created unfortunate competitive associations between state and local government. In addition, increases in federal grant funds, though needed, place increased demands on already strained state budgets which must provide matching requirements.

Only under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 has the federal government attempted a major block grant approach to solving state problems. While in the initial years block grants were confused and difficult to administer, this approach has weathered initial storms and is likely to become a successful venture into a new role for the federal system. Officials are beginning to realize that problems can often be seen clearer and solved easier with state and local initiative and administration coupled with federal funds and only broad federal guidelines. The States are willing to accept the new responsibilities which are inherent in improvements in the grant-in-aid system, block grants and revenue sharing.

In addition, a long-needed overhaul of management processes in federal aid and other programs is being carried out. The regional boundaries of the major domestic departments of the federal government have been modified so that their headquarter cities and the regions they cover conform. This facilitates cooperation between federal agencies and makes it easier for grant-recipients to contact the different agencies they must deal with.

Reorganization is under way at both the federal and state level. Bills are now pending in Congress to reorganize federal agencies by missions. Under the proposal, federal agencies which deal with common or closely related problems would work together in the same organizational framework.

Four bills pending before Congress would replace six of the present executive departments and several other agencies with four new departments: the Department of Natural Resources, the Depart-
ment of Community Development, the Department of Human Resources and the Department of Economic Affairs.

An Office of Intergovernmental Relations has also been created within the Office of the Vice President. Several trends to decentralize the federal government have become apparent. For example, revision of grant program procedures is under way; overhaul of manpower training programs is under way; and revenue sharing is gaining a stronger foothold.

Legislation is pending that would authorize the President to consolidate closely related programs, simplify funding of closely related grants within agencies, and authorize joint funding of projects across agency lines.

In addition, state government reorganization is a prime issue. Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Vermont and Wisconsin were among those States that acted in the seven-year period 1965–71 to reduce the number of their governmental agencies.

North Carolina, for example, reduced over 300 separate agencies to a total of 17 in 1971. Regional organizations, multi-county regions, regional councils of government, and state planning districts are being set up within the States to facilitate intercounty–intercity cooperative development. Sorting out appropriate government roles, improving basic programs, and modernizing management are receiving top priority. These efforts at the state and federal level can make federal-state cooperation a far more workable relationship than it has been in the past.

In recent years, the States have also evidenced a steadily improving management capacity. Within the proliferation of intergovernmental programs, it has become increasingly difficult for state officials to keep abreast. Sophisticated information systems are necessary to enable States to know which grants are available and at what funding level. (For example, the Council of State Governments in analyzing federal appropriations between 1966 and 1970 found that authorizations for 169 federal-aid programs rose from $14 billion to $24 billion while appropriations for these programs increased from $11.6 billion to only $15.9 billion.) This growing divergence between authorizations and appropriations left a dollar gap that totaled $2.7 billion in 1966 and $8.4 billion in fiscal 1970.

As federal-state participation increased, these information systems became increasingly important and resulted ultimately in the issuance of U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circulars A-95 and A-98.

OMB Circular A-95, to implement the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, is aimed at improving the ability of elected officials, especially Governors, to strengthen state and area-wide planning and program coordination. It established procedures for state and regional review for intergovernmental impact the grant applications of some 50 programs. At first, officials anticipated an inundation of useless paper work. However, the program in operation has shown that it is not a burden. The States are just beginning to use the procedure to its fullest extent which, if this implementation continues, will mean that A-95 can have a major impact on state planning and budgeting.

Better information on grants is necessary to planning and coordination of grant prospects. OMB Circular A-98, developed in 1970, is designed to provide information on grant allocations and awards by establishing standard reporting procedures for providing such information to Governors and Legislatures. Each State has established an information center to receive federal data under A-98.

A third OMB Circular (A-97) has aided States in improving their technical and special services staffs. The Civil Service Commission, under A-97, has opened its training programs to state personnel. Between January 1969 and December 1970 more than 8,000 state and local employees participated in these sessions.

Though state governments have been generally frustrated with congressional reluctance to pass general revenue sharing or welfare reform, 1970–71 congressional action has provided a number of measures which will benefit the States.

—Preservation of regional development organizations (such as the Appalachian
Regional Commission), final eligibility of
state housing agencies for federal housing
funds, and the Intergovernmental Per­
sonnel Act, are valuable to the States.
—State roles are included in the Com­
prehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcohol
Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilita­
tion Act of 1970, the Comprehensive Drug
Abuse and Prevention Control Act of
1970 and Drug Abuse Education Act of
1970. Amendments to the 1968 Omnibus
Crime Control and Safe Streets Act con­
tinue the state role but adoption of a
state buy-in concept results in a serious
loss of the exercise of discretion in the
allocation of the revenues by the States.
—The Disaster Relief Act of 1970 re­
vises and broadens existing major disaster
relief programs and provides for de velop­
ment and maintenance grants for States;
—Eighteen year olds were granted vot­
ing privileges by the 26th Amendment in
1971.
—The environment was a major issue
during 1970-71 with clean air, water qual­
ity improvement educational grants to
States supporting environment programs,
and creation of the Environmental Pro­
tection Agency and the National Oceanic
and Atmospheric Administration as part
of the drive to eliminate hazards to the
environment.
—The Family Planning Services and
Population Research Act authorizes for­
mula grants to all state health authorities
for family planning services and project
grants to other public or nonprofit private
organizations to assist in the establish­
ment and operation of voluntary family
planning projects.
“The Office of Federal-State Relations
for the Council of State Governments sees
broad possibilities for increased state roles
in the federal system,” said Charles A.
Byrley, director of the office, which is lo­
cated in Washington. “The States can
and must be a voice of leadership. State
government must be the coordinating
mechanism within the federal system. No
other level of government has the perspec­
tive and balance of administrative, legal,
financial and constitutional tools of state
officials to solve the major financial and
social issues now facing the States.”
A new era of governmental reform has
now begun. The States will again take
their rightful place within the federal
system.
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

PERCENTAGE OF STATE AND LOCAL GENERAL EXPENDITURE
FINANCED BY STATE GOVERNMENTS FROM OWN REVENUE SOURCES
BY STATE, 1968-69

(Total and for selected functions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total general expenditure</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>Public welfare</th>
<th>Health and hospitals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All States (a)</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Percentages for total general expenditure, highways, public welfare, and health and hospitals were derived from Census data on expenditures adjusted to exclude federal intergovernmental transfers. State transfers to local governments are included with state expenditures and deducted from local expenditures. The education percentages were derived from estimated receipts available for expenditure for current expenses, capital outlay, and debt service for public elementary and secondary schools as reported by the National Education Association. Census data for education expenditures were not readily available.

