A PROPOSED MODEL
OF AN
INTERSTATE METROPOLITAN EXTENSION SERVICE AUTHORITY
FOR METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON

by
Michael John Lenaghan

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

APPROVED:

[Signatures]

L. D. Andrew, Chairman

[Signatures]

W. M. Worster C. Bezold E. Cassara

[Signatures]

Wayne H. White
W. B. White

February, 1978

Blacksburg, Virginia
Preface and Acknowledgements

Land grant universities have served society by applying knowledge to problems of agriculture, industry, and community living through the various disciplines of science, technology, and the liberal arts for over one hundred years. Extension services provided land grant universities an outreach into the communities for informal education and technical assistance.
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A model is an idealization of reality. It is created to visualize a set of relationships, structures, and functions for
the purpose of planning, decisionmaking, and subsequent action (or lack of such). It does not assure future outcomes, but it does provide a means for projecting possible results based upon the best available data.

The IMESA organizational model was constructed to address the dilemmas and the opportunities confronting three extension services. Needs were assessed, alternatives were explored, and a final model was extrapolated from the features of existing related models, advice of expert consultants, and the author's professional ingenuity.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture was created in 1914 to reflect the predominantly rural needs and rural political structure of the period. At that time, nearly 70% of the population was classified as living in rural America. By 1977, nearly 70% of the American people lived within the orbit of large cities (Nixon and Grant, 1975), and the Extension Service was no longer providing assistance to an exclusively rural population. Extension service programs, with considerable success, have adapted progressively to the shift from rural to urban population concentrations in the United States.

The metropolitan Washington, D.C. area, a densely populated region, was served in 1977 by three extension services. A federal district and two states and their various local jurisdictions converged in metropolitan Washington. The District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia each possessed a land grant university. Land grant universities were created by the Land Grant College Acts (Morrill Acts) of 1862 and 1890. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which created the Extension Service, also made them part of the land grant universities. The
extension services were charged with providing information, informal education, technical assistance, volunteer leadership development, and related programs in agriculture, home economics, youth development, community resource development and pertinent topics for use in rural, suburban, and urban areas.

In the metropolitan Washington area, the most recently created extension service, is the District of Columbia Cooperative Extension Service, formed in 1967 with the founding of the land grant college (now the University of the District of Columbia) of the District of Columbia. As the minutes of the Extension Committee on Operations and Planning (November 11, 1974) noted, the establishment of the land grant university and of the extension service in the District of Columbia was not contrary to the evolution of the role and function of either organization.

Extension programs were funded by federal, state, county, and municipal jurisdictions and such non-governmental organizations as foundations, businesses, banks, and civic associations. The Extension Service was organized at three levels: nationally, the Administrator of the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) ultimately was responsible to and reported to the Secretary of Agriculture; at the state level, the director of each extension service was responsible
to and reported to the president of the land grant university with which it was affiliated, who in turn transmitted communication to the Administrator of Extension Services; and at the county level, individual agents were responsible to and reported to the state leader of their specialization (agriculture, home economics, youth development, and community development), who transmitted communication to the state director (who, in many cases, also held the title and rank of an academic dean).

The metropolitan Washington extension services provided informal education (i.e., not for college credit) and technical assistance to urban and suburban residents. They were directed primarily toward providing nutrition education, inner-city housing renovation projects; urban 4-H and youth-development bicycle safety programs; ethnic-heritage-based programs for the Chinese, Spanish-speaking, and Afro-American populations; and community video-media projects in public housing, food cooperatives, and high-rise rooftop gardening. The services provided in the 1960s and 1970s differed from those of early years, when they were largely geared toward rural populations. In 1977, these types of activities and many others were occurring in the metropolitan Washington, D.C. area. However, each of the three services was treating its portion of the metropolitan area. This had the disadvantage of making the cost of
administrative and support services three times as much as they might have been and of giving each service access to only one-third the available expertise. The efforts of individual extension services efforts were often duplicated, occasionally conflicted with, and seldom benefited from the experience, expertise, and effectiveness of the others. This condition existed despite a general recognition that regional organization could resolve many of the problems associated with interstate cooperation.

Need for the Study

As a result of metropolitan Washington's population patterns, the responsibilities of various government agencies often overlapped: it was possible for individuals to live in one place, work in another, and play in yet another. This problem was not unique to the nation's capital area. The political organization of the United States (in terms of city, county, and state laws and practices)—whatever its merits in other respects—had tended to thwart regional economic development and the efficient and effective delivery of human services in interstate, metropolitan areas.

The most well-publicized examples of interstate cooperation designed to solve jurisdictional conflicts included the New York Port Authority, which provided regional economic
governance for transportation policy and practices for the seaboard regions of southern Connecticut, New York, and northern New Jersey; the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), a federal agency responsible for a multi-state area in which water control, electricity production, and economic development were the goals; and the Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments (COG). COG was an interstate coordinating organization created under federal legislation and funded by several levels of government. Academic consortia were another form of organizational arrangement designed to reduce interjurisdictional conflicts and to allocate resources more effectively; these were developed in part in response to problems that were apparently greater than any one single school could handle, either financially or politically.

When the extension services of two or more states converge in a common interstate metropolitan area without the benefit of regular coordination, needs and economic dysfunctions exist. This was true of the Washington, D.C. area, where the need for cooperation among the academic and service functions provided by the area's universities and colleges was noted as early as 1959 (Meyer, 1970 and 1971). In 1977, the organization and monetary resources were ready. The common perception of need and the motivation to progress were emerging among the three extension services. What appeared to be lacking was a plan with the rationale, resources, and structure for an area-wide extension approach.
The Office of Management and Budget and other federal departments were strengthening the A-95 administrative guidelines. The A-95 review process was an administrative review process for federal grant applicants started in 1969. The purpose of the process was to assure consultation among jurisdictions, area-wide impact assessments, and, where possible, cooperation within government units included in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area in the process of grant application (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1974). Local governments and the general public process were increasingly more open to involvement in the A-95 process. However, the difficulty remained to define the problem specifically and to discover a solution to the problem of meeting the educational, information, technical, and general living needs of persons in the Washington, D.C. area on an area-wide basis.

Purpose Statement

Once the need was verified, the problem became one of how to develop a viable model and a plan that would enable the three extension services to jointly plan, fund, and deliver certain area-wide services to the metropolitan population. It was important that it be acceptable to the efforts of individual parties needed to implement it.
The purpose of this study was to develop a model for a formal organization that would provide for effective and cooperative management of the resources of the three extension services in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area on a regional basis. Such a model for maximizing metropolitan extension service resources by coordinating and managing regional relationships did not yet exist. However, regional models for solving regional problems did exist and these provided a basis from which to build a model for a regional extension program.

**Significance of the Study**

The cost and effect of duplication of services and programs, overlapping authority and prerogatives, and unhealthy competition among extension services in the metropolitan Washington area was addressed in each metropolitan area extension service's State Extension Management Information System Plan of Work (SEMIS) for 1975 and 1976. For example, Maryland in sponsoring a manpower training program to prepare metropolitan-area senior citizens for part-time jobs in horticulture inadvertently cut off the other two extension services from co-sponsorship, co-participation, and mutual benefit by becoming the metropolitan area's A-95 priority recipient of earmarked funds. This eliminated a funding opportunity for the other services, since
only one project was to be funded by the Department of Labor in a certain category in metropolitan Washington and there was no area-wide cooperation to evaluate the relative capabilities of the separate extension services to meet the same need in their jurisdiction.

Extension program planning, promotion, and implementation in the Washington area for the most part did not have the benefit of collective experience and expertise. Certain consumer education television spots were co-sponsored by the extension services through television spot announcements; however, responses to these spot announcements by area viewers were directed to three separate extension services. The materials varied in content, format and quality. Positive public relations, consistent image, and client satisfaction were diminished by the disjointed approach. Other activities that were confusing to the public because of duplication included soil-testing programs, 4-H and youth development programs, and the metropolitan area county-fair schedules.

Public participation and professional area-wide evaluation of the extension services in the metropolitan area were limited. Dr. Jerry Klement, State Community Resource Development Director for Extension Services at the University of Maryland observed,
With a very few exceptions, Metro extension services as a whole do not exist because in peoples' minds and in reality they do not reflect effective cooperation, communication or coordination (1974).

There had been a number of useful attempts in the past to improve working relationships among the three extension services on an informal, ad hoc basis. The Metropolitan Extension Council (MEC) was an ad hoc committee to plan and to implement special events that were considered to be useful for residents throughout the metropolitan Washington area. An informal initiative of area home economics specialists, the MEC occasionally planned and sponsored area-wide activities such as consumer education workshops or interior-decorating seminars. Such ad hoc special events as a "Horticultural Happening" provided all metropolitan area residents an opportunity to learn more about home horticulture, nutrition, the effects of plants on the environment, and better living skills.

Another instance of area-wide participation was the first District of Columbia outdoor 4-H Family Fair in 1974. The event demonstrated the possibilities inherent in area-wide cooperation. Previous reluctance of other 4-H units in the area to cooperate with the District of Columbia 4-H was reduced. In 1977, the 4-H leaders in the area were conferring on an area-wide approach to youth development.
A telecommunications project proposal was jointly developed by the representatives of the three extension services during 1974 and 1975. However, because of legal, fiscal, administrative, and program description differences among the three extension services, it was not successfully negotiated. Inability to coordinate proposal development and internal approvals prevented the extension services from successful competition for a grant under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. If there had been established channels to enable them to negotiate as a unified entity, they would have been the only grant applicant eligible for metropolitan-wide discretionary funds since together they covered the whole region.

Policy differences were hard to negotiate on a project-by-project basis. These circumstances created delay, frustration, and loss of credibility with potential sponsors. This led to costly machinations to accomplish short-range objectives, often resulting in the cancellation of otherwise sound projects. To be handled properly, a more effective approach was needed.

The difficulties in achieving a permanent working relationship were numerous. They included: traditions of independent institutional development; professional vested interests within each extension service; conflicts between each extension service and its land-grant university; differing federal, state, county, and municipal interests; and prerogatives, mandates,
and practices peculiar to the federal district of Washington, D.C.

In spite of the difficulties inherent in cooperation among extension services, it was clear—from the wider jurisdictional experiences of other areas—that it was possible for individually unmanageable problems to be overcome collectively. Most successful academic consortia commenced their joint ventures with support services organizations rather than with academic course cooperation or amalgamation. New or additional services were easier to introduce to consortium arrangements than were consolidations, substitutions, or eliminations in schedules and services (Heston, 1976). In the case of the Port Authority of New York, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Council of Governments, the initial concerns of each interstate consortium-like arrangement included apparently unmanageable problems that were greater than any single local jurisdiction's ability to manage and underwrite financially.

In designing a cooperative approach, it was clear that each separate extension entity would have to forego some self-determination if a new relationship was to evolve. The key issue was how much each institution would yield. This had to be understood and negotiated without undermining the independence or the viability of individual institutions (Burns, 1973).
Any organizational model that was developed to address those problems would have to be politically, financially, and administratively feasible. Ideally, a model of effective management of the three extension services in metropolitan Washington would be applicable elsewhere as well, since there were 37 similar geographic settings throughout the country (see Appendix F). Thus a model interstate metropolitan extension service authority would have implications beyond its original site and would have to be adaptable to the special needs, resources, and opportunities of other interstate metropolitan areas.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definition of terms provided the standard meaning of the words cited herein.

Academic Consortium. A voluntary association between or among institutions of higher learning for the purpose of accomplishing certain goals considered to be mutually beneficial over a period of time.

Authority. A public administrative agency or corporation having quasi-governmental power and authorized to administer a revenue-producing public enterprise. Quasi-governmental describes an entity to which a government or governments assign certain governmental functions.
Matching Funds. Those funds proportional to, or made to correspond with, a proportion of dollars from more than one source used for a common project. For example, certain federal grants required local jurisdictions to provide a 10% match of funds to acquire 90% match of funds from the federal government.

Mission. A specific task with which a person or group is charged--especially one given to a person or group in an official capacity; the chief function or responsibility of an organization or institution.

Model. A theoretical projection in detail of a possible system of human relationships. Note the definition in Chapter III.

Region. An administrative area, division, or district, for example, the Washington metropolitan area in which local units of government and of other human activities are interdependent.

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). A concept developed to meet the need for the presentation of general purpose statistics about metropolitan areas by agencies of the federal government. The statistical concept of a SMSA was based upon five objective criteria. Information reported in the last census is the usual basis for designating a SMSA. Population estimates prepared by the Bureau of Census which
have been accepted for use in the distribution of federal
benefits were also used as a basis for designating SMSA. All
SMSAs included the county or counties in which qualifying popu-
lation reside. There were five criteria for a SMSA.

