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Urban housing attracted contractors as well as sub-contractors to the urban areas and left many rural communities without the resources to respond to current demand. Federal, state and local efforts to supply adequate housing were often concentrated on the provision of low-income or multi-family dwellings. The plight of middle income families has often been overlooked. (Tax relief measures offer little encouragement that this situation will be ameliorated in the near future.)

Situating in the top of the Texas panhandle in Ochiltree County and three hours removed from any major metropolitan area, PERRYTON (population approximately 4,500) found its housing shortage to be a detriment to locating new industry and providing jobs for local residents. The executive vice president of the Ochiltree Chamber of Commerce, Leo Meyers, summarized the Perryton situation in this fashion: "It seems that housing has always been in demand since the mid-fifties, when this county started to enjoy oil and gas activity. In looking back at recent years, this community felt it was growing, but statistics reveal only seven new homes were built in 1973, 15 in 1974, and 12 in 1975 - a total of 44 new homes in a three-year period."

In 1974, area resource development specialists of the Texas Agricultural Extension Service initiated efforts to assist residents with employment opportunities through the development of an employment clearinghouse. These efforts were part of the Title V Project, which concentrated on manpower problems in the Texas panhandle. Economic reversals in the feedlot industry had caused a shift in the Perryton area from a deficit to a surplus labor situation. Energy exploration in the county and surrounding area quickly provided needed jobs, but merely exacerbated the housing conditions. The Ochiltree Chamber of Commerce was interested in locating new industry, but was stymied in these efforts, in part due to the lack of available housing. With the documented success of the employment clearinghouse, Meyers and the extension specialists began to explore alternatives to the housing dilemma.

As is frequently the case in rural communities, Perryton had organized an industrial foundation to prospect for new industry for the area. But Perryton was not alone in this endeavor. Nationwide, approximately 23,000 organizations continuously prospect for new industry, and each year, approximately 3,000 location decisions are made. The odds against any one community are rather staggering.

In Perryton, the industrial foundation had raised funds for industrial recruitment through individual contributions. But as is the case in many rural areas, the industrial foundation had not become actively involved in recruiting, and these funds had been drawn at a minimal rate of return. It was not difficult to convince the industrial foundation directors that these same funds could be used for housing developments once the need for housing to support future economic development was documented. Recognizing that the objectives of an industrial foundation include the economic growth and viability of the community, the Perryton Industrial Foundation and Chamber of Commerce named housing as their number one priority in 1976. Emphasis was placed on single family and multi-family dwellings.

Based on a review of construction activity in other communities, the key to success appeared to be the ability to attract contractors and sub-contractors to the Perryton area, by proving to these individuals that a strong market existed and proving that profitable speculative building could be undertaken on a continuous basis. The question then became "how to attract contractors?"

Savings and loan subsidiaries in many communities are involved in housing development. These savings and loan subsidiaries develop utilities and streets on raw land which they have acquired. At this point, building contractors are contacted, lots are sold, and a developer is provided with a ready-to-construct structure. Since the Perryton Industrial Foundation was interested in speculative building, it decided to act as a land developer by purchasing 20 local lots with utilities and streets already established. With this single purchase, three residential contractors were enticed to Perryton. Lots were sold to two of these contractors on a break-even basis by the industrial foundation. All three of the residential housing contractors had the same experience: the speculative homes they built were purchased prior to completion. These contractors have seen the need and demand for housing in Perryton and have continued building speculative homes on their own. Through their personal association with other contractors, additional contractors have started to construct homes in the Perryton area. As a result of these minimal efforts, 35 new homes were built in Perryton in 1976, 36 in 1977 and 39 in 1978.

But the Ochiltree Industrial Foundation did not stop there. Additional projects included a 40-unit apartment complex in which the foundation made a collateral pledge to the lender. The pledge merely ensured that all funds needed by the contractor were made available through the local savings and loan. And a similar project was undertaken for a mobile home park.

Commenting on how the Perryton Industrial Foundation could justify the use of its time and effort in housing development, Meyers stated, "The monies have and are being used to fill the first need of Perryton, which is housing. There have been no giveaways. We've only used the dollars to make things happen."