(a) Excluding the District of Columbia. The totals including D.C. are: Total general expenditure, 50.9; Education, 44.1; Highways, 72.8; Public welfare, 74.1; and Health and hospitals, 31.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or other jurisdiction</th>
<th>Elementary &amp; secondary education</th>
<th>Highway</th>
<th>Public welfare</th>
<th>Health &amp; hospitals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent financed from Federal aid</td>
<td>Percent financed from State funds</td>
<td>Percent financed from Local funds</td>
<td>Percent financed from Federal aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6.7 40.8 52.5</td>
<td>27.5 52.8 19.7</td>
<td>53.7 34.3 12.0</td>
<td>5.1 48.5 46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>14.5 63.0(b) 22.5</td>
<td>30.8 58.1 11.1</td>
<td>73.0 25.1 1.8</td>
<td>8.5 39.3 52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>25.7 43.7 30.6</td>
<td>57.5 33.1 9.3</td>
<td>39.8 60.2 ...</td>
<td>16.2 56.4 28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>8.7 47.5 43.7</td>
<td>39.2 50.4 10.5</td>
<td>64.3 29.4 6.3</td>
<td>7.9 30.6 61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>17.1 45.5 37.5</td>
<td>13.4 60.9 6.0</td>
<td>74.4 24.8 0.8</td>
<td>17.2 45.4 37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>5.2 35.0 59.8</td>
<td>20.5 61.3 18.1</td>
<td>49.7 36.2 14.1</td>
<td>2.5 36.1 61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>6.4 25.3 68.3</td>
<td>41.6 37.8 20.5</td>
<td>51.6 38.3 10.2</td>
<td>5.4 55.7 39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3.7 33.1 63.2</td>
<td>29.0 51.3 19.5</td>
<td>44.5 51.0 4.5</td>
<td>3.5 87.0 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>7.6 70.6 21.8</td>
<td>14.7 38.1 47.3</td>
<td>62.2 49.6 8.2</td>
<td>11.3 85.4 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>9.1 56.5 34.4</td>
<td>21.6 56.9 21.5</td>
<td>69.3 19.7 11.0</td>
<td>7.3 29.9 62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>10.6 58.7 30.7</td>
<td>32.1 41.1 26.8</td>
<td>73.9 21.6 4.5</td>
<td>6.5 33.8 59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>9.1 87.0 3.9</td>
<td>37.1 34.1 28.7</td>
<td>40.3 59.4 0.3</td>
<td>11.0 67.8 21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>7.7 43.2 49.1</td>
<td>40.4 46.3 13.1</td>
<td>58.1 30.2 11.6</td>
<td>20.6 28.5 50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>5.0 34.4 60.5</td>
<td>27.9 55.6 16.5</td>
<td>68.1 31.9 ...</td>
<td>3.8 59.6 36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4.1 34.9 61.0</td>
<td>40.5 53.9 5.5</td>
<td>41.7 28.2 30.1</td>
<td>6.3 47.5 46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4.0 30.6(e) 65.0</td>
<td>16.9 58.9 24.1</td>
<td>43.6 34.9 21.5</td>
<td>4.5 33.2 62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>7.4 27.1 65.5</td>
<td>24.1 38.3 37.6</td>
<td>60.6 39.4 ...</td>
<td>6.0 55.6 38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>13.8 52.6 33.6</td>
<td>40.0 54.5 5.5</td>
<td>75.7 23.4 1.9</td>
<td>6.1 52.1 41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>10.8 58.3 30.9</td>
<td>32.0 39.2 28.8</td>
<td>72.4 27.1 0.5</td>
<td>5.8 66.8 26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>5.4 44.9(d) 49.8</td>
<td>23.0 49.9 27.2</td>
<td>59.2 33.3 7.5</td>
<td>6.5 76.9 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6.4 35.2(e) 59.4</td>
<td>21.8 65.7 12.6</td>
<td>44.7 48.2 7.1</td>
<td>3.2 57.1 39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>6.0 20.0 74.0</td>
<td>31.7 35.9 32.4</td>
<td>29.9 43.5 26.6</td>
<td>3.8 58.1 38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3.9 55.1 31.0</td>
<td>28.1 58.1 13.8</td>
<td>44.1 45.1 10.8</td>
<td>4.8 46.9 48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5.4 43.4 51.2</td>
<td>25.1 46.6 28.4</td>
<td>51.5 20.2 28.3</td>
<td>3.8 47.8 49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>22.0 51.6 26.4</td>
<td>26.9 47.8 25.3</td>
<td>68.9 28.0 3.1</td>
<td>1.3 35.4 50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6.3 34.5 59.2</td>
<td>24.2 55.1 20.6</td>
<td>63.0 34.7 2.4</td>
<td>4.5 52.2 43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>5.8 30.9 63.2</td>
<td>49.4 31.7 18.7</td>
<td>47.5 25.4 27.1</td>
<td>12.1 54.4 34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>6.4 20.0 75.6</td>
<td>24.0 45.6 30.4</td>
<td>72.1 22.9 ...</td>
<td>9.0 24.4 66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6.0 39.2 54.8</td>
<td>52.4 33.7 13.7</td>
<td>55.9 18.5 25.7</td>
<td>7.4 14.1 78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>4.2 8.5(f) 87.2</td>
<td>27.6 41.9 30.5</td>
<td>40.7 22.5 36.8</td>
<td>7.8 73.3 18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>4.3 28.7 71.3</td>
<td>20.4 57.4 22.4</td>
<td>44.6 50.2 5.2</td>
<td>3.4 37.0 59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>14.0 62.7 23.3</td>
<td>50.6 35.3 14.0</td>
<td>73.3 28.3 0.3</td>
<td>10.5 40.7 48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3.5 45.4 51.1</td>
<td>20.1 47.2 32.2</td>
<td>51.9 33.2 14.9</td>
<td>1.5 49.7 48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>10.8 70.9 18.2</td>
<td>17.2 72.0 10.8</td>
<td>73.6 16.2 10.3</td>
<td>10.4 60.5 28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>8.1 27.2 65.8</td>
<td>32.2 38.9 28.9</td>
<td>65.0 23.1 9.9</td>
<td>11.3 81.7 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4.7 31.6 63.7</td>
<td>32.6 55.5 11.9</td>
<td>44.6 36.3 19.1</td>
<td>5.1 41.4 53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>46.9 (g)</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>30.2(h)</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures on highways, public welfare, and health and hospitals for 1968-69, compiled by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations from various reports of the Governmental Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census. Figures on elementary and secondary education estimates for school year 1969-70, from National Education Association, Research Division, Estimates of School Statistics, 1969-70. (Copyright 1969 by the National Education Association; all rights reserved.)