1. At least one city with 50,000 or more inhabi-
tants, or at least a city with 25,000 inhabitants
that together with contiguous place of a 1000 person
per square mile density has a combined population
of 50,000 and constitutes a single socio-economic
community, provided that the county(ies) in which
the city and contiguous places are located has at
least 75,000 inhabitants.

2. A contiguous county will be included in a SMSA
if at least 75% of the resident labor force is non-
aricultural and at least 30% of the employed workers
work in the central county(ies) of the area.

3. A contiguous county not meeting criterion 2
above is considered within a SMSA if at least 75%
of its resident work force is non-agricultural and it
meets 2 criterion of metropolitan character and one
criterion of integration: Metropolitan character:
a) 25% urban population; b) 15% population increase
measured during the 2 most recent censuses; and c)
county population density of at least 50 persons per
square mile.

4. SMSA titles are determined by the following:
the largest city is always in the title. No more
than three cities will be in a SMSA title. The
largest city will be first in the title. The state
or states will be included in the title.

5. A SMSA will lose its designation if it fails to
meet the criteria for defining a SMSA as measured by
information reported in two successive censuses.
(Office of Management and Budget, 1975, pp. 15-16).
Standard Consolidated Statistical Area (SCSA). Two or more contiguous SMSAs that met certain criteria of size, urban character, integration, and contiguity of urbanized areas as identified in the 1975 Office of Management and Budget publication.

System. A complex unity formed from many, often diverse parts subject to a common plan or serving a common purpose.

Limitations

This study was an exercise in policy design and in the development of an organizational model. As such, it did not attempt to establish a scientific theoretical construct for testing. It used the knowledge and judgement of experts in the design and review of an interstate metropolitan organizational model. Therefore, the study reflects the collective wisdom and creativity of the experts who participated. The present study focused upon a specific interstate metropolitan area, namely, the Washington, D.C. area. In using the proposed model, other areas would undoubtedly have to refine it to make it conform to their own needs. Finally, while some elements of the proposal had been implemented and found functional in similar situations, as of this writing, the proposed model was not yet implemented. Its feasibility, however, was tested with the help of a panel of expert consultants—each
of whom held key positions from which it was possible to work toward implementation of the model.

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter I was the introduction. It included the need, problem, purpose statement, significance of the study, definition of terms, and limitations.

Chapter II contained the review of literature. It covered background information and pertinent literature.

Chapter III described the methodology. It included the definition of a model, design, data collection, and data treatment.

Chapter IV provided results. It covered results and implications of the study.

Chapter V was the model and conclusions. It gave the complete composite model resulting from the study and the author's conclusions and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There were numerous factors to consider in the exploratory development of a model to enhance cooperation among extension services in the metropolitan Washington area. This chapter discusses:

1. recent trends in regional organizations;
2. regional metropolitan governance;
3. the economics of metropolitan interstate interaction;
4. land grant universities and extension services;
5. academic consortium model experiences;
6. extension service regionalism;
7. legal bases for interstate metropolitan agreements;
8. pertinent laws;
9. Washington D.C. area precedents for regional organization;
10. funding; and
11. summary and conclusions.
Regional Organization

Regional planning had become increasingly common. In Urban Growth: A Counter Report (Beckman, 1973), the authors argued for federal policy and resources to support regional and metropolitan cooperative mechanisms. They noted that major human settlements did not always conform to legal jurisdictions and that planning therefore required non-traditional analyses and perceptions by government and the people.

Melvin I. Urofsky's (1973) Perspectives on Urban America reinforced Beckman's perception that there is no national leadership in dealing with urban metropolitan problems and that we all suffer as a result. Richard M. Nixon (1972) in the first biennial federal report on the urban American condition affirmed what the 1960 and 1970 censuses implied: the United States was not merely urban but it was distinctly metropolitan and becoming more so each year. Nixon acknowledged that as a result of federal initiative a framework existed for meeting evolving urban metropolitan needs and situations. However, he did not provide an assertive policy position as to where his administration's analysis led.

Perloff (cited in Eldridge, 1967) identified two key features of the metropolitan environment that facilitate metrowide planning and implementation. First, he noted that under
existing laws and practices, the capability existed to accomplish metropolitan planning without metropolitan government, especially if a "financially benevolent" federal government would fund research, planning, and facilities that favored metro areas ready to plan on an area-wide basis. Second, Perloff suggested that a metropolitan planning agency is in a useful position to "manufacture" consensus that eventually can lead to the delineation of area-wide interests and action (Eldridge, pp. 667-724). The need and some predisposition for metropolitan approaches to problem solving were apparent and operative on various levels of society.

In Vital Signs, USA, John Fischer (1975) cited experiments in community planning and action--from Seattle to Jacksonville--that have recast the structure of society; he noted that regionalism is increasingly recognized as necessary and effective. The Tennessee Valley Authority was one of the first major steps in federally supported regional planning. The TVA initiated economic revival in a seven-state area (Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia) through flood control, electric power production, land restoration, and reforestation. Land grant universities and their extension services were deeply involved in the economic revival. They provided community training that led to effective utilization
of the new resources. The TVA's policymaking board was federally appointed. The states were represented, but there was little local citizen participation in planning and decisionmaking. The federal government provided most of the initial funding of the TVA, although state and county funds were invested in special cases.

In 1961, the Delaware Valley Basin Commission was created with support from the federal government and four states: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. Its mission was to control water distribution, pollution, and flooding. The land grant universities in each state provided technical advice and education, at points facilitated by the Northeast Extension Service Committee.

Eight river commissions were created under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965: however, these were only minimally funded. They enjoyed moderate success in efforts to coordinate the planning of federal and 32 state agencies involved in river control. The New England River Basin Commission has had more success than the other commissions, primarily due to the energy and political astuteness of its chairman (J. Fischer, 1975).

Other regional "experiments" were the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Ozark Commission, the New England Commission,
the Mississippi Delta Commission, the Ohio Valley Commission, and the Colorado River Commission. These were created between 1963 and 1968 to attack poverty indigenous to the region. The Appalachian Regional Commission reported directly to a White House staff member because of President Johnson's personal interest in Appalachia. The other five commissions were the responsibility of Department of Commerce staff. Each commission was comprised of representatives appointed by their governors and federal officials appointed by the President. The Appalachian Regional Commission was funded by local, state, and federal governments. It had the close cooperation of the land grant universities and their extension services. An Appalachian Regional Center was located in West Virginia and co-sponsored by seven state extension services and the United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service (USDA and J. Fischer).

Early in the first term of Nixon's presidency, ten federal regional councils were formed. Their progress toward improving planning and management was impeded by local and regional interests jealous of the federal presence and authority. The Councils were managed primarily by the federal bureaucracy and strong control was exerted by a White House program coordinator and by White House representatives on each regional
federal council. Fischer (1975) attributed the failure of the councils to overcontrol by the White House and to lack of effective means for using local and state input. Proposals made by the Carter Administration in 1977 for the councils appeared more participatory at the local level but no more decentralized.

Regional Metropolitan Governance

Large metropolitan areas generally extended across many different levels of government, e.g., small cities within the metropolitan region, counties, and often states. In general, most authorities on the governance of large urban areas favored a centralized approach, i.e., a single source of authority or governance for the metropolitan region (Mogulof, 1970, 1971, and 1972).

There had been difficulties with the strong centralized approach, since it tended to build an expensive and bureaucratic structure that became increasingly insensitive to local interstate needs. Dick Pazen (1972) rhetorically asked if "bigger is better" for metropolitan government. He noted that a superbureaucracy would probably do less for people and cost more. However, he ignored the costs of addressing locally unmanageable problems that could be better managed and more cost effective on an area-wide basis, especially with local
advice and consent.

Oliver P. Williams (1965) reported in *Suburban Differences and Metropolitan Policies: A Philadelphia Story* the failure of Philadelphia and its local suburbs to develop and to implement successfully a comprehensive and functional metro policy. This failure appears to have been the result of a lack of group sensitivity, political imagination, organizational planning skills, and proper timing. The apparently closed political system in Philadelphia from mid-1950 to 1960 forced the project to develop in relative isolation.

John Rehhus (1974) argued for centralization to address area-wide generic needs (e.g., garbage collection, safety standards, health codes) and decentralization to address problems and opportunities peculiar to each jurisdiction. He believed that such a dual approach would encourage optimum quality of life and citizen participation.

He noted several successful examples of metro planning and governance. The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments and its counterpart in the San Francisco area both worked well. These councils emphasized planning in consultation with local, county, and state governments and with citizens from each jurisdiction. The councils attempted to avoid controversy and to act only on those problems perceived to be area-wide.
Based upon his study of the Washington, D.C. and San Francisco experiences, Mogulof (1970) recommended two approaches to the development of metropolitan councils of government: a primarily service function was recommended for the San Francisco COG area and a regional planning and implementation function was recommended for the Washington COG. Mogulof argued that an effective COG can establish local government as a primary actor with regard to the issues of regionalism. The COG may not remain as the vehicle for the next step in regional governance, but the members of COG will be highly influential in determining what those next issues will be ... the COG cannot choose to banish the question of governance from regional affairs; it can only choose to avoid the question and therefore insure that its resolution will rest in other hands. (1970, p. 126).

Joan B. Aron (1974) appraised governance in the New York metropolitan region and reported that better organization, procedures, planning, and support were needed to avoid unmanageable urban dilemmas. Others contended that federal policy for metro areas' governance was nonexistent (Beckman, 1974). At the same time, the quality of life in American cities was increasingly and obviously discouraging (De Torres, 1974).

Metropolitan politics were an obstacle to metropolitan problem solving in many places, according to Phillip E. Coulter (1967) and to Michael N. Danielson (1971), who detailed the intricacies of local competition for resources, status, and

Hein (1974) studied nine cases of regional development for the Office of Research and Development of the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The experience in these nine cases led the authors to conclude that metropolitan approaches can solve regional environmental problems.

In general, the literature supported the opinions given above that metropolitan or regional approaches were needed to solve the increasingly complex problems of densely populated areas under the jurisdictions of several governmental agencies. The Economics of Metropolitan Interstate Interactions

Was the perpetrator of interlocal cooperation leading his community, constituents, and clients into a zero-sum economic game by pursuing metropolitan-wide approaches to collective problem solving, planning, and implementation of projects, programs, and services? The answer to this question had to be qualified, tied to an issue or need, cost-estimated, and considered
against alternatives to a particular situation.

Mushkin's *Public Prices for Public Products* (1972) and Ahlbrandt's *Urban Affairs* article "Implications of Contracting for a Public Service" (1974) were two of the best sources on this issue. They provided additional questions which must be addressed in any specific setting. First, what was the real cost of a service or program and what was the real cost of not meeting a need or want compared with alleviating it? Second, could some other level of organized human activity provide the program or service less expensively? Third, at what level and on what scale was community service most effectively and economically implemented? Fourth, if a non-governmental organization was under consideration as an alternative provider of the service, was it lawfully able to perform certain functions, e.g., adjudication, corrections, unemployment compensation administration, or licensing?

A review of Nobel Laureate and Economist Paul A. Samuelson's *Economics, Ninth Edition Revised* (1973) suggested that economies of scale were possible for metropolitan interjurisdictional cooperation in purchasing, location of service facilities, emergency assistance planning and implementation, licensing, municipal operations scheduling, employment practices, building codes, law enforcement, welfare and unemployment administration,
and public transportation scheduling. Achieving economies of scale assumed that conflicts between localities in laws and ordinances were not unresolvable.

The significance of economies of scale and other values enhanced or diminished through metropolitan cooperation or its absence had been treated by several authors. Benjamin Chinitz in City and Suburb: The Economics of Metropolitan Growth (1964) presented the views of several authors on the tradeoffs in metropolitan cooperation. James L. Green in Metropolitan Economic Republics: Case Study in Regional Economic Growth (1965) described the originally "balkanized" Atlanta, Georgia area. The response of sub-communities to metropolitan consciousness, development, and coordination led him to use an analogy from international trade--comparing metropolitan subcommunities to economic republics that form a common market.

The Committee for Economic Development, located in New York City, published a work called Guiding Metropolitan Growth (1966), which advocated close attention to economic analysis as metropolitan growth is implemented. It stressed that each site offered insights and better management opportunities that could result in optimum economies. J. E. Buckley (1969) analyzed "Intra-occupational wage dispersion in metropolitan areas
1967-1968" in the *Monthly Labor Review*. Buckley showed that wages for the same job varied within metropolitan regions; the question of which wage scale persisted is both an economic and a political issue.

Robert L. Bish (1971) presented major factors in the economics of public spending in *The Public Economy of Metropolitan Areas*. Maximum use of public dollars was crucial, but the impact of uniformities and disparities among laws, regulations, and practices in each jurisdiction and among jurisdictions in both the public and the private sectors could not be ignored. Similarly, he considered it important that calculations by businesses and households based on a patchwork of tax bases and revenue rules be understood.