Additional housing does not guarantee economic growth; however, lack of housing can be a deterrent to the location of new industry and can reduce economic benefits of industrial expansion. Creative thinking may simultaneously stimulate rural housing and provide community improvement and additional employment - the ultimate goals of industrial development. Individuals involved in any facet of rural development may find a readily available source of funds and energy by tapping the resources of an industrial foundation.
More and more people in rural areas across the nation are becoming actively involved in trying to solve problems facing their communities. This increased citizen participation can be very beneficial, but citizens who join together in attempts to improve their communities often find themselves short on knowledge of how to go about achieving community improvement. These citizens need trained leadership to ensure that their efforts achieve their maximum potential for good.

But finding enough trained personnel to provide the leadership needed to aid the thousands of rural development efforts around the country can be a real problem. In an effort to solve that problem, the Project Development Network of the Southern Rural Development Center (SRDC) has developed a packet of materials designed to "train-the-trainer" in rural development. The network was composed of 20 representatives from land grant universities, Federal agencies, and other firms and agencies involved in rural development. A grant from the Rural Development Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture provided funds for the network to prepare a complete set of training materials, including texts, a teacher's guide, and various learning aids.

The packet is designed so that a teacher can take a class of potential trainers through a six-step process for achieving rural development action. Components of the process are:

1. Understanding rural development
2. Identifying community problems and setting priorities
3. Finding the best approaches
4. Locating resources
5. Developing and implementing action programs
6. Evaluation

After extensive testing and widespread use in the Southern region, the packet, Training for Rural Development, was distributed nationally at a workshop in St. Louis, Missouri, May 21-23.

Coordinated by Jay P. Chance, SRDC assistant director, the workshop drew 24 participants from the Western, North Central, and North Eastern United States. Farmers Home Administration, USDA, provided funding for a second printing of the packet and for the national workshop.

Sponsors for the national workshop were the Southern Rural Development Center, Mississippi State, MS; the Northeast Center for Rural Development, Ithaca, NY; the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, Ames, Iowa; and the Western Center for Rural Development, Corvallis, OR.

The purpose of the workshop was to train training teams for each of the three regions, Chance said. The rural development center in each region sponsored participants in the workshop. In addition, several representatives from the Farmers Home Administration took part in the workshop.

Instructors for the three-day national workshop were Dr. Dennis A. Evans, Auburn University; Dr. Maurice F. Voland, North Carolina State University; and J. B. Williams, University of Arkansas. All of the instructors were involved in the original workshop which was used to introduce the packet in the Southern region. Both Voland and Williams serve on the network which developed and tested the packet, and Voland was instrumental in preparing the teacher's guide. Evans has used the packet extensively in his rural development responsibilities in Alabama.

After receiving orientation in the use of training packets at the national workshop, participants are responsible for conducting similar workshops for their own regions.

Ultimate users of the training packet will include rural development personnel, community resource development personnel, state and local agencies, public service organizations, and business, industrial, and civic groups interested in rural development.

Conference participants were separated into small groups to address a rural development problem in a hypothetical community. Working through some of the packet exercises are (l-r) Garnett Premer, Guy Burns, Susan Stone, J. E. di Prisco, Kent Gustafson, Carolyn Bean, Guy Temple and Keith Austin.

Instructor J. B. Williams looks on as Maurice Voland explains one of the six components of the Training for Rural Development packet.

Other workshop participants included (l-r) Del Yadur, Wanda Leonard, Walter Ramsey, Ron Canham and Diane Olen.

Workshop instructor Dennis Evans leads a discussion on locating resources for rural development efforts.
Title V Accomplishes Much

Dr. William W. Linder
Director
Southern Rural Development Center

This summer the Congress will be asked to approve a two-year extension of funding for Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972 and continued funding of the four regional rural development centers. Therefore, this seems an appropriate time to review program achievements which have come about because of this legislation.

This paper presents only a partial listing of Title V accomplishments in the Southern region, since a complete review of progress under Title V would easily fill an entire volume. Adding to this the numerous successful programs conducted by Title V personnel in the other regions of the country, it is easy to see the significant impact Title V has had on rural areas.