---

(a) Includes federal grant programs to state and local school systems, including funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Economic Opportunity Act, aid to federally impacted areas, National Defense Education Act, Manpower Development and Training, Vocational Education, etc. Funds received from the School Lunch and Milk Program are included, but reporting on the money value of commodities received is incomplete. ESEA revenues have generally been estimated on a cash expenditure basis.
(b) State revenue receipts include social security and teacher retirement for all educational agencies and institutions.
(c) Includes state appropriation for area vocational schools and junior colleges, responsibility of local school districts. Special state appropriation of $21,500,000 to change fiscal year of school districts.
(d) Excludes state's share of teacher retirement and social security.
(e) Excludes revenues for public junior colleges as this responsibility was transferred from state department to education.
(f) Excludes State's share of kindergarten.
(g) Federal revenue receipts include federal appropriations for capital outlay, civil defense, Capital Page School, and other federally funded programs listed in footnote (a) above.
STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS IN 1970-1971

BY GEORGE S. BLAIR*

STRENGTHENING LOCAL GOVERNMENT through mandatory or permissive structural change was a dominant theme in state legislative action across the Nation in 1970–71. Home-rule privileges were extended or strengthened in a number of States, and legislation was enacted to facilitate cooperative relations among units of government. New court decisions extended and clarified the application of the "one man, one vote" doctrine to apportionment of local legislative bodies. Important actions were also taken in the areas of state assistance to local governments, improving judicial administration, and in making state administrative structure more responsive to urban and community needs.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES

In its Twelfth Annual Report, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations stated that "Jurisdictional fragmentation has led to local government paralysis rather than to grass roots decision making." A report prepared by the Council of State Governments for the National Governors' Conference, also issued in 1971, points out some of the actions state governments have taken to correct the situation. In its Sub-State District Systems, the Council says that nearly all States have enacted legislation enabling local governments to exercise extraterritorial powers, engage in interlocal cooperation, and form regional planning commissions and councils of government. In addition, there has been special legislation enabling city-county consolidation, metropolitan federation, and more home-rule authority.

Still another device, says the report, has been the creation since 1963 of statewide sub-state district systems in more than 40 States, with over half created since 1967. "Sub-state districts have proven to be effective structures through which local elected officials can coordinate the use of federal, state and local resources in solving areawide problems," says the report. "While sub-state districts are essentially aggregates of local jurisdictions, state government plays a pivotal role in their creation and maintenance. Designation of district boundaries, enactment of enabling legislation, and provision of needed financial and technical support are unique capabilities of state government. The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 and Budget Circular A-95 emphasized the importance of multi-jurisdictional coordination, and impelled action toward the establishment of sub-state district systems."

Some examples of state legislative action during the years 1970–71 in meeting the challenge of local jurisdictional fragmentation follow. Some of the actions mandated changes while others were permissive legislation available to local governments wishing to use them.

Kansas legislation permits county com-

---

*Dr. Blair is Professor of Government and Chairman, Graduate Faculty in Government, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California.
missioners to consolidate townships in county-unit road system counties. Following hearings on a resolution of intent to disorganize existing townships, voters may prevent disorganization by filing a proper petition. Sixty-one of the 105 counties have county-unit road systems and are eligible to consolidate townships. For example, the 19 townships in Pratt County were reduced to 7 under this procedure.

Action in Michigan permits the state boundary commission to order annexation to home-rule cities. New Maine legislation permits the voluntary consolidation of two or more municipalities. To become effective, the proposed consolidation must be approved by a majority of voters in each affected municipality. City-county consolidation is now permitted in Kentucky counties containing cities of the second class.

Two city-county consolidations were accomplished in 1970. Voters approved a home-rule charter creating the city and borough of Juneau-Douglas, Alaska. The merger of Columbus and Muscogee County, Georgia, was approved by a large majority. These two consolidations bring the total to 10 since 1947. Voters in Volusia County (Daytona Beach), Florida, approved a home-rule charter providing for the consolidation with the county of 38 boards, districts, authorities, and agencies. No municipalities are included in the merger, but the county was granted the power of preemption with respect to protection of the environment.

Voters, in Washington County, Oregon, using their home-rule charter amendment powers, made the sheriff a nonpartisan office. Eligible candidates must be certified by the state board on police standards and training. Florida, Michigan, and New Mexico during the biennium each placed the function of county coroners in qualified medical hands. Typically, elective coroners were replaced by medically qualified coroners appointed by state medical examiners. Twenty-five States have now moved in this direction.

The new Illinois constitution provides that the sheriff, clerk, and treasurer must remain elective officers in Illinois counties. All other county officers may be eliminated or the method of their selection changed.

In other actions, a California amendment empowers county governing boards to set their own compensation by ordinance subject to referendum. Idaho established four-year terms for county treasurers and assessors, and Iowa repealed its provision requiring the election of county attorneys for two-year terms. New legislation in Texas permits the consolidation of offices and functions of local governments. Illinois counties are now required to appoint a supervisor of assessments on a merit system basis to coordinate the work of township assessors. Counties in Colorado are permitted to establish special taxing districts to finance services in portions of a county.

**Home Rule**

New constitutions in Illinois and Virginia strengthened local governments in those States. The Illinois constitution empowers counties to perform urban-type services. Any county electing a chief executive officer qualifies as a home-rule county. In Virginia, the local government article was shortened and clarified granting counties' organizational flexibility comparable to that of cities.