Raymond J. Struyk (1972) added to the discussion on private sector concerns in an article in *Land Economics*. "Evidence on Location Activity of Manufacturing Industries in Metropolitan Areas" reflected business concern for maximized profitability in the location of enterprises. The article demonstrated the need to consult business people in the process of metropolitan planning.

detailed the theory and practice of metropolitan economic development--its pitfalls and its positive aspects. Careful priority setting, attentive management, clarity and measurability of financial and fiscal objectives, and regular evaluations and adjustments were the elements of successful inter-area management and fiscal practices.

Proper orientation planning, evaluation methods, and astute management made the economic aspects of coordinated metropolitan operations appear more manageable than detailed arguments at first suggested. In fact, most arguments against interjurisdictional fiscal interaction were based on concern about the unknown in any given situation. Key motivational sets of questions to elevate matters from the morass of inaction caused by uncertainty were; "Given identifiable trends is what is presently in place likely to remain in the future?" and "Is what is known or in place at present what is desired for the future?" Public budgetary and related quantitative and qualitative analyses were available to hold the governmental institutions accountable and to keep the public adequately informed, involved, and carefully critical.

Land Grant Universities and Extension Services

Clark Kerr (1972) noted that the modern American university was shaped by two main influences both federal and both in
response to national needs: "the Land Grant movement and the start of federally supported scientific research at universities during World War II" (p. 12).

The land grant movement occurred as a response to the rapid industrialization and agricultural development of the United States that had reached great momentum in the mid-1800s. Universities assisted in this development through:

(1) training that went beyond the creation of "gentlemen" and of teachers, lawyers, clergymen, and doctors;

(2) research related to technical advances in farming and manufacturing; and

(3) services to the economic and political segments of society.

The land grant movement was also related to the growing democratic trend in the nation. Higher education was to be open to qualified young people from all walks of life.

The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 establishing land grant universities was followed by the Second Morrill Act in 1890 which supplemented the original land grants with federal grants of funds to support college instruction in specified subjects; these grants still continued and had recently been expanded. The Hatch Act of 1887 established Agricultural Experimental Stations at land grant universities. The Smith-Lever Act in
1914 created the Agricultural Experimental Service and the Extension Service. A historical review of the effect of these acts showed that vitality, flexibility, community service through the cooperative extension program, responsiveness to national needs, and federal funding had been characteristic of the land grant universities.

The cooperative extension service generally was funded by federal and state governments on a 40/60 basis, respectively. The District of Columbia, where the funding was 50/50, was an anomaly. The cooperative extension program, sponsored by the United States Department of Agriculture, was administered by a state staff at the universities and implemented by county agents and home demonstration agents throughout the state.

In 1977, the plan for extension services for fiscal years 1975-1979 provided for "continued assistance to states with multistate activities, particularly in industry-wide and regional efforts which will permit more effective use of professional extension service state and federal staff resources." It further stated that "cooperation across state and regional lines will be encouraged by extension service in the conduct of programs, development of publications, and teaching materials to complement and supplement those already in existence and reduce duplication of effort among the States" (Extension
Committee on Organization and Policy, 1975).

Increased use of new communication technology was encouraged. However, the plan gave major priority to "meeting the needs of people in rural areas." Primary emphasis was to be on "educational programs relating to agriculture and home economics for adults and youths." The plan also stressed "close cooperation with State Cooperative Extension Services in expanding improvement programs for rural Americans" and for less emphasis "to be given to help State CES with programs for people living in cities with a population of 50,000 or over," with such important exceptions as required by congressional appropriation and civil rights legislation.

The emphasis on multistate cooperative relationships for land grant colleges and their extension services was not new. Land grant colleges worked closely with the first federally sponsored, multistate economic-social-environmental development program, the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Tennessee Valley Agricultural Correlating Committee in A Study of the Work of the Land Grant Colleges in the Tennessee Valley Area in Cooperation with the Tennessee Valley Authority (1939) concluded:

This new pattern should enable these agencies, as they further develop their cooperative relationships, to speed up desirable action programs, to economize in the use of public monies and to give greater service to the citizens of the area. (p. 76)

**Academic Consortium Model Experience**

Given the affiliation of the cooperative extension services with academic institutions and the opportunity to cooperate across state lines in an urban area, one available organizational model was the academic consortium. To effect savings by reducing duplication of programs, consortia had become important in both public and private higher education. Student recruitment policies and the development of alternative programs were high priority items on the agendas of many consortia. The term consortium meant a cooperative arrangement among institutions of higher education which were managed by a shared staff repres-
senting the two or more institutions involved. Relatively recent in American higher education, consortia were seen by their supporters as a rational alternative to the competition, duplication of courses, inefficient utilization of facilities, and general redundancy among neighboring institutions. Most consortia had charters or goal statements that committed them to improved academic offerings and to fiscal efficiency through cooperation without loss of individual identities.

Lewis Patterson (1970) had identified six benefits as the basis for a consortium arrangement:

(1) improved quality of educational programs and institutional operations;
(2) expanded educational opportunities for students and the general public;
(3) facilitation of change within member institutions;
(4) improved community relations;
(5) greater economy of operations, particularly in the higher cost aspects of university operations; and
(6) improved fund-raising capacity.

Problems that the participating institutions in a consortium met included questions of institutional identity and autonomy, financing, administration of grants, and faculty involvement and reward for participation. In 1977, most successful
consortia projects concentrated on supportive activities rather than the heart of the academic enterprise. Consortia tended to be the product of the administration and of less interest to discipline-oriented faculty (L. Patterson, 1975).

The fact that consortia were formed at the rate of one per month from 1970 to 1975 was due in no small part to such external forces as:

1. inflation;
2. no-growth budgets;
3. growing competition for a no-longer increasing pool of students and the tuition they bring; and
4. increasing dependence on government support and related external coordination and regulation (Cheit, 1975).

Leland L. Medsker's 1974 study suggested that external forces were the primary force for greater inter-institutional cooperation. Franklin Patterson had questioned whether "voluntary cooperation can take hold and work well enough to mitigate some of the thrust toward externally directed coordination" (Medsker, 1974, p. 8).

Fritz H. Grupé (1975) had argued that consortia were at an early stage of development, where they would stay until they became viewed as a vehicle for solving institutional needs.
He had suggested that too often members of a consortia failed to recognize that they were the consortium. Even where they were overseen by state governing boards and/or legislatures and/or other public institutions, consortia were the sum of their members plus paid staff. The consortia provided forums for identifying and facilitating innovative means by which each member could achieve its own goals through inter-institutional cooperation. To achieve this, however, consortium staff needed to be expediters, matchmakers, and minute takers. At the same time, they had to provide other logistical support for that interaction (Grupe, 1975).

Consortium governance generally had placed major emphasis on the selection and composition of specific, task-oriented committees whose members were appointed by the individual institutions. The effectiveness of task forces was highly dependent upon credibility of individual members on their own campuses. Only well-qualified individuals with sufficient authority in their own institutions could be present. The operation and survival of a consortium depended on what each institution felt it was getting for its membership fees, e.g., expertise, power, and the ability to produce insights not generated in one institution alone (Johnson, 1973).

Consortia could not be viewed as a source of relief from,
or as a solution to, institutional financial problems. The biggest benefits were improved quality, efficiency, relevancy, and a better return for dollars spent (Acres, 1971). Dollar savings usually occurred, except in such support programs as joint recruiting brochures, joint purchasing, consortium professorships, or common student volunteer community service programs (Acres, 1971).

Consortium programs involved additional efforts on the part of member institutions, such as personnel time for task forces and dollars for joint projects. Often funding not available on an individual basis was obtained by consortia for regional studies.

The voluntary multipurpose academic consortium was controlled by a governing board on which the institutional presidents, or their representatives, sat; the presidents retained a majority of the votes on consortium policy questions. Few consortia had non-college members. Decision making procedures and responsibilities of the chief administrative officer were usually clearly spelled out in a governance agreement. Procedures for participation in cooperative ventures, as well as the limitations of responsibility, were also specified. There were no legal requirements for continued membership or for participation in any or all joint activities. Individual members
retained their right to withdraw from the consortium.

Each institution, regardless of size, had equal voting power on the board (Heston, 1976). To protect, promote, and develop a voluntary consortium in the future, Heston advocated:

(a) priorities that are realistic, achievable and beneficial to the consortium membership and to each institution's individual goals and aspiration;

(b) improved progress reporting and interpreting to the board and public on an annual basis by assuring that:

(1) the basic purposes(s) of the consortium is clearly defined and accepted by each member;

(2) goals and objectives with a time frame for accomplishment are selected and agreed upon;

(3) necessary institutional task force personnel commitments are made and supported;

(4) consortium director expectations are spelled out in advance, including marching orders and responsibilities, thereby allowing a firm basis for cost effectiveness, consortium progress, and evaluation;

(c) adopting a management by objective (MBO) approach to carry out point two above using George S. Odiorne's basic premises:

(1) management takes place within an economic system in an environment that is characterized by change;

(2) MBO is a process by which the challenge of such change can best be met through goal identification. (p. 19)

Realistic goal setting had been the "key to survival" for consortia. According to Alvin Burbich (1958), three things were essential to good goal setting. They were:
(1) the planning to achieve agreed upon goals must carry within itself the seeds of accomplishment;

(2) the planning must be done in such a way that the selection of goals actually helps to generate the action required for achievement;

(3) the planning process that is required to move from plans to implementation must itself be well thought out. (p. 24)

And what made good goals? Durich stated that the goals should meet six criteria. They should be:

(1) sufficiently explicit to suggest defineable types of action;

(2) a guide to action;

(3) the kinds of measurements needed to evaluate and control progress (emphasize results over activity);

(4) challenging;

(5) consistent with and supportive of the whole set of goals;

(6) consider internal and external constraints (be realistic and achievable). (p. 38)

Fritz Grupé (1974) contended that the most difficult task facing any consortium was the selection of priorities. He stated that consortium priorities should reflect the priorities of member institutions since the overall purpose of a consortium was to provide cooperative solutions to individual problems which could not be solved individually.
**Extension Service Regionalism**

In the extension service, regional consultation, ad hoc cooperation, and regular collaboration were regular features of the arrangements for information gathering, and program development and planning among state extension services and state units and with the United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service. For example, the Northeast Public Policy Committee was a regional consultative mechanism of the USDA Extension Service. It met twice a year for the purposes of exchanging information about issues and programs, developing region-wide strategy, and arranging appropriate joint ventures among extension services. Extension community resource development staff were members. Expenses of the committee meetings and functions (e.g., reports, travel, and maintenance) were paid for by the Farm Foundation, Inc., of Chicago, Illinois. Extension services in the five other regions of the country had similar arrangements. Regional groupings of other departments of extension had less frequent regional meetings.

The six public policy committees sent representatives to the semi-annual Extension Committee on Operations and Policy (ECOP) of the USDA Extension Service. The ECOP group was the major interface between state and federal extension service executives. ECOP was the ongoing program system maintenance
and policy planning group for the USDA Extension Service.

Regional activity was conducted among extension service directors and home economics, 4-H and youth development, and agricultural staffs. While the geographic responsibilities of these regional groups included urban and some interstate metropolitan areas, the predominant national focus of the regional group was rural, with the exception being New England, where there was least distinction among urban, suburban, and rural areas.

A Northeast 4-H Community Development Committee met intermittently to confer on the relationships between youth programs and community resource development programs. Transforming youth leadership into adult citizenship through programs that bridge the two administrative elements in extension services was a special concern in relation to rural, suburban, and urban youth.

The Northeast Extension Publications Committee staff was located at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey. This was a committee composed of members representing the northeastern states' extension services which reviewed the region's needs for publications, publications recommendations by individual states, and available resources in order to make collective decisions. This process facilitated regional cooperation and economies of scale; if a state shared its need for a particular
type of publication with one or more others, and if there could be agreement on the content, format, and cost of a product, then one large publication output would keep prices down and meet multiple needs. Co-authorship, cross refinancing, and other acknowledgement of professional collaboration relieved "publish or perish" pressures for numerous single-state-sponsored publications on the same topic.

Economies of scale and professional cooperation were key factors in avoiding costly overlap or duplication in extension publications. Joint venture centers like those at Rutgers University existed in other regions of the country under the auspices of the Extension Service. Publications that required publishing monies not available to individual extension agencies for extension-generated projects were easier to acquire from the USDA, the Farm Foundation, and other related foundations through a regional approach.