The rural development work which has been going on under Title V provisions has achieved demonstrable success in every state in the Southern region. Whether the need was for a recreational facility in Louisiana, a new industry in Mississippi, an effective land use plan in North Carolina — or any one of dozens of other needs in rural areas throughout the region — research and extension personnel with Title V support have been ready to offer assistance to rural communities seeking to solve their problems or develop their potential.

A look at the numerous programs implemented under Title V reveals that it —

1. Directs its efforts toward all rural residents seeking solutions to local problems, not just the agricultural producers.
2. Reflects grass-roots participation by local officials, community leaders, civic organizations and individual citizens who are interested in working with qualified professionals to improve their communities.
3. Provides an effective mix of research and extension personnel, expertise, and planning leading to innovative and creative approaches to problem-solving.

A brief look at just a few of the successful Title V program efforts in the Southern region shows the progress that has been made.

— An Alabama Title V project helped bring the rural communities of Lineville and Ashland together to plan an industrial park to benefit both towns.

— Title V personnel in Arkansas trained the residents of a small community of Miami, Texas, overcame a serious lack of available rental housing.

— Title V workers in Virginia helped local organizations solve a youth unemployment problem by assisting in a "Rent-A-Youth" program.

These are only samples of the many programs sponsored or assisted by Title V personnel in the Southern region.

As a result of research and extension efforts under Title V, the four regional rural development centers have brought together professionals in rural development work in multi-state efforts to solve the problems faced by the nation's rural areas.

The concept of sharing the findings of research efforts among all the states is important to Title V programs because it reduces duplication of efforts and thereby helps hold down costs. In order for this type of sharing to take place, there must be effective communication among all the region's rural development practitioners, whether they be in extension or research. One of the centers' major goals is to facilitate this type of communication throughout the United States by publishing materials designed to keep extension and research personnel informed about important research efforts and programs in rural development.

Title V has achieved remarkable results since its inception, especially considering the funding limitations which have been ever present since the program began. With relatively low financial support, Title V efforts during the past few years have stressed programs which are transferable to other areas. Initial program efforts in a rural area are designed to serve as models for similar efforts in other areas.

Extension of funding for Title V will ensure that the program models already developed will continue to be shared throughout each region and the nation and that new programs will be developed to help rural areas solve the myriad of problems they face.
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Meeting County Recreational Needs

Michael A. Hedges
Extension Specialist, Commercial Recreation
Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service

Independence County, Ark., has a population growth problem. With a current citizenry of 24,800, the county is expected to reach 29,000 by 1990. That rate of population growth might not present much of a problem for a thriving city, but in this rural Ozark county, the additional 5,000 inhabitants could put severe stress on existing recreational and park facilities.

What happens if there are not enough recreational facilities to meet future demands? Some people may become dissatisfied with the community, and young people may turn their energy to less socially acceptable behavior.

Independence County leaders are aware of the potential problems related to growth. Under the sponsorship of the Independence County Development Council and with assistance from the University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service, 35 county leaders met in February, 1977, to develop a longrange planning document for 1977-1982.

One of the problem areas identified was parks and recreation. The leaders recommended that a committee be established to study and analyze the county's parks and recreation situation.

Lad by Nelson Barnett, committee chairman; Larry Sandage, county extension staffing chairman; and Lee Rainey, district extension CRD program leader, the committee invited Mike Hedges, extension commercial recreation specialist, to see what could be done to address the problem of providing adequate parks and recreational facilities.

After several meetings to discuss problems, the committee set goals to: 1) identify, define, and establish the relationship of local elements in existing recreation and park areas; 2) analyze and classify the present park sites; 3) conduct a local survey to assess current park needs; and 4) formulate a recreation and park system conforming to national standards and present probable methods for implementation.

The committee reviewed other surveys and developed one to analyze county residents' needs. Questionnaires were distributed to three rural Georgia counties participated in the Training for Rural Development program at a part of their efforts to improve the housing situation in their counties.

In the survey were distributed through schools, civic clubs, industries and other organizations. Approximately 50 volunteers and some professional pollsters were involved in the survey. More than 1,000 surveys were returned from Independence County homes.

Using the information assembled from its study, the committee developed a plan designed to meet the park and recreational needs of Batesville and Independence County. The county development council and the quorum court approved the plan, and the local newspaper and radio station gave it a lot of publicity.