In other actions relating to county home rule, Missouri voters authorized citizens of charter counties to determine governmental services to be supplied by counties and communities in both incorporated and unincorporated areas. Also in Missouri, citizens of Jackson County (Kansas City) approved a home-rule charter—the second Missouri county to do so. The new government goes into operation January 1, 1973, and will feature an elected county executive and a 15-member governing board. A Maryland amendment eased the procedure for achieving county home rule, and two of Maryland's more populous counties adopted the county executive form. Colorado voters approved a constitutional amendment in November 1970 providing for county home rule.

Municipal home rule was also extended in a number of States. In February 1970, the Maine Legislature enacted legislation to implement the home rule
for municipalities amendment adopted in 1969. In the first municipal elections proposing implementation of home rule in North Dakota, voters in Fargo and Grand Forks approved charters in November 1970. Municipal home rule was also extended by a 1970 amendment in New Mexico.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION**

Significant developments occurred in the field of planning. The Legislatures of Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York established the Tri-State Regional Planning Commission by interstate compact. The new comprehensive planning agency encompasses the functions of land use, housing, public facilities, and transportation. The newly constituted board will have more locally elected officials. Montana enacted "new permissive planning and zoning legislation. Counties there are now empowered to create planning agencies and to undertake countywide planning. Cities are permitted to zone three miles beyond their boundaries if counties fail to exercise this authority. New Colorado legislation requires the creation of county planning commissions. In other planning actions, the Georgia Legislature created a planning commission for the five-county Atlanta metropolitan area and tri-county planning commissions were established in Illinois and Washington.

The Governor of Kansas designated 11 state development regions to facilitate intergovernmental cooperation and 11 such planning regions were also established by the Minnesota Governor. South Carolina voters approved an amendment permitting the establishment of and support for regional councils of government. The Interlocal Cooperation Act enacted in Texas grants broad contracting authority for a wide range of functions to be performed between and among state and local units, and local governments there are permitted to organize interstate, regional bodies and to cooperate with local governments in Mexico. The Massachusetts Metropolitan Area Planning Council was converted from a state agency into a body approximating a council of governments. Each of the member cities and towns appoints one member and the Governor appoints 21 members of the governing board. Colorado counties are permitted to establish multipurpose authorities that cross county lines.

Portland, Oregon, voters approved the formation of a metropolitan district to provide regional sewerage treatment and disposal, mass transit, and flood control services in a three-county area. Other services can be added to the district by affirmative vote of the people. A regional transit district for Denver and surrounding counties was approved by the Colorado Legislature.

**APPORTIONMENT**

The United States Supreme Court in a February 1970 decision extended the rule of one man, one vote. In *Hadley v. The Junior College District of Metropolitan Kansas City, Missouri*, the Court said, "When members of an elected board are chosen from elected districts each district must be established on the basis which will insure, as far as is practicable, that equal numbers of voters can vote for proportionately equal numbers of officials."

This apparent numerical rule, however, was softened by the Court in a June 1971 decision. In *Abate v. Mundt*, the Court upheld the apportionment of the Rockland County, New York, board of supervisors although there was a population disparity of 11.9 percent between the largest and smallest districts. Justice Marshall's opinion argued that the deviation did not violate the equal protection clause because of the "...long history, and a perceived need for, close cooperation between the county and its constituent towns." He further stated the practice contained no "built-in-bias" designed to favor particular interests or geographic areas.

The California Supreme Court went beyond current dictates of the U.S. Court in a March 1971 decision holding that one man, one vote means that the total population, not just registered voters, must be used as the basis for districting a city for election of councilmen. The decision voided a section of the Los Angeles City Charter apportioning districts
according to number of voters and permitting 10 percent deviation in district size. This deviation was ruled too large to be acceptable, but the court refused to give a more precise mathematical yardstick.

Illinois legislation required the reapportionment of county governing boards composed of township supervisors by July 1, 1971. The law provides that three methods may be used in restructuring county boards: (1) election at large, (2) single-member districting, or (3) a modified form of weighted voting. Reconstituted boards must have between 5 and 29 members, but no county can authorize more members for the new board than the board had previously.

**ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

The environment was a topic of interest and concern in a number of States. Connecticut established the Department of Environment to consolidate all pollution control activities by absorbing the functions of 16 major commissions and boards. The Vermont Legislature passed a "scenic easements" act allowing the State or a municipality to purchase or lease land in order to keep it open for public use, and other legislation to promote environment protection standards. In Georgia, the Legislature created the Coastal Marshlands Protection Agency. Colorado and Arizona Legislatures enacted legislation toughening pollution control standards in moving to protect the environment. Oregon voters approved a $173 million bond issue for pollution-control measures including sewerage treatment plants. Other bond issues geared to environmental issues were approved in Alaska, California, Florida, Illinois, Maine, Nevada, and Texas.

In Michigan, a master plan for a statewide automated management information program was completed. A "state-local technical services" act in Missouri permits state agencies and local governments to contract with one another for certain services.

An "anti-snob" zoning bill was enacted in Massachusetts to enable builders of low- and moderate-income housing to challenge restrictive suburban zoning laws. The act establishes a five-member state board (with two local government representatives) in the Department of Community Affairs to review and approve proposed construction of such housing in communities prohibiting it.

The South Carolina Legislature approved construction of federally certified modular and factory-built housing regardless of restrictive local building codes.

**IMPROVING JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION**

In its report, *State-Local Relations in the Criminal Justice System*, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended that States and localities make far-reaching improvements in the areas of courts, corrections, police, and prosecution. A number of States took actions during the biennium to complement this recommendation. Rhode Island, for example, consolidated its court system into a single, statewide system, and Iowa reduced the number of its judicial districts from 18 to 8. Nebraska’s constitutional provision pertaining to justice of the peace courts was repealed and the creation of county court systems is now permitted. Wyoming legislation requires large counties to establish county court systems in place of justice of the peace courts. Smaller Wyoming counties are permitted to make this change at their discretion.

To assure speedy trials, the States of California, Illinois, and New York have imposed specific time limitations during which defendants must be tried. The New York action specifies that the State will dismiss charges against defendants in other than homicide cases if not brought to trial within six months following arrest, unless the delay is due to the defendant’s own actions.