Area-wide regional interstate centers for research, planning, and program recommendations included the Appalachian Regional Center, located in West Virginia, and the New England Regional Center, located in Massachusetts. Both were joint federal and multistate cooperative extension service ventures to study and to propose economic, social, educational, and cultural strategies to improve the qualities of life for rural area
residents in the multistate areas of their jurisdictions. Rural generally was defined as meaning a locality with a population configuration of 50,000 or less, as defined within the Rural Development Act of 1972.

The regional centers were jointly funded by participating extension services, USDA Extension Service regular and discretionary funds, and USDA Extension Service funds from the Rural Development Act of 1972. These centers had an independent existence, although they were administered through the host state’s extension service by joint agreement with cooperating parties. An expert advisory committee of sponsors and individuals assisted each center. Similar extension centers existed in other regions.

Metropolitan Extension Council of the Washington, D.C. area was a group of home economics specialists from the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia who conferred on an ad hoc basis to exchange information and occasionally to coordinate activities in metropolitan Washington. They acquired space from area businesses, shared public service radio and television timeslots, coordinated phone banks for public media campaigns, and sponsored a "horticulture happening". These activities reaped occasional area-wide recognition and increased extension clientele. However, no sustained project or program had been
possible, largely because of different decision making processes in each state extension service and because of a credibility problem resulting from the almost ephemeral relationship among the services.

Interorganizational, interstate joint ventures had been possible within extension services in their relationships with the federal, state, county, and local levels of government. Private organizations: businesses and foundations (Rudolph Pruden interview). The specific subject and administrative approach within the federal and state extension service priorities emphasized staffing, location, clients served, budget, expenses, management technique, and evaluation. This was the same information that the federal Extension Management Information System (EMIS) required in determining federal contributions to each state. The EMIS was a management system that used a computer to process data. The content and format of the EMIS were structured to relate to federally originated goals and to standards that provided guidance and measurement devices for using federal funds at the state and local levels. The EMIS was set up for feeding into a computer for analysis. It is a management system for which new alternatives would provide the major issues to be processed. Precedents existed for nearly all apparent elements of an interstate metropolitan extension coordinating body.
Administrative Procedures. The Administrative adjustments for metropolitan Washington extension services to establish a jointly funded and accountable area-wide system were minimal, since the theory of the existing management information, fiscal, and control systems were derived from MEO principles in an already arranged accounting format.

Review of the EMIS documents and the SEMIS documents indicated that the generalizations that apply to the EMIS were also pertinent to the State Extension Management Information System. However, the SEMIS was organized in such a way as to reflect the specifically state-oriented goals, programs, clients, and funds administered. In theory, the SEMIS was interactive with the EMIS for the purpose of providing a total impact analysis on a common computer readout that reflected simultaneously federal, state, and local results.

In FY 1975, Version 3 of EMIS and subsequently SEMIS were implemented. This improvement in the principal reporting system of the federal extension service system provided a more comprehensive and detailed description of federal and state activity than had previously existed. The new system was to be functionally interactive and comparable with all SEMIS sources through EMIS. The practicality of Version 3 was being assessed as it serviced data resulting from federal and state
activity.

In general, the local (county, city, and town) government-supported input (funding, materials, personnel, and facilities) and output (services, programs, publications, and media activity) were included within the SEMIS statements. However, individual extension service reports to local governments were made in descriptive and analytical reports through local extension agents. Sub-state reporting elements were seldom computerized, except as regional computer readouts for comparison of state regions. The District of Columbia was still in its early utilization phase of EMIS and SEMIS Version 3 systems. (Interview with Dr. John Jenkins). Administrative procedures and reporting systems appeared to be compatible nationwide; this suggested that a tripartitemetropolitan interstate arrangement was a problem merely of system adjustments, not of system creation or additions.

A state extension service's Plan of Work (POW) included the written goals, rationale, performance objectives, methodology, extension techniques, man-hour projections and cost projections, and related data for a fiscal year. It was both a plan and a measuring stick. The majority of state POWs included urban and suburban goals and objectives with programs, program language, and concepts of planning pertinent to urban, suburban, and rural
needs and related interaction. For example, the FY 1975 District of Columbia POW cited participation in the Metropolitan Extension Council as a SEMIS subcategory in home economics and community resource development. Urban 4-H, urban home economics, urban agriculture, and urban community resource development were descriptors present in many state plans—especially those of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. Interstate descriptors were present in many other state POWs.

Finally, all federally mandated laws, regulations, remedies, and access to redress on matters of personnel administration, confidentiality, job safety, discrimination, and related rights and prerogatives applied to extension services activities at all levels. Equal Employment Opportunity Act provisions, Occupational Safety and Health Act guidelines, Affirmative Action guidelines of the USDA under various civil rights acts, and other personnel and client protections and facilitators were features of extension service systems and activities.

Internal budget development, approval, and allocations procedures of the state extension services varied greatly, depending on the applicable state legal requirements; official interpretations; and budget negotiation styles in each extension service, land grant university, and state legislature; as well as on local government allocation processes.
Extension evaluation modes approximated the Odiorne (1965) MBO process whereby the outcomes of programs were judged against original goals, interim adjustments and justifications for unforeseen factors, and final outcomes. There were political and professional improvement factors. State extension services did not pursue for long politically unpopular accomplishments that were excellent by all objective standards but unacceptable to local politicians. Content and process, as well as products and outcomes, were essentially non-controversial at the start of new ventures, especially in a traditionally rural oriented framework that was being remodelled to accommodate non-traditional features. (Interview with Dr. William Skelton, 1975)

**Administrative Practices.** Recommended procedures and actual practices did not always coincide in the administration of extension services. Information conveyed in Version 2 formats of SEMIS and EMIS were not actually compatible or comparable among the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, to cite but three of many examples nationwide. EMIS and SEMIS Version 3 addressed that problem and, generally speaking, was able to make administrative practices by state and federal extension services national in form and thereby facilitated accountability and convenience.
Legal Bases for Interstate Metropolitan Agreements

The concept of an interstate metropolitan agreement was not new. There were numerous precedents that had indicated that such arrangements were necessary and important. However, there were also serious hindrances, not the least of which were political interests, the jealousy of local governments, and funding. Taxing in an interstate metropolitan area had been complex at best. As long as areas had mobile populations that worked, played, and lived in different parts of the interstate metropolitan area, it was unlikely that there would be any close correlation between the payment of taxes and the receipt of benefits from public expenditures. On the state level, tax inequities arose in terms of necessary expenditures and necessary tax resources. For example, taxes from bedroom communities, shopping centers, industrial districts, slums, and recreation areas did not necessarily go toward expenditures in those same areas.

There had been the problem of establishing authority in intergovernmental agreements across state lines since the idea had first come about. John M. Winters (1962) noted that:

in the affairs of local government, and consequently, in most governmental activities directed to the solving of metropolitan area problems, the state retains in practice the repository of powers which is found in the theory of the American constitutional system. (p. 32)
Thus a means of sharing or delegating this authority was required. Winters (1962) suggested three methods by which to implement cooperation between those states having legal jurisdiction over parts of an interstate metropolitan area:

(1) a formal interstate compact;

(2) state-level cooperation without Congressional consent; and

(3) interstate cooperation at the local level. (p. 62)

A formal interstate compact entered into by concurrence of the states involved and consented to by the United States Congress pursuant to the Constitution of the United States of America was the most structured type of interstate relationship. Without Congressional approval, there could be legal difficulties because the Constitution stated that:

No state shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation....No State shall, without the consent of Congress....enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State or Foreign Power. (U.S. Constitution, Article I, paragraph 10)

In 1935, five of 40 (12%) regional compacts pertained to boundaries, rivers, bridges, and tunnels. In 1956, 15 of 87 (17%) compacts in force pertained to interstate metropolitan problems (Council of the State, 1957). In 1977, 25 of 123 (20%) regional compacts pertained to interstate metropolitan problems. Such interstate metropolitan compacts provided the
basis for the New York Port Authority, the Delaware River Port Authority, the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District, interstate parks, the Kansas-Missouri Waterworks, the New York-New Jersey Waterfront Commission, and the New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency.

Legal problems generated by compacts were adjudicable by the United State Supreme Court. The Court's jurisdiction over compact disputes was closely associated with the power it had as the court of first instance in disputes between states and with power derived directly from the Constitution of the United States (Article III, paragraph 2). The Court generally had spoken of relieving disputes through legislative adjustment (compact) or direct recourse to the Court, which was the final arbiter. Few cases had reached the Supreme Court (Winters, 1962).

Cooperation at the state level without Congressional consent was the second most structured relationship among jurisdictions. In the absence of a formal compact, joint action was to have been of a political nature, relying on personalities and attitudes of officials involved. Yet the path for cooperation still required the approval of state legislatures to permit the various legislative and administrative devices to be legally authorized in support of interstate relationships.
Such authorizations may:

(1) create general organizations or commissions which can operate on any subject of interstate interest;

(2) give individual departments the power to cooperate at an interstate level on the particular subject in which the department is interested; or

(3) allow departmental authority on a particular project. (Winters, 1962, p. 74)

Achieving state level cooperation without Congressional consent was a long and serious process, subject to many compromises and minor accommodations.

A third relationship, interstate cooperation at the local level, had both formal and informal elements. In many cases, populous county or municipal jurisdictions in one state were contiguous with a similar jurisdiction in a neighboring state. State legislatures could grant two kinds of power to jurisdictions in need of legal instrumentalities to relate to out-of-state jurisdictions in the conduct of appropriate business. A state could grant general powers of cooperation to local governments for interstate transactions or it could grant specific powers of cooperation to local governments (Winters, 1962, pp. 85-96).

In addition to these formal methods for engaging in interstate metropolitan cooperation, there were highly informal
arrangements, whereby local officials on opposite sides of a state line conferred and acted in their common interest through ad hoc consultations on an occasional or regular basis. Such arrangements were nonbinding and based upon good will. They were means by which to cooperate as a last resort when no formal supportive action by the respective legislatures existed for whatever reason.

In a few states, the state constitution had provisions allowing interstate cooperation at state, county, or municipal levels. Alaska, Hawaii, and Missouri had this provision in their constitutions (Winters, 1962).

The merits of a formal compact, agreement at the state level, or a change in state constitution depended upon the effect desired by the parties involved. A formal compact was considered the most significant--more familiar and better understood, with an aura of stability and certainty enhancing the likelihood of accomplishment. However, additions and deletions could only be made if all parties agreed, making it almost unchangeable. Consent by Congress was hard to acquire--often achieved only after lengthy efforts. It was sound administrative practice to pursue a formal compact for any agreement that involved a complicated operation of relatively great financial import (Winters, 1962, p. 99).
Pertinent Laws

Several notable federal laws and related actions paved the way for improved delineation of federal responsibility and of federal capability to impact upon interstate metropolitan areas. Those selected for description herein were the stepping stone laws that laid the groundwork for access to, and provided the rationale for, additional resources to be considered for extension service use in a new relationship to the interstate metropole.

Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 had required that the specific types of federal grant-in-aid applications from individual local governments located within Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas be subjected to review and comment by an "area-wide agency designated to perform metropolitan or regional planning for the area within which the assistance is to be used." The creation of area-wide agencies where none existed was mandated by the statute. The Washington Metropolitan Council of Government was an example of a regional planning and review agency acceptable under the legislation.

The review and comment process was considerably broadened by Section 401 (a) of the Intergovernmental Act of 1968 that stated: "The President of the United States shall (provide)... rules and regulations governing the formulation, evaluation,
and review of federal programs and projects having a significant impact on area and community development..."

With neither an apparent national urban policy nor apparent priorities, the Nixon administration dealt with "the challenge of balanced and orderly growth" through a federal review process for requests for federal funds coming from SMSAs. This was the A-95 review process. Acting for the President, the Office of Management and Budget issued Circular A-95 on July 24, 1969 (with subsequent revisions); it required area-wide impact assessments and covered all major federal grants that could have an impact beyond the jurisdiction submitting the application. The number of grant topics covered by the requirement totaled 50, including outdoor recreation, basic water and sewer facilities, airport planning and construction, community action programs, law enforcement facilities, and other topics. State governments and area-wide agencies had 30 days to review notifications to apply for urban funding grants. Section 204 already had facilitated the creation of area-wide review agencies in nearly all metropolitan areas; the concept of interlocal cooperation had gained acceptance in metropolitan and rural areas for a number of reasons as a result of Section 204. State review of area-wide applications for state-aided projects had been increasing at the same time that interstate
review processes through the offices of state planning agencies (SPAs) had been increasing.