Since Independence County leaders first contacted the Extension Service for help, much progress has been made in addressing the county's present and future recreational and park needs. In addition to approving the committee's plan, the county quorum court has enacted ordinances to set up a county park and recreation commission and to organize and develop parks and recreational facilities throughout the county. Also, the city of Batesville is presently attempting to buy 50 acres of land for parks and recreational facilities.

Independence County is working to meet its residents' recreational needs, both present and future. The combined efforts of extension staff, county leaders, school boards, recreational boards, local media, elected officials and interested citizens are paying off now and will continue to pay off as the county's population grows.

Citizens Active In Rural Housing Study

Quality housing is an extremely important aspect of overall quality of life for rural residents. Many rural areas lack adequate housing facilities, and many rural residents are forced to live in inadequate and substandard housing. But a group of concerned citizens in Georgia has begun taking steps to improve the housing situation in its rural area.

The Central Savannah River Area Planning and Development Commission (C SRAPDC) recently received a $37,500 Area Development Assistance Grant from Farmers Home Administration to conduct a study of the housing situation in the 11 rural counties in the Central Savannah River Area. The goal of the study is to develop a functional plan for improving the area's rural housing.

Three of the 11 counties — Burke, Emanuel, and Jefferson — were selected as impact counties. Citizen Housing Committees were set up with members representing all segments of the population in the three counties. Staff members from CSRAPDC and the Georgia Extension Service are working with these committees on the housing study.

As one of their first steps, committee members took part in a training program conducted by the Rural Development Center in Tifton, Ga., using the Training for Rural Development packet as a guide for achieving action (see related story, pp. 6-7). After completing the training program the Citizen Housing Committees began to hold monthly meetings.

CSRAPDC Rural Development Coordinator Cheryl T. Stump said local citizens have accomplished a great deal in only six months by:

- "Completing the Training for Rural Development program;"
- Attending and contributing valuable recommendations to the Citizen Housing Committee Meetings in the three impact counties;
- Making concerted efforts to inform the news media, businessmen, politicians, co-workers, friends and relatives about housing programs that can be utilized to benefit their community as a whole;
- Gathering statistical information and conducting visual housing surveys; and
- Suggesting plausible remedies for improving housing conditions."

Active citizen participation is the most important aspect of the housing efforts, according to Ms. Stump. "Our staff feels that keeping the citizens involved in the program is the key to the development of an acceptable and realistic housing plan for the 11 non-metropolitan counties in the CSRA," she said. "Hopefully, we can lay a strong foundation upon which a total rural development process can be built that will address the housing needs of the unemployed and underemployed low-income rural citizens."
Under the agreement, assistance through FmHA’s rural development loan program will be available to states for railroad-related projects to supplement FRA resources. Also under the memorandum EDA has agreed to make public works grants and loans for capital improvements where railroad and rail supplier facilities will support commercial facilities and retain or create jobs.

Ridersharing And Vanpooling Encouraged:... A series of new and existing means to encourage vanpooling also are discussed in the initiatives. Among them are commitments to identify grant monies to support vanpooling, to establish a Department of Energy program in which vanpools registered with a state energy office or its designees could receive 100 percent of required gas supplies during periods of gas shortage, to carry out DOT demonstration project for ridersharing programs involving Metropolitan Planning Organizations and state and local governments, and to offer tax credits to employers who set up vanpooling arrangements.


USDA Sponsors National Ag Land Study

Farmers, realtors, land developers, public planners, environmentalists, and educators are some of the many different publics whose opinions on agricultural land conversion will be sought during a National Agricultural Lands Study getting underway this fall.

The study, sponsored through an interagency agreement between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Council on Environmental Quality, will focus on the extent and causes of conversion of agricultural lands to nonagricultural uses. Participants in the study will seek to determine the economic, environmental, and social impact of this conversion and to recommend what actions, if any, need to be taken to deter this loss of agricultural lands.

Robert J. Gray, former administrative assistant to Congressman James Jeffords of Vermont, is serving as executive director of the study.

A primary purpose of the study is to involve those people most likely to be affected by any Federal legislation or administrative action regarding use of agricultural lands. To achieve that purpose, the four regional rural development centers will conduct a total of 17 workshops at various locations around the country this fall. Each workshop will include from 100 to 150 participants from a multi-state area in which it is held.