A mutual aid agreement has been approved for the Washington, D.C., area permitting police to cross jurisdictional lines during emergencies. A new Oklahoma law permits police officers of one community to perform police functions in other communities under emergency conditions. Delaware local police are now permitted to maintain their authority outside of their home jurisdiction.
STATE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

State Legislatures and Governors continued during this biennium to deal with the problem of making state administrative structure more responsive to urban and community needs. New departments or agencies were established by law or executive action in several States. In Utah, a Department of Community Affairs replaced the State's local affairs agency which had been established two years previously by executive order. The new agency assumed functions paralleling those of its predecessor—coordinating and assisting local governments in their operations and administering certain Department of Housing and Urban Development programs. New Texas legislation created a Department of Community Affairs to manage local government assistance and planning programs.

In July 1970, the Governor of New York appointed a state commission on the powers of local government. The commission has responsibility to recommend changes in the laws and state constitution to give cities maximum authority to conduct their own affairs consistent with the overall well-being of the State and the rights of individual citizens. The commission is also assigned the responsibilities of reevaluating the whole range of intergovernmental fiscal relationships; reevaluating the present allocation of public services to different governmental levels and recommending the most effective level for the performance of these services; recommending elimination of any excessive control over local governments by the State; and reevaluating the home-rule law in terms of the essentially urban character of New York. A newly established Texas Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations will act in an advisory capacity to the Governor, Legislature, and other public agencies.

CONCLUSION

This brief summary of major developments in state-local relations, incomplete as it necessarily is, reflects a continuing concern on the part of States and their citizens and efforts by them to assist their local governments. The general trend of state action has been to provide leadership for and stimulus to local initiative in many areas while mandating change in other areas. Few problems were solved during this biennium, but constructive actions were taken to ameliorate conditions in many problem areas. Developments as a whole represent a progressive step in achieving greater balance in the vital partnership of strong communities and strong States and show a cooperative spirit to meet major challenges.

SELECTED REFERENCES


National Service to Regional Councils. Regional Review Quarterly. Washington, D.C.


STATE PAYMENTS to local governments in fiscal 1970 amounted to $28.9 billion, or $143 per capita. The 1970 sum was up $4.1 billion, or 16.6 percent, from the 1969 amount. This represents a considerable rise in state intergovernmental expenditures since 1957, when the total was $7.4 billion, of $44 per capita. But other state expenditure was going up at a similar pace, so that the proportion of total state general expenditure represented by distributive payments to local governments was changed relatively little—37.3 percent in 1970, 35.3 percent in 1957.

During the 20-year period from 1950 to 1970, the annual amount of state payments to local governments was multiplied sevenfold, moving-up from $4.2 billion to $28.9 billion. Throughout these two decades, however, such payments made up a fairly consistent fraction of the annual nationwide total of state general expenditure. Between 1950 and 1960, this percentage relationship ranged between 33.4 and 36.8, and since then the percentage has varied only between 34.6 and 37.3. In the past decade, also, the proportion of all general revenue of local governments supplied by state distributive payments has shown limited variation, ranging between 28.4 and 33.3 percent.

Table 1 provides a historical nationwide summary of state intergovernmental expenditure, showing data for each fiscal year from 1950 on and for selected earlier years back to 1942.

NATURE OF STATE INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE

The terms “state payments to local governments” and “state aid” are used interchangeably in this article with the more technical phrase “state intergovernmental expenditure.” Such expenditure includes not only grants-in-aid and state-collected locally shared taxes, but also reimbursements paid to local governments by States for services rendered by them to state governments. State intergovernmental expenditure also includes extension of contingent loans of which the repayment by local governments is on a conditional basis.

By definition, state intergovernmental expenditure involves the actual payment of money to local governments. It thus excludes state transactions or activities which benefit localities without involving the flow of funds to local governments.

Examples include:

1. Nonfiscal assistance by a State to local governments in the form of advisory or other services or aid in kind (e.g., free provisions of commodities or textbooks, or the loan of equipment).

2. Contribution by a State to trust funds it administers for financing of retirement benefits to local government employees.

3. Shares of state-imposed taxes which are collected and retained by local governments.

STATISTICAL FINDINGS

Individual state governments differ widely in the amounts they pay to local governments. As indicated by the figures in Table 2, state intergovernmental expenditure in 1970 ranged from more than $200 per capita in four States to less than $30 in two States.

The per capita amount of fiscal aid was higher in 1970 than in 1969 for 46 States, but with considerable variation in the rates of change involved. During the five-year period 1962 to 1967, as Table 2 shows, state aid per capita doubled in
New Hampshire, New York, and South Dakota and rose by more than three-fourths in 10 other States. One State (Hawaii) showed a decrease during this period.

Payments to local governments in the Nation as a whole made up 37.3 percent of all state government general expenditure in 1970. This relationship ranged widely from less than 10 percent in Hawaii and New Hampshire to more than 50 percent in the State of New York. During the past two decades there has been a considerable decline in the number of States devoting either a relatively very high or very low percentage of their total general expenditure to distributive payments.

The bulk of all state intergovernmental expenditure, as Tables 3 and 4 show, is made available to help finance particularly designated functions or activities. In 1970 only $2,958 million, or 10.2 percent of the total, was provided without such functional designation—i.e., on terms that made funds available for "general local government support." There are 4 States with no distributive programs of this kind, and 9 other States in which only a nominal amount (less than $2.00 per capita) was thus made available in 1970. On the other hand, general support grants are highly significant in a number of States, equaling in 1970 $87 per capita in Wisconsin, $65 per capita in Minnesota, $33 per capita in Arizona, $31 per capita in New York, between $20 and $30 in 6 States, and between $10 and $20 per capita in 10 other States.

Grants for education make up a major proportion of all state payments to local governments, in most individual States as well as in the Nation as a whole. However, there is wide variety in the scale of such state distributions. They ranged in 1970 from more than $190 per capita in Alaska, Delaware, New-Mexico, and New York, down to less than $40 per capita in Hawaii, New Hampshire and South Dakota. (In Hawaii, however, the state government directly administers and finances the public school system.)