With the passage of Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, the President of the United States was required to transmit a report on urban growth to Congress during the month of February in every even-numbered year. The first such document used the term "national growth policy" instead of urban growth, "recognizing that rural and urban community development are inseparably linked" (Nixon, 1972, ix). The attitude and subsequent actions reflected in the first report were that the federal government would keep its hands off urban problems. Arguing that "patterns of growth reflect many determinations having primarily local significance..."in metropolitan areas the report states that"...it is not feasible for the highest level of government to design policies for development that can operate successfully in all parts of the nation." (Nixon, 1972). Earlier federal experience had shown the difficulty in the national coordination of regional policies.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) had proposed in 1962 that federal legislation require review and comment by a metropolitan-wide body on all local government applications for federal grants. The process for managing sometimes awkward, multiple, and overlapping roles and
functions of the various levels of government in an interstate area was begun in a manner that applied the same procedure to all metropolitan settings fitting a common definition—later termed a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. This ACIR proposal was subsequently mandated in the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. The interstate and metropolitan impact of federal funding proposals from local jurisdictions were to be identified prior to funding consideration. Impact was considered in metropolitan proposal clearinghouses that recommended or rejected projects or services advanced by governmental and non-governmental entities in interstate metropolitan areas.

Title IV of the Intergovernmental Act of 1968 specified other regulations to treat the metropolitan areas as wholes, seeking citizen input, local and area-wide impact assessments, and concurrence with the requirements of neighboring jurisdictions. The issuance of Circular A-95 by OMB formalized and operationalized the area-wide review process for metropolitan areas' proposals from the point of origin, through the region and state, and through the federal government, as they applied to the federal government and as the federal government sought access to all or part of a metropolitan area (ACIR, 1975).
Washington, D.C. Area Precedents for Regional Organization

Regional organizations provided forms for delineating, discussing, and often resolving a variety of problems in the metropolitan Washington, D.C. area. Governmental and non-governmental, profit and non-profit, enterprises operated at a regional level to alleviate problems and to elevate options for better living with limited resources in the metropolitan area. This was exemplified by the examples cited here.

The Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments was the dominant precedent for interstate metropolitan intergovernmental cooperation in the national capital area and a significant precedent nationally. It was formed in 1957 by elected officials from the major cities and counties in the area. These officials recognized the need to develop an area-wide consensus to solve major area-wide problems. Because one local government could not always solve its problems alone, responses were to take place by the cooperative action of local governments. The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments was the only metropolitan-wide governmental organization concerned with all aspects of metropolitan development. The COG worked for approaches to such regional problems as crime, traffic congestion, air and water pollution, inadequate housing, water supply, and land use. In addition, COG served as the regional planning agency.
for the OMB A-95 process, including transportation planning, for the metropolitan Washington area.

The Washington COG's general membership included 220 members who were the governing officials of participating governments. The board of directors had 24 members—four from the District of Columbia; two each from Alexandria, Fairfax City, and Arlington, Fairfax, Loudon, and Prince William counties; two each from Montgomery and Prince George's counties, Maryland; and one from each of the Maryland and Virginia legislatures.

The COG had an executive director and a staff of 165 members, predominantly planners, social scientists, and administrators. Major components of the COG structure included:

(1) A Transportation Planning Board which was created in July, 1965, by a Memorandum of Agreement among local governments and the state highway departments in response to the requirements of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962. In July, 1966, by mutual agreement, the Transportation Planning Board became the Technical Committee of the COG.

(2) The National Capital Interstate Air Quality Planning Committee, established in 1971 by the state governors and the Mayor-Commissioner to "Prepare, adopt and recommend plans for protection and improvement of air quality." Of the nine committee members, two
each were appointed by the chief officers of the
District, Maryland, and Virginia; COG appointed 3 members.

(3) **Policy Committees** for a) health and environmental
protection, b) human resources, c) land use, d) energy,
e) public safety, f) water resource planning, g) trans-
portation, and h) interstate air quality. Committee
members were governing officials from the 16
jurisdictions and experts.

(4) **Special Committees** addressed a) airports, b) historical e-
vents, c) cable television, d) drug abuse, e) emergency
medical services, and f) food prices.

(5) **Citizen Advisory Committees** for a) environment,
b) human resources, c) land use, d) public safety,
e) transportation, and f) water resources. These
committees assisted corresponding COG policy committees
to assure that metropolitan planning was responsive
to the needs of citizens living within their member
jurisdictions.

(6) **Technical Committees** advised the policy committees
on the technical aspects of regional issues and proposals
including a) air pollution, b) assessment officers,
c) chief administrators, d) codes and regulations,
e) consumer protection, f) disaster emergency prepared-
ness, g) corrections, h) elections, i) fire chiefs, j) housing, k) libraries, l) personnel officers, m) planning directors, n) police chiefs, o) purchasing officers, p) regional health officers, q) regional open space, r) regional sanitary board, and s) transportation. These committees include senior staff officials from local governments, state and federal officials, and private individuals with special expertise. (Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments, 1977)

"Crawling before it walked," the COG addressed non-controversial issues at first. As Walter A. Scheiber stated in The Star (1976), "There was a time when public officials who said they favored regional cooperation could lose an election on that issue alone. Now it's in their campaign literature."

The Committee of 100 on the Federal City was established in 1923 as the first planning organization in Washington. In 1926, it originated the establishment of what is now the
National Capital Planning Commission. Its basic goals included fostering and facilitating an understanding and appreciation for the best use of urban and rural land and natural resources. It advocated safeguarding and planned use of local, urban, and regional parks. It also worked for conservation of natural scenery, improved living conditions and combating community deterioration, and advancing good environmental design.

The Consortium for Continuing Higher Education in Northern Virginia was created in 1972 to encourage cooperation to meet the needs of adult students enrolled in state-supported institutions in Northern Virginia. Members included George Mason University, The University of Virginia (Northern Virginia Regional Center); and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Extension Division area office, Dulles); Marymount College of Virginia was an affiliate member.

The Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area was created in 1965 by The American University, Catholic University, George Washington University, Georgetown University, and Howard University; in 1977, it included Trinity College, Gallaudet College, Mount Vernon College, and the University of the District of Columbia. Members used the consortium to broaden the opportunities available to their students and to maximize their use of resources through cooperation. Until 1976, the consortium
managed the Title I, Higher Education Act, funds for the District of Columbia. After 1976 those funds were managed by the District of Columbia Commission on Post-Secondary Education, which is directly appointed by the mayor.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was established in 1941 and operated under an amended compact of September, 1970 (Public Law 91-407). It promoted the conservation, protection, and improvement of the quality of the waters and associated land resources of the Potomac Valley Conservancy District to provide for its maximum enjoyment and use. Its concerns included water supply, disposal of effluents, fish and wildlife recreation, industrial and agricultural development, gainful employment, and the maintenance of a high quality of life in the environment. Members were appointed to the Commission by the states of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and by the President of the United States.

Several intrastate interjurisdictional entities operated within the Washington area for the purpose of coordinating and planning for change within the states and the District. They interacted informally and communicated with the Council of Governments. Their public information brochures provided the following information:
(1) The Maryland-National-Capital Park and Planning Commission was a bi-county agency created by the Maryland legislature to plan for urban portions of the two counties and managed a regional park system.

(2) The National Capital Planning Commission was the central federal planning agency for the National Capital Region; with the District of Columbia, it published a joint comprehensive plan for the region.

(3) The Northern Virginia Planning District Commission promoted the orderly and efficient development of the planning district's physical, social, and economic elements. Created under the Virginia Area Development Act of 1968, its members included Arlington, Fairfax, Prince William, and Loudon counties and the cities of Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax and the towns of Herndon, Leesburg, Manassas Park, and Vienna, whose officials appointed members based on population statistics.

(4) The Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority had responsibilities for planning, acquiring, developing, and operating and maintaining a system of regional parks for the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, and
Loudon and the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, and Falls Church.

(5) The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission was responsible for the public water supply and sewage systems for the majority of Montgomery and Prince George's counties.

Each of the above intrastate organizations interacted informally with the region as a whole through the Council of Governments and interorganizational contact.

By the late 1970s, several previously separate organizations formally functioned on an area-wide basis because of the need for an area-wide approach to solving generic problems and the need to benefit from economies of scale. Their public information brochures and further study delineated the special features of each organization. Each was a not-for-profit organization that originally functioned as a group of separate but related entities but eventually came to enjoy metro-wide coordination:

(1) The United Way of the National Capital Area and the United Black Fund were cooperating non-profit organizations engaged in general voluntary fund solicitations from area residents to alleviate physical, social, emotional, and economic problems by conducting fund campaigns and allocating
funds on a priority (achieved by consensus) basis to over 100 non-profit agencies in metropolitan Washington. They had a self-perpetuating board of private, civic leaders from each participating jurisdiction. Base data for decision making criteria for fund allocations were from area jurisdictions and the Council of Governments.

(2) The National Capital Division of the American National Red Cross was an area-wide administrative unit to coordinate local chapters in the District of Columbia; Montgomery and Prince George's counties in Maryland; and Fairfax, Arlington, and Prince William counties, as well as the cities of Alexandria and Fairfax; in Virginia. The activities of local chapters consisted of service to school systems and community programs, disaster preparedness, volunteer training, blood programs, first aid and water safety, and nursing health programs. Chapters were governed by voluntary boards. Their area-wide system benefited from economies of scale, metropolitan access to public media time, and space and area-wide resource utilization.

(3) The United Planning Organization of the National Capital Area was a private, non-profit community action agency.
The agency prepared and involved the poor in their own problem solving with regard to finances, educational and career development, environmental improvement, consumer affairs, and manpower development and placement. Previously fragmented programs, funds, and political leverage necessitated a metropolitan approach.

Each of these interstate organizations was private and non-profit and conformed to the legal requirements of each jurisdiction and to any pertinent federal laws with regard to the interstate clauses of the Constitution of the United States.

Finally, there was the experience of local, state, and privately coordinated transportation systems which were ultimately consolidated as a responsibility of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WAMATA). The previously privately owned D. C. Transit Company was not cited because it was a case of a private corporation being bought out by a public authority, WAMATA, not an important fact for our study. A brief description of transportation followed.

(1) The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission was created by interstate compact in 1960. It had jurisdiction over the fares of interstate taxicabs and local sightseeing carriers, operators, private regular route operators and airport ground transportation in
the metropolitan transit district. The commissioners from each state were appointed by each government and the District.

(2) The Northern Virginia Transportation Commission was created in 1964 by the Virginia General Assembly to act as a public agency to plan and assist in financing a regional transportation system for northern Virginia with state participation in the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Pact. Commission members came from appointments made by the governing bodies of Arlington and Fairfax counties and the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, and Falls Church.

(3) The Washington Suburban Transit Commission was a bi-county commission created by the Maryland General Assembly in 1965. It was to plan and assist in financing a regional transportation system for Montgomery and Prince George's counties and to participate in the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Pact. The county government appointed members.

(4) The WAMATA was created by interstate compact among the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia in 1966. It planned, developed, operated and maintained, and financed the rapid rail and bus system for the metropolitan
interstate area. Authority board members were appointed by the two states and the District. WAMATA superceded the other two regional Commissions and complemented the taxi et al commission.

Funding

Funding to underwrite adjustments in implementing area-wide organization cooperation in the metropolitan interstate region including the nation's capital was available from within and without of pertinent organizations. However, the literature did not detail how funds could be obtained for the transitions from multiple to singular metropolitan organizations. Ad hoc arrangements evolved into formal ones to which a budget and resources were assigned and co-responsibility among two or more parties was negotiated and transacted in time.

Federal funding priorities and/or regulations provided an obvious incentive for most government-sponsored regional cooperative arrangements. Corporation, foundation, and public giving was an incentive that somehow perceived benefit to metropolitan strategies for giving to effectuate efficiency and more lasting change. Public participation was an important feature of successful regional approaches, although appointments were the norm. But all this added up to greater financial credibility what with citizen involvement and an area-wide approach.
The regional Foundation Center, the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, the Urban Institute, the Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments, the Washington Metropolitan Board of Trade, and the Federal Regional Office in Philadelphia confirmed in bulletins and conversations that from their point of view the better use of resources available at the time was achieved by regional approaches. They attributed this to economies of scale, relief to generic problems of a region, collaborative use of resources, and higher impact per dollar spent.

Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter it became increasingly clear that:

(1) Regional organizations were pertinent to and important for the resolution of certain metropolitan-wide needs and wants, especially given limited resources;

(2) Regional metropolitan governance was increasingly an acceptable area-wide technique addressing metropolitan problems with citizen participation, credibility, and measureable outcomes;

(3) Metropolitan interstate economic interactions were complex but generally complemented area-wide approaches to human service delivery and to the total quality of life more than did more anarchic approaches;
(4) Land grant universities and extension services originated and evolved with federal, state, and county interaction for political, economic, and social support. Academic and community service adjustment to accommodate a new era in the United States was not new to the land grant school or extension service;

(5) Academic consortia were on the increase, as private and public universities attempted to maximize the utilization of their resources to meet generic needs and to accentuate that which was unique at each university and location;

(6) Regional interstate cooperation among extension services was a regular feature of rural farm and purely extension administrative problem solving, but it was a new idea as applied to an interstate metropolitan area;

(7) The legal basis for interstate metropolitan agreements existed in the United States Constitution and at various lower levels of government prerogative;

(8) Federal laws enabled and facilitated interstate metropolitan cooperative arrangements under a variety of circumstances;
(9) Metropolitan Washington contained organizations with much experience across state lines. Funding for a new interstate metropolitan organizational relationship was available in numerous forms. Goals, objectives, strategies, and programs were crucial to obtaining access to specific resources and needed to be clearly defined to assure funding.