Workshop participants will be asked to address a number of questions related to agricultural land conversion, including the following:

- To what extent is the conversion of agricultural lands occurring in your county/area/state?
- What do you think are the primary causes of the conversion of agricultural lands to nonagricultural uses?
- Should there be public policies and programs that will help to retain land for production of food, fiber and wood?
- What do you feel are the justifications for public actions to retain agricultural lands?
- What actions are being taken now to retain land in agriculture production in your county/area/state? How effective are they? What actions do you think should be taken and by whom?

While there will be an effort to achieve a consensus of opinion on these and other issues, dissenting opinions will also be sought and recorded.
Structure of Agriculture Meetings Planned

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is inviting citizens to attend one of 10 public meetings to discuss the economic and social issues affecting agriculture and rural life today. The meetings will be called “Structure of Agriculture.”

Three of the meetings are scheduled in the Southern region: Nov. 28, Fayetteville, N.C.; Nov. 29, Huntsville, Ala.; and Dec. 6, Wichita Falls, Tex. All meetings are open to the public, according to the USDA announcement.

Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland and other top Agriculture Department officials are expected to attend. Bergland says the open forum is planned as a continuation of the “national dialogue on agriculture structure” announced last March.

The Agriculture Secretary further explains the meetings’ intent as a step in developing a comprehensive package of factual information and recommendations for use in formulating future policies, especially new farm legislation, when the current farm bill expires in 1981.

He said the term “structure” is difficult to define in precise terms. However, he said it broadly defined it as these issues:

- Number and size of farms, and how they vary by region and type of operation.
- Ownership and control of resources, including the form of business organization, its tenure, and its purchasing and marketing arrangements.
- Degree of production specialization and how it affects managerial and technological requirements.
- Barriers to entering and leaving farming.
- Social and economic characteristics of farm operators and owners.

USDA is compiling a series of background issue papers with basic facts and statistics outlining the major questions involved in structure. These will be printed and distributed during September and October.

Comments from citizens attending the meetings and written suggestions from those unable to attend are welcome and will be recorded. Anyone wishing to comment in person is asked to write in advance.

The schedule of “Structure of Agriculture” meetings around the country in November and December includes:


For further information, to offer suggestions or to request time to comment, write: Structure of Agriculture Project Coordinator, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250.

Research Notes

Housing Credit: A Rural-Urban Comparison

Hughes H. Spurlock

Ronald Bird

Economic Development Division

Economics, Statistics, and Cooperative Service

USDA

In 1975, there was much less home mortgage credit available in rural areas than in urban areas, as shown by outstanding loans on one- to four-family dwellings held by commercial banks, savings and loan associations (S&L’s), and Farmers Home Administration (FmHA).

Those three sources of funds held outstanding housing loans averaging $498 per capita in rural counties and $1,590 per capita in the large metropolitan counties. About one-half of the difference might be due to differences in household incomes and the cost of housing; the remainder seems to reflect credit supply differences.

A major reason for the difference in the amount of outstanding housing loans between rural and metropolitan areas is the virtual absence of S&L’s in rural counties. Of the 856 rural counties in the nation, 805 did not have an S&L nor a branch office within their borders. In contrast, there were several S&L’s in each metropolitan area. Outstanding housing loans of S&L’s on single-family homes averaged only $49 per capita in the most rural areas compared with $1,213 per capita in the large metropolitan counties in 1975. Bank lending showed a much smaller difference—$286 in the rural areas and $371 in the more metropolitan counties.

The proportion of housing loans guaranteed or insured by the Veterans’ Administration and the Federal Housing Administration differed significantly between rural and metropolitan areas. In 1975, in the large metropolitan areas, 17.4 percent of the outstanding loans on one- to four-family units were guaranteed or insured compared with 2.1 percent in the rural counties, where other private credit sources are less active.

FmHA has made more loans in rural counties than in urban. Outstanding FmHA loans per capita on single-family units were $169 in the most rural counties and only $7 in the larger metropolitan counties in 1975. In rural counties, FmHA held 34 percent of the outstanding housing loans compared with about 0.4 percent in the larger metropolitan counties.