In the Nation as a whole, public welfare ranks second to education as a state-aided function. It accounted in 1970 for about one-sixth of all state payments to local governments. This record is dominated, however, by 13 States in which all or most "categorical" public assistance programs are administered by local governments, subject to state (and federal) cost-sharing.¹

State payments to local governments for highway purposes amounted to $2.4 billion in 1970, or about one-twelfth of total state intergovernmental expenditure. Some of such distributive payments were made by all States except four (Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, and West Virginia). The per capita amount was $10.75 for the median State and ranged up to more than $26 in Illinois, Iowa, and Oregon.

The total amount of $1,408 million shown under "Miscellaneous and combined" in Table 4 includes $161 million for hospitals, $97 million for housing and urban renewal, $73 million for libraries, $53 million for correction, $47 million for airports, and scattering amounts for other functions and combined or unallocable purposes.

In Table 5, state aid amounts are shown separately for the several types of local governments, which are distinguished in Census Bureau reporting. The 1967 Census study, State Payments to Local Governments, presented a cross classification of intergovernmental expenditure, by States, in terms of major functional categories and the various types of recipient local governments.

INDIVIDUAL STATE DETAIL

The concluding portion of the 1967 Census report cited above provides a summary-textual description of the distributive programs of each of the 50 state governments, as authorized for fiscal 1967.

For many of the state aid items shown, the description will also make evident

¹The 13 States are California, Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. A more complete picture of the diverse patterns of state government expenditure (direct and intergovernmental) for public welfare purposes is provided by Table 9 of the Bureau of the Census report, State Government Finances in 1970.
the source of financing involved. This is the case, for example, with regard to allocations of particular earmarked taxes and grant items that are payable distinctively from federally provided funds. However, it is often impossible to associate a particular distributive program with some specific financing source. This is most obvious for a grant payable from a state "general fund" that is fed by numerous revenue sources. An intermediate situation involves aid payable from a special fund which in turn is fed by two or more earmarked revenue sources. Where the main components of such multiple-source funds could be readily ascertained and briefly stated (e.g., "highway-user revenue"), they are often mentioned in the description of the distributive program concerned. Also, items financed in part from federal resources are commonly described as payable from "state and federal funds." In many of the latter instances, the text also shows the amount of related revenue received from the federal government during fiscal 1967. These features of the presentation provide background about the financing of many individual grant items, but they do not afford a basis for comprehensive classification of all state intergovernmental expenditure by source of financing.

**STATE AID FORMULAS**

Particular programs of state aid to local governments involve various means by which (a) the total amount available for a particular fiscal year or biennium is established, and (b) the shares payable to various individual governments are determined.

The amount of some items of state intergovernmental expenditure is set by a specific appropriation of such a nature that a particular total sum named will be distributed without reduction or change.

At the other extreme are aid items whose total amount is not explicitly determined or even limited in advance. One example of this is the distribution of a specified share of some particular state revenue source, with the actual current amount of aid determined by the yield of that source. Another example is the "open-end" authorization of whatever amount is needed to meet the requirements of a particular distributive formula.

Between the absolutely fixed and the completely indeterminate types of aid provisions are numerous gradations and combinations of methods. Thus, a specified share of some revenue source may be authorized for a particular fiscal aid program, but with the total sum for the current period limited also by a specific amount appropriation. Again, a definite amount may be appropriated as a maximum, subject to reduction by the operation of a distributive formula or by administrative action.

The basis for determining individual governments' shares of a particular grant or shared tax are also extremely varied.

The term "shared tax" has sometimes been applied strictly to specified portions of state taxes distributed back to local governments of origin without restriction as to use. On the other hand, some aid thus distributed on a source basis is limited to particular functions or purposes.

More generally, aid for the support of specific local government functions is distributed with reference to some measure of local need or activity—"for example, for education; school-age population, enrollment or attendance, or actual local expenditure; for highways, miles of roads, number of vehicles, or particular local requirements; for public welfare programs, actual or estimated local expenditure."

A broad measure of need finds expression in formulas based on local population and applied to the distribution of money for general local government support.

For many aid programs using a measure of local need, some standard of local financial ability or effort is also applied, aiming at a degree of "equalization" as between relatively poor and more prosperous local units. A contrasting principle is applied where a "floor" is provided in terms of a minimum amount of aid payable to each local government unit involved. Finally, some aid programs provide an identical amount to all local units of a particular type.
INTERSTATE COMPARISONS

Tables 2 to 5 afford a basis for comparing amounts of aid to local governments provided by individual States. It is important that such comparisons take adequate account of the aid concept employed and of the great variations which exist in the pattern of state-local responsibility for particular governmental functions throughout the Nation. Thus, State A directly provides public schools, local highways or assistance; State B grants to its local governments funds for local performance of these functions under state supervision. Total cost to each State may be similar, although involving a different form of state expenditure.

Hasty conclusions and interpretations therefore must be avoided in this area. Interstate comparisons can be made only with caution and, usually, some qualification.

Additional detail on state intergovernmental expenditure in fiscal 1967, including a descriptive table covering all the major state aid programs in that fiscal year, appears in State Payments to Local Governments (Volume 6, No. 4, of the 1967 Census of Governments).

### Table 1

**SUMMARY OF STATE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS: 1942-70**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Total state payments to local governments</th>
<th>As a percent of total general revenue of state</th>
<th>Amounts in millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total, local government support</td>
<td>For specified purposes</td>
<td>Per capita governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Highways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 Source: Bureau of the Census, State Payments to Local Governments (Volume 6, No. 4, of the 1967 Census of Governments) and annual report, State Government Finances.*

(a) Principally public welfare.
## INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