An analysis of the literature suggested that a number of factors could contribute to a new approach by the extension services to meet the needs of the metropolitan Washington public. The real issue became what could be acceptable, affordable, and implemented among the extension services in the interstate metropolitan area in question. The chapter on methodology addressed that issue.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to develop a model for organization that allowed effective, cooperative management of the resources of three extension services on a region-wide basis in the Washington, D.C. area. This chapter identifies and explains the methodology that was used to develop an organizational model within the capability of the three extension services for an interstate metropolitan extension service authority. The methodology was based extensively on the works of E. S. Quade (1975) and Yezekiel Dror (1974) for the development of a model and the determination of its feasibility.

This study defined the role and function of a model in terms relevant to the work of the Extension Service. The methodology used in developing the model was to design the study, identify the participants, develop the instruments, collect the data, evaluate the data, and, on the basis of these, draw conclusions
and make recommendations.

Model

At the outset, it was important to identify the definition, role, and function of a model in this study. A model was considered to be an idealization, an abstraction of the real world, used to identify the outcomes that follow a choice among various alternatives. It was thought that a model could help to determine the most appropriate action to be taken in the face of a given situation (Quade, 1975) and that models provided the basis for practical decision making in many daily situations.

It was assumed that in the early stages of developing a new approach to problem solving, a decision maker may have to rely on available expert judgment rather than on experience and that theory applicable to a given problem may not resolve the problem from the decision maker's point of view. Therefore, the development of a model using expert judgment provided a workable approach to formulating both a solution to the problem and a policy to implement that solution. Such a model may be ad hoc, tentative, and subject to modification and improvement; it may be future directed and policy oriented. It was further assumed that the reliability of such a model may leave much to be desired and that its justification should derive from the fact that the action recommended as the result of the model is more
appropriate than action selected without the use of a model would be (Helmer, 1966).

The test of any model is whether or not it is adequate for the problem at hand. Is it made up of factors relevant to a particular situation and to the relations among the factors? Are the outputs from the model, the answers, reasonably appropriate and valid in relation to the questions? Ideally, a model should do more. It should predict outcomes with as high a degree of complexity of the case allows. In public policy analysis, this has tended not to be possible, since there are many variables. In this case, the variables included the concerns and practices of many different individuals and problems in different local, state, and federal organizations.

Design

This study was designed according to the Verification Feedback Iteration paradigm (shown in Figure 1), developed by Kathleen Archibald and cited by E. S. Quade (1975). Quade emphasized problem definition, needs assessment, measures of effectiveness, alternative models, impact assessment, evaluation and ranking of alternatives, interpretation, and recommendations. The interpretation in this case included the development of a composite model utilizing the best features of the alternatives that were identified by the panel of experts as being acceptable.
Figure 1

Verification Feedback Iteration: A Paradigm for Policy Analysis (Quade, 1975, p. 52)
Problem Definition. The problem was identified, defined, and redefined on the basis of personal observation and consultation with urban experts, extension service experts, and legal and funding experts between 1971 and 1977. Some of the agencies that individuals providing input and acting as consultants represented were: the Urban Institute; the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies; the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; the Metropolitan Council of Governments; the extension division of the three land grant universities; the United States Department of Agriculture Extension Services; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the American Law Division of the Library of Congress.

Needs Assessment. The needs assessment—which involved a survey of a wide range of consultants and a survey of the literature and the public media—for this study took place between 1973 and 1975. Officials of local municipal and county governments, of non-governmental regional organizations, and of government-related regional organizations in the Washington Metropolitan area were consulted. As part of this assessment experts from the various organizations mentioned above were interviewed with an open-ended questionnaire. Interviews were conducted either by personal contact, by telephone, or by mail. Personal contact and telephone interviews were generally an hour or less in duration.
Each individual was contacted twice in the needs assessment process. In the first contact, each representative was given an open-ended questionnaire described later in this chapter. Information from the first questionnaire was used by the author to develop a questionnaire with more specific questions and multiple-choice answers. The organizational representatives were interviewed a second time, again either by phone, personal contact, or mail.

Also contributing to the needs assessment were literature, documentation, and public media. These included urban metropolitan studies, annual Plans of Work from the respective extension services, planning data from the Extension Services of the United States Department of Agriculture, and questions raised by columnists in Washington area newspapers.

Measures of Effectiveness. The following criteria were established to determine whether or not a new model was an effective way of addressing the problem of the study:

(1) whether the model maximized existing extension resources utilization;

(2) whether the model provided access to new or additional resources earmarked exclusively for metropolitan areas with particular features;

(3) whether the model minimized the difficulty
individuals and institutions would have in accepting the expanded role of a joint metropolitan area extension service;

(4) whether the new model required minimum adjustments by the sponsoring institutions and other organizations in the metropolitan area.

Alternative Models. Alternative models were selected from those models which addressed problems most similar to those that confronted the extension services in the Washington metropolitan area. Four alternative models came closest to addressing the difficulties inherent in an interstate cooperative metropolitan setting, the multiplicity of governmental rules and regulations, multiple source funding, and related legal and political issues faced in the metropolitan area. Extension services had the additional problem of being appendages of land grant universities, thus necessitating that the community service and academic interests of each land grant university be accommodated. The four models selected as alternatives from nearly 30 reviewed were the Port Authority of New York, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments, and the academic consortium.

Impact Assessment. The usefulness of each alternative
model was determined by projecting the impact of each model on extension services, land grant universities, and the metropolitan area. This was accomplished by consultation with the panel of experts. The major considerations were:

(1) maximizing utilization of existing extension services;
(2) maximizing access to funding and other resources exclusively designated for metropolitan organizations;
(3) minimizing misunderstanding of the extension services' expanded roles in the metropolitan community; and
(4) minimizing the adjustments that the extension services, the land grant universities, and other organizations had to make to a new metropolitan relationship.

Evaluation and Ranking of Alternatives. Alternative models were evaluated and ranked according to their adaptability to the existing problems and institutions in the metropolitan area. This was done with the advice of the panel of experts by applying the measures of effectiveness to each model. The major concerns were to determine:

(1) the relationship of the model to the problem solving capabilities of the three extension services in metropolitan Washington;
(2) the relationship of the model to the institution of higher education that sponsored the extension service; and
(3) the acceptability of the model to multigovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, and the public to be served.

Interpretation and Recommendations. The interpretation and recommendations resulting from the evaluation and ranking of alternatives was evolved from discussion with the panel of experts. One of the possible outcomes of this process was that none of the alternative models considered would sufficiently meet all the criteria for a feasible model for the metropolitan Washington area. Another possible outcome was the development of a composite model that contained both the pertinent features of other models and the additional features necessary for any new entity to be politically feasible. Political feasibility was determined by applying Dror's (1974) norms to the extant situation.

Panel of Experts

The panel of experts was comprised of the most knowledgeable and influential individuals who could affect the extension services of the metropolitan Washington area. More than 50 individuals were involved in early problem definition and needs assessment. Fifty were selected because of what they knew and could contribute to the success of reprogramming after consulting the ten key decision makers. The final 10 members were selected
to act as a panel of experts. The members of the panel of experts were each contacted a minimum of eight times during the course of the study. Panel members included: Edwin Kirby, Administrator, Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture; William Skeiton, Dean, Extension Division, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; Robert Wagner, Director, Maryland Extension Service, University of Maryland; John Jenkins, Director, District of Columbia Cooperative Extension Service, University of the District of Columbia; Marc Shreiber, Executive Director, Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments; Royce Hanson, President, Washington Center of Metropolitan Studies; E. J. Stiles, Director of Publications, the Urban Institute; Norman Beckman, Deputy Director, Congressional Reference Service, Library of Congress; Donald T. Rotunda, Staff, House Budget Committee, House of Representatives; and Paul Royston, Executive Staff, Office of Management and Budget. Each expert was in a position to facilitate implementation of the model developed, if motivated to do so.

(Details about individuals involved and the sequence of their involvement are presented in Appendices A and B).

Instrumentation

Several instruments were required in this study. They were:
(1) an open-ended questionnaire;
(2) a multiple-choice questionnaire;
(3) a composite model of an interstate metropolitan extension service; and
(4) a modified composite model of an interstate metropolitan extension service and related questions.

The open-ended questionnaire was used to verify the definition of the problem and to explore options by which the extension service could address the problem. The results of the first questionnaire led to the formulation of a second, multiple-choice questionnaire (See Appendix C).

The multiple-choice questionnaire helped to rank those problems that a cooperative extension service was most likely to alleviate and the resources most likely to support a metropolitan approach by the extension services (See Appendix D).

A composite model of an interstate metropolitan extension service organization was derived from the four alternative models and after consultation with the panel of experts. The initial model was used to crystallize the acceptable organizational concepts for a new arrangement among the extension services.

A modified composite model reflecting further refinement based on consultation with the panel of experts was submitted to that panel, along with 10 specific questions, for further
comment and evaluation (See Appendix E).

**Data Collection**

A variety of methods was used to collect the data for this study. The survey of published and unpublished literature and documents required a great deal of time. This entailed locating the materials, obtaining access to material normally considered to be confidential, reading the material, and absorbing the information and its meaning. Circulating the original questionnaires, the composite model, the modified model, and the final questions submitted to the panel of experts was an on-going process of data collection.

**Data Treatment**

Data were accumulated using the instruments cited above from populations who were knowledgeable and experienced in metropolitan issues and extension capabilities. The people who were involved in this study were experts and decision makers of the extension service and metropolitan area experts and decision makers. Responses from the 50 individuals answering the first two questionnaires fell naturally into three populations characterized by shared viewpoints.

The primary population included extension officials at the local, county, regional, state, and federal levels. Specifically, these were the metropolitan area extension administrators, program staff, and agents; the state extension directors and
program leaders; administrators in the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; and representatives from the administrations of the University of the District of Columbia, the University of Maryland, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

The secondary population included governmental and non-governmental representatives who were capable of verifying the general acceptability of a new approach to extension service in the metropolitan area. Staff members from the Advisory Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations, the Office of Management and Budget, the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, and pertinent funding agencies, especially foundations, were consulted. The Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments—the area-wide A-95 clearinghouse for metropolitan Washington—was consulted for advice and guidance.

The tertiary population included experts in metropolitan interstate affairs from the Urban Institute, the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, the National Association of Regional Councils, and other regional authorities. Unfavorable reaction to a metropolitan extension approach among this tertiary population would have been harmful to progress of any model. On the other hand, acceptance by this population would assist support from public and private financial resources.
Data collection and treatment and the building of the model had to be conducted carefully and with the cooperation of many individual institutions. The process was eclectic. Differences, criticisms, consensus, and some advocacy permeated the study's process and results.

The first questionnaire reflected concerns that were apparent in early discussions with various consultants, extension documents, and the literature dealing with extension metropolitan problems, organization, and finance. The open-ended design of the questionnaire was used to avoid limiting the options to predetermined possibilities. Broad advice and guidance was sought through this questionnaire. As a result of this process, the questions and the study itself took into account a variety of viewpoints.

The second questionnaire reflected further research and the responses to the first questionnaire. However, the second questionnaire was designed with multiple-choice answers. It presented a specific range of choices and a more precise indication of the nature of options presented. This allowed all those responding to react to the same set of possible answers to each question. This range of choices was developed using the answers to the first questionnaire and the collective expertise and perceptions that that implied.
The second questionnaire crystallized the problems and limitations of the current extension arrangement. It reflected the fact that a new relationship did not have to be a zero-sum-game in which one party gave up something when another party got that something. The multiple-choice answers presented in the second questionnaire showed that if two or more parties got something, the individual parties would not necessarily be recipients of lesser portions than if each were to seek the same resource alone. The multiple-choice format also provided a more precise indication of the implications of the study than the first questionnaire.

The four alternative models chosen for consideration (the New York Port Authority, the TVA, the Washington CCG, and the academic consortium) after this process of literature review, consultation, and questionnaire circulation, were chosen for their comprehensibility, their relatively low cost, their widespread political acceptability, and their applicability to the Washington setting.