The scarcity of savings and loan associations in rural counties throughout the nation is one of the major reasons for the shortage of available home mortgage credit for rural residents.

Counts. FmHA’s activity would have to vastly expanded in the more rural counties if credit availability were to be equalized.

Between 1972 and 1975, the change in the percentage of loans to assets indicates that changes in U.S. monetary policy affected mainly the big city banks. In big cities, the loan-asset percentages rose in 1973 and 1974 and then declined in 1975 to about the same level as 1972. As monetary policy tightened, banks’ customers shifted away from demand to time and savings deposits, and banks reduced their holding of Government securities. In the nonmetro areas, the loan-asset ratios rose during the 4-year period, probably in response to changing farm income.

Nonmetro Areas Experience Rapid Industrial Growth

Many nonmetropolitan areas around the country are experiencing sharp increases in industrial job growth as more and more manufacturing industries locate from or leave metropolitan areas. This new trend is helping to fulfill the need for middle-class jobs that were left behind in nonmetropolitan areas. A new report by M. F. Petrulis, Economist, Economic Development Division, USDA, examines the impact of this trend on economic development.

U.S. industrial job growth appears to be moving from metropolitan to nonmetropolitan areas and showing a general increase in overall employment at the expense of the nation's Northeast and Midwest. During 1967-73, nonmetro areas had an 11.3 percent increase in industrial employment, while metro-area jobs dropped 3.2 percent. Employment in nonmetro areas increased in 18 of 20 major manufacturing industries, while metro area employment declined in 11 industries. All told, manufacturing employment grew 0.8 percent, or by more than 145,000 jobs.

Growth rates among nine regions showed an even sharper contrast than nonmetro-metro comparisons. Three geographic divisions—New England, the Middle Atlantic, and the East North Central—realized industrial employment declines of up to 12 percent. The remaining six regions showed upturns ranging from 3 to 30 percent. Although a large portion of the nation's industrial makeup appears to be changing, much of the employment shift to nonmetro areas was concentrated in slow-growth industries—industries that grew slower nationally than the average of all manufacturing. The urban centers of the Northeast and Midwest are losing jobs, the people skilled in them, and the resultant revenue to other regions. This decentralization of industry forces a reexamination of both urban and rural programs.

The period 1967-73 was chosen for analysis because it starts and finishes in non-recession years and brackets a period of growing economic activity in nonmetro areas. At the time this study was prepared, this period afforded the latest complete data on all aspects of the study. Source: M. F. Petrulis, Regional Manufacturing Employment Growth Patterns (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1979), p. iv.

Coastal Recreation and Tourism. College Park: Maryland Cooperative Extension Service (1979)

This notebook contains papers presented at a workshop for local officials, Managing the Demand for Recreation and Tourism in the Atlantic Coastal Areas of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey and Virginia, September 27-29, 1979, in Ocean City, Maryland. The Cooperative Extension Services in each of the four states co-sponsored the workshop, with support from the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development, the Southern Rural Development Center, and Sea Grant Programs. The papers are grouped in four areas: 1) Economic Impact of Recreation and Tourism, 2) Water: The Impact of (and on) Recreation Development, 3) Land Development, and 4) Beach Management.

Copies are available from Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

Coughenour, C. Milton and A. Lee Coleman. Eastern Kentuckians View Their Quality of Life: Implications for Development. Lexington: Department of Sociology, University of Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station (March 1979).

"The term 'quality of life' has been much used recently by journalists and the public to refer to the deterioration of the physical environment and related social conditions. Social scientists use it to refer to the evaluation of all the environmental and socioeconomic conditions of a given time and/or place in terms of their effect on human well-being. During the past decade, attempts to measure these conditions and the resultant quality of life as a guide to social policy have been increasing. This report presents data from 1961, 1971 and 1973 surveys in four counties of Appalachian Kentucky and assesses some of their policy implications."

Copies are available from Department of Sociology, College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506.