### TABLE 2

STATE INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE BY STATE: 1957 TO 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount (in thousands of dollars)</th>
<th>Percent increase in per capita amount</th>
<th>Per capita amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>75,083</td>
<td>79,566</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>56,744</td>
<td>61,103</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>172,213</td>
<td>176,726</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>5,316,228</td>
<td>5,625,075</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>760,497</td>
<td>824,171</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>65,966</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>887,579</td>
<td>942,393</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>244,210</td>
<td>259,871</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,290,377</td>
<td>1,377,909</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>19,471</td>
<td>21,720</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>282,242</td>
<td>305,992</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>33,435</td>
<td>35,371</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>374,127</td>
<td>394,083</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>896,042</td>
<td>925,583</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>129,148</td>
<td>134,306</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>48,705</td>
<td>50,835</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>504,251</td>
<td>533,818</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>540,979</td>
<td>585,389</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>677,532</td>
<td>712,096</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>925,838</td>
<td>961,414</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>49,704</td>
<td>51,860</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Bureau of the Census, State Payments to Local Governments (Volume 6, No. 47 of the 1967 Census of Governments) and Annual report, State Government Finances (1967-1970).*

(a) Alaska and Hawaii figures appear here for 1957 only as exhibit data, not included in totals for "All States."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>General government support</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>Public welfare and combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All States</td>
<td>$142.73</td>
<td>$14.61</td>
<td>$84.40</td>
<td>$12.05</td>
<td>$24.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median State</td>
<td>111.64</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>81.86</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>114.47</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>90.26</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>170.28</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>153.06</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>162.76</td>
<td>32.71</td>
<td>113.40</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>94.17</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>71.57</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>217.61</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td>86.31</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>128.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>70.86</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>38.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>105.64</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>84.68</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>142.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>112.90</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>124.74</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>101.31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>84.45</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>106.15</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>74.05</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>128.53</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>76.27</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>108.35</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>64.26</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>13.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>134.35</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>131.44</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>69.74</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>43.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>94.39</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>68.42</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>132.22</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>97.48</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>88.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>78.85</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>150.65</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>73.98</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>31.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>78.82</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>146.12</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>89.08</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>215.92</td>
<td>65.21</td>
<td>85.09</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>43.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>145.67</td>
<td>20.96</td>
<td>100.82</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>75.28</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>67.80</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>81.72</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>71.85</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>13.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>101.50</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>40.46</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>35.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>148.12</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>113.05</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>25.42</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>120.84</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>53.77</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>36.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>169.50</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>145.98</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>292.24</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>133.12</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>104.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>149.61</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>113.45</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>23.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>106.78</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>82.48</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>46.44</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>95.42</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>68.52</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>113.77</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>64.06</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>109.41</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>88.22</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>86.30</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>63.28</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>108.93</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>89.61</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>95.34</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>80.03</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>77.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>122.08</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>112.97</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>109.52</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>90.07</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>108.48</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>49.26</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>16.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>158.68</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>112.35</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>102.99</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>97.45</td>
<td>24.99</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>209.51</td>
<td>87.34</td>
<td>66.13</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>149.52</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>89.42</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>20.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Bureau of the Census, State Government Finances in 1970. (a) Represents zero or rounds to zero. (n) Not computed.
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### Table 4