With the exception of the Appalachian Center, the New England Center, and the Ozark Center (which were run entirely by one university's extension service), the existing regional interstate relationships of the extension services were rural, ad hoc, and extra-institutional. Thus although they did provide
a possible model for researching and planning for a geographic region larger than one state, it was not one that was easily adaptable to urban conditions. Nor did the variety of other ways in which businesses, banks, and private non-profit organizations created interjurisdictional arrangements provide adequate models. A composite model based on the four alternatives and entitled the Washington Metropolitan Extension Service System was designed and distributed to the panel of experts for consideration.

Specific recommendations and related discussion about the first model provided the basis for the development of a second model that addressed the panel's concern for effectiveness and appeared to address its concern for acceptability. The second model and the brief questionnaire pertaining to the feasibility of that model, entitled Interstate Metropolitan Extension Service Authority (IMESA), were circulated for review and reaction.

Strategic and tactical considerations to implement the IMESA were developed from the theory and practical insights offered by the literature, interviews and related discussions, logic, and personal experience. The implementation strategy and conclusions were finalized after the review of the modified composite model for an IMESA.
Conclusion

The methodology of this study conformed to the modified version of the paradigm cited in the design section. This approach benefited from the review and modification process carried out by the broad group of consultants and the panel of experts. The assessment of need, the statement of the problem, and the finalization of a feasible solution to the problem were carefully constructed. The model that resulted from this methodology appeared to be appropriate for an extension function in an interstate metropolitan area.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Data for this study was acquired by using the instruments cited in Chapter III. The three populations were knowledgeable and experienced in metropolitan issues, extension capabilities, and related resources. The participants knew the needs and wants of metropolitan area citizens and the adequacy of services available or planned. Each knew what was unacceptable, tolerable, acceptable, and desirable in the metropolitan interstate setting under study. Each was knowledgeable and had a sense of what was feasible under specific circumstances. Each had a track record for interpreting and/or influencing metropolitan affairs.

The primary population was composed of local, county, regional, state, and federal level extension service staff and management personnel. The secondary population consisted of members of the Washington metropolitan governmental and non-governmental organizations who had power or influence to facilitate
a new arrangement among area extension services in accord with area-wide needs, wants, and resources. The tertiary population were experts in metropolitan and interstate affairs and resources to expedite optimum education and human service delivery in those settings.

A complex web of political, social, and economic perceptions and realities in the metropolitan Washington area emerged from the data. The situation could have provided considerable rationale to do nothing significant to alter relationships and resources that could impact upon and improve such extension activities as informal education, technical assistance, leadership development, and community development. However, initial responses reflected a basic receptivity to a change.

**Preliminary Findings**

Early in the development of the research topic, the majority of the primary population made it clear that an acceptable approach to a three-party venture among area extension services would not take anything away from the existing stature, resources, and capabilities of any one organization. On the other hand, the incentives for change had to be clear and present to facilitate the adjustments necessary to any agreement among the three organizations.

There was a common concern not to overstate the number of
area-wide problems extension services might address, understate the existing capability of the extension service to alleviate complex educational needs, or berate the current method, or lack of such, in the metropolitan setting. The need to "supplement," "augment," "provide access to," or "increase knowledge about and use of" extension services were considered accurate acceptable definitions of the problem and solutions under review.

In contrast, the secondary and tertiary population members were at the outset amazed, at the least, and frequently somewhat apprehensive about the efficacy of a metropolitan educational and technical assistive role for extension because of their assumptions about the rural nature of extension services and land grant universities. Yet "doing nothing, inventing a new multi-purpose something, or inducing other colleges and universities into an area-wide role had proven to be fruitless from the 1950s to date," claimed Margaret Beatty, D. C. Title I HEA (1965) Director, early in 1975.

Clarence Erata of the Washington Metropolitan Board of Trade identified the initial concerns of the various populations:

An extension service initiative in metropolitan Washington already has a traditional legal, fiscal, administrative, and program context to justify its prerogative and role. But the issue appears to be one of credibility among the people to be served, acceptability among land-grant sponsors, fundability in the non-traditional setting, and rapport with 'others' who also aspire to area-wide education and service roles. (Erata, 1975)
The first questionnaire yielded the information outlined below. It confirmed trends suggested by early stages of research and discussions with the three populations.

**Area-wide Demographic Data**

Population, housing, and economic shifts suggested the need for a functional redefinition of metropolitan Washington's "central city." A number of key indicators show that metropolitan Washington's central city now includes Arlington County and the city of Alexandria. Arlington, Alexandria, and the District of Columbia were originally part of the "ten mile square" section carved out of the states of Maryland and Virginia to serve as the nation's capital. Later, Alexandria and Arlington were returned to Virginia.

In 1977, the metropolitan area encompassed a large region that reached halfway to Baltimore, Maryland, and included the counties of Montgomery and Prince George's to the north. It could be anticipated that parts of Montgomery and Prince George's counties would join Alexandria, Arlington, and the District as part of the area's central city (Flax, 1972). To the west and the south, the metropolitan area extended beyond Reston, Virginia, to Dulles Airport, and halfway to Richmond, Virginia (Office of Management and Budget, 1975).

The people in all these areas were renters rather than homeowners and lived in high-density development areas in small
housing units. They increasingly were single, under 33 or over 44 years of age, and working within the regions in which they lived. The only significant difference among the jurisdictions was that the District of Columbia was 71% black, while none of the others exceeded 14% black population.

A related demographic development was noteworthy. Modern black/white population growth trends in suburbia were reversed during the 1960s. By 1970, for the first time in the twentieth century; the black percentage of the suburban population had increased instead of decreased. In 1920, it was 33%; in 1960 it was 6%; and in 1970 it was 8%. Between 1960 and 1970, the black population increased at an annual rate of 98% in the suburbs and only 31% in the District of Columbia. The rate of the black population growth in the suburbs was higher than the rate of total population growth (98% vs. 60%).

The 1970 national census indicated that the metropolitan area of Washington had a "sex gap," especially among people aged 20 to 24 and among those over 65 years of age. In 1970, females outnumbered males in the 18 to 24 year old age bracket by 15%, compared to .4% in 1960. It was likely that the Washington area would have a substantially increased number of unmarried women for decades to come. Adults who have never been married grew from 351,000 in 1960 to 591,000 in 1970,
reflecting an increase of 240,000 persons, or 68%, and a doubling of the single population growth rate.

These trends in "sex gaps" and unmarried adults had implications for public and private policy, especially in projecting apartment needs and related services. Increased competition from single women in the labor market required improved educational services for women. Mortgage lending, rental requirements, professional employment practices, job descriptions, pay scales, banking services, and insurance protection required overhauling to accommodate the needs of women since they were geared to accommodate men and couples.

Local governments, civic groups, institutions of higher learning, churches, and businesses needed to assess and to address the above issues to maintain high levels of satisfaction and of performance among area residents who make a community thrive or deteriorate.

Area-wide unemployment was below 7% in 1977, a Washington Board of Trade Representative pointed out. But a Washington Metropolitan Council of Government official countered with the fact that unemployment reached nearly 25% among blacks and Spanish-speaking people in Takoma Park and East Silver Spring, Maryland; Washington, D.C.; and Alexandria and Arlington, Virginia. Youth unemployment persisted at 40% to 50% in the same
areas. Low-income populations in Prince George's County, the eastern half of the District of Columbia, and Arlington County were marginal insofar as inflation made them poorer each day. Opportunities for personal and for professional improvement were fewer and fewer for the marginal (low-income) workers who were close to unemployment each day.

Analysis of the demographic patterns showed the human problems to be area-wide in issues and scope. However, area-wide approaches to human problem solving through education, technical assistance, leadership development, and organization were limited in number and difficult for the average person and for many otherwise astute business representatives, bureaucrats, and politicians to assess. The municipalities, counties, and states around the District of Columbia only became conscious of their metropolitan character after the fact.

These area-wide trends offered generic problems for consideration by a new extension authority. The sources of analytical data were also regional. The data affirmed that an area-wide approach, across jurisdictions, would be the most useful for providing needed extension services.

**Fiscal Incentives to Cooperate**

The fragmentation of the extension services in metropolitan Washington detracted from their capacity to enlist resources
designated by virtue of law, policy, or practice. Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, required that funding priority be given to metropolitan projects and that 10% of any year's funds be set aside exclusively for metropolitan projects (Title I, 1970). The Discretionary Special Fund administered by the Administrator of the USDA Extension Service required that 10% of any year's federal extension budget be set aside for projects that gave high priority to cooperation between two or more states (Extension Committee on Operation and Policy, 1974). The President's Office of Management and Budget, in circular A-95 and subsequent modifications and extensions (Gordon, 1974), provided guidelines to facilitate regional cooperation. Regional factors were emphasized in categorical and general federal grants to states and to their sub-state units (National Association of Regional Councils, February, 1974).

Private and corporate foundations also gave funding priority to projects that took into account a regional approach. These included the Meyer Foundation, the Redskin Foundation, the Public Welfare Foundations, and businesses and banks that cooperated through the Washington Metropolitan Board of Trade.

**Regional Organizational Trends**

The organization of numerous single-issue groups across
jurisdictional lines demonstrated that a community of interest on positive and adverse conditions in the area was not limited by legal lines of demarcation. Effective coordination of the three extension units could improve the quality of life in the Washington metropolitan area through informal education, the transfer of technology, professional leadership sharing, and joint program development for area-wide generic problems or for local program needs that could benefit from collaborative expertise.

Other organizations with human service delivery systems and educational components were adopting regional approaches to their individually organized programs. Examples of regionalization across state lines included the Washington Metropolitan Board of Trade, the Clean Air Coalition, the National Capital Division of the American National Red Cross, the National Capital Area Health and Welfare Council (administrator of the metropolitan United Way Fund allocations), and many others (Metropolitan Bulletin, 1974).

Factors facilitating a joint multimember extension service administrative arrangement in metropolitan Washington included the following:

(a) increasing area-wide demands for educational and technical services;
(b) increasing area-wide urban characteristics;
(c) shared, rather than competitive, perceptions and priorities by area extension services;
(d) complementary extension-staff expertise and experience;
(e) triplication of some functions and structures;
(f) limited or no access to metropolitan-wide "public service" designated resources by individual extension services;
(g) recent federal laws and funding guidelines that favored metropolitan and interstate cooperative arrangements;
(h) business and philanthropic preference for coordinated area-wide efforts;
(i) new theories about organizational development; and
(j) existing legal, administrative, fiscal, program, and purpose similarities.

In the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, several features appeared to provide impetus for development of a formal cooperative arrangement among extension services. A significant portion of Maryland's and Virginia's population (18% and 16% respectively) lived in the area; this represented some 2.7 million people that had an increasingly strong voice in state government as the effects of one-man, one-vote judicial decisions were felt in state legislatures, thereby counter-balancing rural influence in those states with suburban and urban influences.
Representation in general and committee assignments tended to support growing accommodation to non-rural interests in the state legislatures.

In spite of the conditions favoring cooperation, however, innovation on several levels was required on the part of the three parties to (a) create an adequate organizational structure and function; (b) respond to an evolving metropolitan population’s needs and wants; and (c) implement a new institutional approach to extension service in an increasingly "common" urban interstate metropolitan setting.

**Favor and Disfavor in the Universities**

Extension service had a unique history, purpose, and function. It had always interacted with the land grant university and different levels of government ranging from the local to the federal. Extension was at home in the university environment with all the resources that implied. In a metropolitan interstate context, the uniqueness of the service provided by the extension agencies was accentuated.

Yet it could not be assumed that a consolidation of the community education and community service functions of the three state land grant universities would be well received by other higher education institutions funded by state, county, or private sponsors. If the risk of cooperation in the metro area carried with it the probability of greater public satisfaction
and support, then the risk of reverberation from one or several other institutions was one risk to be cognizant of, to be willing to discuss, and to be prepared for, in order to avoid unnecessary or prolonged public disagreement.

It was interesting that even though a land grant university participated in each one, none of the academic consortia of the three jurisdictions interacted across state borders. The same was true of each of the state agencies created by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Title I, HEA 1965, allocated funds for community service projects carried out through higher education institutions. Metropolitan interstate cooperation was a high priority of Title I. There were a number of circuits of information, resources, and influence that a Washington area-wide extension system could complete. This appeared to be useful for extension services and land grant universities to better serve the public insofar as their area-wide facts and perceptions might improve each one's criteria to select projects and to implement them and thereby facilitate area-wide extension cooperation itself.

**Consensus on the Need and Approach**

Using a survey approach to establish the reasonableness of need for improved metropolitan area extension service evaluation, program development, and program delivery and evaluation, the open-
ended Questionnaire I was circulated among a group of 50 Washington metropolitan area experts and leaders. The responses basically confirmed, with some modifications, the author's intent, purpose, and methodology. Advice on strategy was integrated into this consultative process, prior to formulation of the IMESA descriptive statement.