"During 1970-75, 43 of 298 nonmetro counties that had been classified in 1969 as persistently low-income (PLI) counties had prospered enough to escape that designation. This study identified persistently low-income areas and their associated socioeconomic characteristics for policymakers dealing with this part of nonmetro America. Low-income counties are usually located in the South, have small populations which are largely Black, and rely on agriculture for a large percentage of employment and earnings. Of the 43 counties shedding their low-income status, all but one were located in the South, with Georgia, Kentucky, and Arkansas accounting for over half. Increased earnings from mining and agriculture apparently accounted for most of the improvement. Analysis of Federal outlays data shows that Federal money had little impact in low-income nonmetro counties. Thus it appears that circumstances in the private rather than the Federal (public) sector contributed to income gains. Those counties depending on coal mining may continue to make future income gains, given increased prices for coal. The future is less certain for counties relying on favorable agricultural prices for increased income."


"A home fire is one of the most feared accidents a homeowner can have, especially in rural areas where extended distances, inadequate water supplies or lack of any community fire fighting services limits fire fighting capability. Unless a rural resident makes prior arrangements with a volunteer or city fire department, fire fighting equipment may not arrive in time to contain the fire, and even if the fire department responds promptly, the water supply may be too small or the road too narrow for the fire engines. Rural residents in some areas of Texas have always been without adequate fire protection. This publication examines alternatives for rural communities in Texas to develop adequate fire protection for homes and farm and ranch facilities."

Copies are available from Texas Agricultural Extension Service, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843.


This publication is a report on Phase I of a three-phase program being conducted by NRC to "collect, organize and present effectively the information policymakers need to reach informed decisions on matters related to programs and policies affecting families operating smaller-scale farms." Phase I deals with the questions "How should 'small farm family' be defined, and what are the key problems hindering these farm families from increasing their earnings?"

Copies are available from the National Rural Center, 1829 I St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
How New Industry Will Affect Your Community discusses the varied impact — both positive and negative — caused by the recent trend toward increased industrialization of rural areas. Annual Progress Report, 1978 summarizes SRDC achievements and activities for the fiscal year October 1, 1977, to September 30, 1978.

SRDC Plan of Work: Southern States' Title V Programs, 1978 provides a brief overview of SRDC activities projected for FY 1979 and summaries of the states' Title V programs.

Community Development Southern Style features CRD success stories from the Southern states and Puerto Rico.

Regional Perspectives in Rural Development presents the views of researchers and users of research on creating a closer link between the two groups.

Rural Industrialization: A Monograph contains eight papers dealing with rural industrialization research needs, industrial site development, and effects of industrialization on rural areas.

Brown Receives Publication Award

A publication on juvenile delinquency in rural areas by David W. Brown of the University of Tennessee won UT's Cavender Award for the outstanding publication in the field of agriculture for 1978.

Brown, international professor of agricultural economics in the Department of Agricultural Economics at UT, received the award for his publication, Rural Juvenile Delinquency: Problems and Needs in East Tennessee. Brown coauthored the study with William Dan Bolton, a former graduate research assistant in the Ag Econ Department.

The publication presents results of an exploratory study of delinquency problems and possibilities for improving juvenile services in 15 nonmetropolitan counties surrounding Knoxville.

Holland Named Circuit Rider

Gary Holland, former director of school and alumni relations at Northern Oklahoma College, has been named as a circuit riding technology agent under the Community Technology Initiatives Program (CTIP).

A graduate of the University of Oklahoma, Holland has a bachelor's degree in business administration in marketing and has done graduate study in marketing. Holland is one of eight circuit riders serving the 32 local governments which make up the CTIP membership.

He will be based in Stillwater, Oklahoma, one of the member jurisdictions on his circuit.

Holland and the other CTIP circuit riders furnish technical assistance and evaluates for three to five local governments, each under 50,000 in population, in the CTIP program. They provide assistance to public officials in defining and solving technical problems through drawing on Federal laboratories for back-up support.

The National Science Foundation, which is providing financial support for this program, has a Congressional mandate to apply scientific and technological resources to problems facing state and local jurisdictions. CTIP is a new institutional device designed to carry out that mandate.

The Federal Laboratory Consortium has endorsed CTIP and has agreed to participate in program activities as appropriate. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, through its Science and Education Administration, the Southern Rural Development Center, and its Cooperative State Extension Services, also has agreed to participate in appropriate program activities.

The CTIP mission includes development of an agenda of research and development priority problems and a search for solutions to those problems for participating communities. The results and benefits of CTIP activities will be potentially applicable to government operations in thousands of jurisdictions.