#### STATE INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURE BY FUNCTION AND BY STATE: 1970*

(In thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>General local government support</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>Public welfare</th>
<th>Miscellaneous and combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All States</td>
<td>$28,892,342,000</td>
<td>$17,084,976</td>
<td>$2,438,721</td>
<td>$5,003,159</td>
<td>$1,407,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>394,246</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>310,864</td>
<td>59,211</td>
<td>14,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>51,454</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>46,252</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>282,823</td>
<td>57,067</td>
<td>201,035</td>
<td>24,283</td>
<td>5,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>181,124</td>
<td>9,885</td>
<td>131,655</td>
<td>28,276</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4,342,079</td>
<td>546,613</td>
<td>1,722,061</td>
<td>309,573</td>
<td>1,587,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>282,823</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>156,416</td>
<td>30,089</td>
<td>85,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>320,332</td>
<td>9,141</td>
<td>256,753</td>
<td>13,585</td>
<td>8,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>77,956</td>
<td>7,842</td>
<td>72,842</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>34,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>846,892</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>777,357</td>
<td>22,670</td>
<td>45,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>464,971</td>
<td>12,217</td>
<td>387,602</td>
<td>26,567</td>
<td>18,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>15,775</td>
<td>13,607</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>75,685</td>
<td>6,803</td>
<td>52,782</td>
<td>14,736</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1,428,453</td>
<td>62,375</td>
<td>847,642</td>
<td>319,620</td>
<td>100,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>365,763</td>
<td>27,750</td>
<td>333,741</td>
<td>101,806</td>
<td>68,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>379,351</td>
<td>41,015</td>
<td>242,784</td>
<td>80,312</td>
<td>2,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>295,608</td>
<td>11,389</td>
<td>156,847</td>
<td>24,686</td>
<td>97,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>303,855</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>284,600</td>
<td>3,755</td>
<td>13,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>481,719</td>
<td>74,782</td>
<td>353,132</td>
<td>26,071</td>
<td>25,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>88,260</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>78,346</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>4,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>590,901</td>
<td>39,834</td>
<td>290,172</td>
<td>76,104</td>
<td>122,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>448,407</td>
<td>85,605</td>
<td>265,462</td>
<td>13,851</td>
<td>19,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1,296,789</td>
<td>202,634</td>
<td>790,574</td>
<td>228,241</td>
<td>52,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>821,359</td>
<td>248,113</td>
<td>323,778</td>
<td>64,681</td>
<td>105,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>332,930</td>
<td>46,471</td>
<td>223,514</td>
<td>40,008</td>
<td>12,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>332,132</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>317,118</td>
<td>22,161</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>56,744</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,682</td>
<td>6,062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>150,605</td>
<td>11,206</td>
<td>60,040</td>
<td>24,326</td>
<td>52,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>72,993</td>
<td>8,703</td>
<td>55,237</td>
<td>6,369</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>18,734</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>866,214</td>
<td>141,223</td>
<td>385,443</td>
<td>20,844</td>
<td>260,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>172,215</td>
<td>8,714</td>
<td>148,314</td>
<td>10,658</td>
<td>4,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3,316,128</td>
<td>557,058</td>
<td>2,421,617</td>
<td>133,439</td>
<td>1,894,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>760,447</td>
<td>35,095</td>
<td>576,574</td>
<td>11,232</td>
<td>119,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>65,966</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>43,241</td>
<td>14,658</td>
<td>1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>878,579</td>
<td>98,823</td>
<td>494,850</td>
<td>201,946</td>
<td>62,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>244,210</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>175,367</td>
<td>53,532</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>237,939</td>
<td>42,337</td>
<td>133,945</td>
<td>55,071</td>
<td>1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,290,377</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>1,040,477</td>
<td>65,741</td>
<td>51,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>81,945</td>
<td>9,743</td>
<td>60,094</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>7,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>282,242</td>
<td>25,748</td>
<td>232,134</td>
<td>12,252</td>
<td>12,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>33,435</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>25,037</td>
<td>2,969</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>374,127</td>
<td>28,428</td>
<td>271,741</td>
<td>60,154</td>
<td>1,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>896,042</td>
<td>628,735</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>21,943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>129,314</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>119,704</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>3,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>48,705</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40,057</td>
<td>6,553</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>540,251</td>
<td>14,551</td>
<td>368,456</td>
<td>18,782</td>
<td>74,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>540,979</td>
<td>36,084</td>
<td>683,018</td>
<td>75,127</td>
<td>4,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>175,640</td>
<td>169,971</td>
<td>116,401</td>
<td>86,685</td>
<td>50,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>925,583</td>
<td>385,888</td>
<td>292,153</td>
<td>110,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>49,704</td>
<td>6,746</td>
<td>29,726</td>
<td>6,529</td>
<td>6,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Bureau of the Census, State Government Finances in 1970. (a) Includes $38,830,000 housing subsidies, almost entirely to cities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>School districts</th>
<th>Townships and New England &quot;towns&quot;</th>
<th>Special districts</th>
<th>Combined and unallocable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All States</td>
<td>$28,892,342</td>
<td>$7,418,023</td>
<td>$5,664,391</td>
<td>$13,216,258</td>
<td>$452,563</td>
<td>$141,717</td>
<td>$2,017,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>394,246</td>
<td>66,460</td>
<td>14,784</td>
<td>310,864</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>51,454</td>
<td>42,873</td>
<td>8,581</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>285,488</td>
<td>54,803</td>
<td>31,768</td>
<td>201,005</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>181,124</td>
<td>23,004</td>
<td>19,863</td>
<td>137,280</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4,342,079</td>
<td>2,201,005</td>
<td>438,558</td>
<td>1,693,872</td>
<td>8,257</td>
<td>387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>282,823</td>
<td>84,269</td>
<td>40,409</td>
<td>156,416</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>320,452</td>
<td>128,320</td>
<td>9,454</td>
<td>181,950</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>77,936</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>72,776</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>846,850</td>
<td>66,085</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>777,357</td>
<td>13,694</td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>464,971</td>
<td>56,567</td>
<td>14,356</td>
<td>387,570</td>
<td>6,242</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>15,775</td>
<td>9,461</td>
<td>6,314</td>
<td>9,461</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>73,685</td>
<td>19,491</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>52,782</td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1,428,453</td>
<td>235,591</td>
<td>209,103</td>
<td>49,535</td>
<td>12,599</td>
<td>77,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>561,765</td>
<td>141,566</td>
<td>33,029</td>
<td>331,428</td>
<td>14,405</td>
<td>22,437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>379,551</td>
<td>58,549</td>
<td>36,291</td>
<td>242,680</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>41,254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>295,608</td>
<td>124,757</td>
<td>12,418</td>
<td>154,847</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>363,855</td>
<td>15,903</td>
<td>5,107</td>
<td>281,950</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>481,719</td>
<td>30,123</td>
<td>29,487</td>
<td>352,325</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>61,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>88,260</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>16,806</td>
<td>70,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>590,901</td>
<td>401,318</td>
<td>182,709</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>4,866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>448,407</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>30,787</td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1,290,789</td>
<td>229,448</td>
<td>29,007</td>
<td>790,574</td>
<td>43,619</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>821,589</td>
<td>229,853</td>
<td>29,037</td>
<td>329,778</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>322,330</td>
<td>63,368</td>
<td>35,913</td>
<td>223,514</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>351,132</td>
<td>10,992</td>
<td>21,846</td>
<td>317,201</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>56,744</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>47,682</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>150,605</td>
<td>73,363</td>
<td>15,887</td>
<td>60,040</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>78,393</td>
<td>10,572</td>
<td>6,569</td>
<td>55,225</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>18,757</td>
<td>4,997</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>866,214</td>
<td>311,354</td>
<td>42,413(c)</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>511,836(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>172,215</td>
<td>15,660</td>
<td>8,131</td>
<td>148,314</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>5,316,128</td>
<td>752,149</td>
<td>3,003,204</td>
<td>1,503,592</td>
<td>45,550</td>
<td>10,758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>700,447</td>
<td>725,115</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>401,674</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>63,906</td>
<td>16,713</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>43,200</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>878,579</td>
<td>188,256</td>
<td>107,548</td>
<td>467,118</td>
<td>22,936</td>
<td>554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>244,210</td>
<td>49,497</td>
<td>16,889</td>
<td>175,296</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>237,907</td>
<td>87,665</td>
<td>23,143</td>
<td>126,444</td>
<td>387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,290,472</td>
<td>106,619</td>
<td>75,546</td>
<td>1,040,472</td>
<td>34,648</td>
<td>12,028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>81,956</td>
<td>48,415</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>74,810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>282,242</td>
<td>42,077</td>
<td>7,208</td>
<td>232,134</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>31,435</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>25,037</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>374,127</td>
<td>215,620</td>
<td>153,647</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>896,042</td>
<td>18,332</td>
<td>7,306</td>
<td>863,909</td>
<td>6,453</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>129,314</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>119,157</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>48,703</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>40,057</td>
<td>6,139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>504,251</td>
<td>285,710</td>
<td>218,502</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>546,979</td>
<td>72,483</td>
<td>84,784</td>
<td>382,317</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>179,640</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>169,800</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>923,268</td>
<td>259,545</td>
<td>229,057</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>403,841(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>49,704</td>
<td>11,358</td>
<td>8,571</td>
<td>29,726</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Mainly in counties, cities, and townships.
(b) To cities and "towns." 
(c) Includes amounts for independent school districts and to cities which operate local public schools.
(d) Amounts for independent school districts and for schools operated by cities and towns are shown under "Combined and unallocable." 
(e) Includes amounts for independent school districts and to cities which operate local public schools.

*Footnote (d).