The second survey postulated greater detail for a more specific assessment of extension service perceptions and options. The choice of consultants was representative of those who could facilitate the proposed change and those whose experience in interstate metropolitan areas would validate or invalidate the intent, purpose, and plan for a cooperative arrangement for extension in the national capital area. This further confirmed the details of the need for the study and the acceptability of the approach.

**Questionnaire I**

The primary population in responding to Questionnaire I (See Appendix C) reacted with caution to the implications of questions dealing with overlapping services, under-funded programs, coordination, and overextended resources in the metropolitan area. Initial self-criticism more readily provided a rationale for program elimination than for expansion. Two of the three extension services expressed a general concern to avoid immediate budget comparison and comparative cost efficiency data for lack
of an accurate instrument. They expressed caution about the central concept that the open-ended questionnaire proposed, namely that extension had a major role in interstate metropolitan areas.

The secondary population was most interested in maximizing the benefits of existing resources. They were curious about an apparent re-conceptualization of extension's overall responsibility and role in metropolitan Washington. Better use of existing resources and best use of new resources was the major concern of those respondents. There was concern about the extent to which control over new resources would be so far away from public control as to neutralize the secondary population's effort to guarantee local public understanding, influence, input, and benefits from a metropolitan extension service organization or authority. A metropolitan role for extension was not questioned.

The tertiary population saw any events leading to metropolitan extension approach as a natural consequence of regionalism across the country. However, there was a special concern expressed about the advantage that government-sponsored agencies and universities might have and exercise in interstate metropolitan settings: extension services and their land grant universities could overpower the private sector agency or university.
in the same setting where competition for resources might be reduced in the face of a land grant extension "monopoly" or "oligopoly." To this population, it appeared that federal funding, public relations, and other aspects of academic or community service expansion would be pre-empted by land grant universities and their extension services.

Each of the populations perceived the possible effects of a cooperative approach to extension to be more effective use of both existing additional resources as well as additional responsibility and recognition. The possibility of better, more, and easier access to extension services and program provided the rationale for the development of a second questionnaire that allowed for multiple-choice answers and specific guidance by which to choose a metropolitan strategy for further consideration of a new arrangement. The problems, fears, and various motivations apparent in a new arrangement were obvious but not overpowering to the various populations.

**Questionnaire II**

Respondents to Questionnaire II (see Appendix D) envisioned similar arrangements that appeared to be pertinent. Rural extension models, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and academic consortium were cited as pertinent by primary population members. No one had a definite approach, much less a definitive structure.
Concern over classic mistakes in regional approaches was expressed by the tertiary population. Royce Hanson, of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, cautioned "to project minimal expectations with minimal rhetoric in further research and development of a model," especially given the "non-traditional expectation" of extension that emerges from the study.

B. J. Stiles of the Urban Institute noted the errors of past regional approaches to planning and cooperation in Philadelphia.

The Washington Metropolitan Transportation Authority representative, Jody Pfanspiel, advised minimal "up-front structure and political concessions because people feel powerless to begin with." More resources and recognition, legal feasibility, and power relationships and prerogatives emerged as the concerns of all three populations. Populations two and three did not perceive the metropolitan approach to extension as being unsettling to anyone at the outset because they themselves were not highly, if at all, conscious of extension in the metropolitan area.

The gains from a new arrangement of extension appeared to outnumber risks according to responses received from the second questionnaires. The general anonymity of extension in the region had advantages for initial "take-off stages" of a new entity, if the land grant universities saw the situation as advantageous
and if other colleges and universities or parallel community agencies were not concerned about the apparent implications of the arrangement.

No written response and very short phone responses were generated by the Maryland Commission on Higher Education, the Northern Virginia Consortium for Higher Education, and the Washington Metropolitan Consortium for Higher Education. The latter was made up exclusively of Washington, D.C. colleges and universities and the others represented schools only in their own states. Apparently, the complexity of arranging private, community, county, and state sponsored higher education did not allow these state groupings to reflect upon extension's problems in metropolitan Washington. These consortia and their community service components appeared to be concentrating on the evolution of internal state arrangements to their distraction away from interstate metropolitan approaches to education and community service.

Other than the representatives of the extension services, none of the interviewees was familiar with national interstate rural extension arrangements. In fact, below the state level, few extension staff members were familiar with interstate extension relationships of an ongoing regional nature (e.g., the extension centers for Appalachia, New England, and the Delmarva regions).
Because preconceptions were few and flexible, and interstate entities were considered to be large and complex, the design of an extension service interstate metropolitan organization was a creative task within the constraints provided by extension service mandates and the rules and regulations under which land grant universities operate. Pertinent state and federal laws, as well as available financial resources, were additional constraints. The nature and scope of the four notable alternatives neither were completely relevant to the purpose of a new extension arrangement, nor were they adequate. The TVA was an electric power and economic development venture to which extension services were eventually applied in each state and in an ad hoc relationship throughout the TVA region. The Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments was a regional quasi-governmental planner, proposal reviewer, and allocator of resources within a political design. The New York Port Authority was a coordinator of transportation and related economic developments and political affairs. Although academic consortia initially implemented community services, they primarily focused on such curriculum-related issues as academic services, faculty efficiency, non-duplication of courses, and mutual survival, especially among non-public colleges.
Composite Model I

When the first composite model, entitled the Washington Metropolitan Extension Service System, was reviewed by the panel of experts, it was perceived by that panel to be incomplete. The composite model appeared to be an overly ambitious new venture rather than a new emphasis with new relationships among long-standing, established organizations. However, the dynamics of reviewing the first model de-mythicized the notion that the task of an interstate metropolitan extension service was impossible or unreasonable to pursue or that there was no parallel experience or models. Making the new structure less top heavy, with fewer initial advisory components, and allowing for the evolution of a useful entity were the critiques and the modifications suggested by all parties.

Participation in the process of modifying the composite model did not assure complete candor by the representatives of any of the institutions about estimated overlapping services, economic dysfunctions, or possible inadequacies of service within the metropolitan area. Each extension service feared that such information might prove to be detrimental to its short-run interests. Each population appeared to assume that the inefficiencies were real and could be documented if the time and trouble were taken for minute cost-efficiency analyses. This,
however, would be the subject for another study. Hard financial data would continue to be elusive "until nearly absolute certainty exists that disclosure of funding gaps or service inadequacies can assure increased resources and not contribute to debilitating debate and proof for possible financial cutbacks" (a regional county agent).

Specific recommendations and related discussions about the first model provided the basis for the development of a second model that addressed the panel's concern for effectiveness and appeared to address its concern for acceptability. Because of the general consensus that the "thrust" of the modified composite model was "headed in the right directions," the second model review resulted in only minor modifications. This reflected concurrence that implementing the proposed interjurisdictional authority would avoid probable pitfalls, turf problems with other metropolitan organizations, and apparent legal problems.

**Composite Model II**

The second model and the brief questionnaire pertaining to the feasibility of that model, entitled Interstate Metropolitan Extension Service Authority (IMESA), were circulated for review and reaction. The responses indicated that an interstate metropolitan extension service authority would be a valid concept that would address real needs of institutions that were capable,
that had a credible organizational record and historic legitimacy, and that were based on a mandate to provide services innovatively and by taking full advantage of every opportunity.

Strategic and tactical considerations to implement the IMESA were developed from the theory and practical insights offered by the literature, interviews and related discussions, logic, and personal experience. The implementation strategy and conclusions were finalized after the panel's review of the IMESA.

Conclusions

The size and requirements of the metropolitan area population were increasing rapidly. Increased regular and non-traditional demands and opportunities for programming confronted extension services. Institutions of higher education and their community service programs cooperated in a sub-state regional pattern through joint projects and consortium arrangements within the District, Maryland, and Virginia. However, ongoing, interstate cooperation among the institutions of higher education did not exist (Maryland Council for Higher Education, 1974; Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area, 1974; Consortium for Continuing Higher Education in Northern Virginia, 1974; and Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, 1975). Lack of a regional metropolitan-wide program inhibited extension
service responsiveness and effectiveness in response to area-wide needs and wants. The result was apparent inefficiency, ineffectiveness, and frustration on the part of those who sought to resolve individual and collective problems, as well as waning support from the public for an extension service apparently unable to coordinate services for present and future metropolitan area problems across state lines.

Three extension service programs existed in the Washington metropolitan area. Cooperation between and among extension services was minimal. There was no centralized metropolitan listing for extension services in the telephone books of the area. Courses and other services to the public were not uniformly available to an area-wide public that was more similar than different.

The strengths and shortcomings in the individual programs provided by the separate extension services were not regularly or comprehensively reviewed and adjusted to permit collective needs assessment, programming, and evaluation for the total metropolitan community. There was a need to interrelate and thereby expand capabilities, program mandates, and availability of services to the people served by the metropolitan area extension services. It was hoped that interdependence and individual institutional growth and development would result, thus enabling
the metropolitan extension services to have a more prominent, positive image and the support of the public and of funding sources.
CHAPTER V
AN INTERSTATE METROPOLITAN EXTENSION SERVICE AUTHORITY

Summary

There was no model of an interstate extension service organization that served an urban centered, rural fringed standard metropolitan statistical area on a regular region-wide basis. There were elements of extant interjurisdictional and interstate organizational models that appeared to pertain to the case of the metropolitan Washington, D.C. area and several ad hoc experiences in the area under study to build upon in 1977.

A need was shown to exist based upon an analysis of the demographic features of the area, geographic adequacy arguments, and the testimonial replies to questionnaires by key actors and policymakers. The need for a metropolitan organization by the extension service was verified with input from people with expertise and/or authority on extension, interstate metropolitan federal management and funding, organizational development, and related matters.
A preliminary organizational model was developed that attempted to meet the following criteria generated by the collective policy paradigm process of Quade (1975) and Yehezkelial Dror's political feasibility considerations (1975): more efficient use of existing resources; access to new or additional resources earmarked for metropolitan areas; minimal adjustments within the cooperating land grant universities and extension services; minimum friction among related members of extension's organizational set in the metropolitan area and wider public recognition and usage of services. Dror's political feasibility variables included: that the capacities and intentions of people (key actors) critical to the acceptance and implementation of a plan were understood, influenced, redirected, or reinforced to be at one with a goal; that public opinion, resources, and political climate were considered as factors that would affect the perception of change by key actors; consideration was given to the interaction among peers, rules of the game, spill over effects from other areas of interest; and that attention was given to experience in the field subjected to change by variables external to the analysis. Each was given consideration.

The preliminary model was submitted to a panel of experts who were chosen not only for their professional expertise but because they had the power and involvement by which they could implement the model. The model was refined almost continually
on the basis of the panel's commentary until they agreed that it met the organizational criteria and was politically feasible.

The methodology used in this model development followed the plan set forth by Quade for policy analysis and incorporated the criteria determined by Dror for political feasibility. The methodology recognized the political reality that the most feasible model was the one that satisfied those who had to implement it.

The commentary of the panel of experts obtained through questionnaires and personal conversations demonstrated that the model provided the means for meeting and in its final form met the needs and criteria identified by Quade and Dror.
Model: Interstate Metropolitan Extension Service Authority

The model presented below had five major components: charter, bylaws, goals, organization, and decision making process. Each was presented in sufficient detail to provide a basis for implementation.

Charter. The form and style of the proposed charter followed the model charter recommended by Heston (1976) for inter-university cooperative arrangements. The purpose and content of the acceptable proposed charter was solely pertinent to the extension service in this study.

CHARTER

The land-grant universities wherein is located primary administrative responsibility for the extension services of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia agree to establish an Interstate Metropolitan Extension Service Authority (IMESA) and to enable it to perform mutually agreed upon functions.

The purpose for which such an agreement and system are promulgated is to create a regular coordinating mechanism by inter-institutional cooperation of the member institutions so that by joint action they may:
(1) create and establish an intercollegiate cooperative extension service center to implement the purposes of an IMESA;

(2) improve their educational and community service effectiveness and fiscal efficiency without losing their individual identities and prerogatives;

(3) enlist the cooperation of other educational, community service, civic, business, cultural, and governmental resources in programs that are beneficial to the metropolitan Washington area and states in which the client populations and member institutions are located; and

(4) demonstrate and develop the relevance of the extension service as a vital interface and initiator within the National Capital Area land grant university and the state-wide extension system as it relates to the needs of citizens in metropolitan, interstate areas.

For the purpose of conducting the business of the Washington IMESA, the following bylaws will prevail until such time as they are amended or otherwise revised by duly authorized action under this agreement.

Bylaws. The bylaws of the proposed IMESA set forth the mutually agreed upon minimum governance requirements and executive job description elements considered to be necessary for an adequately functioning IMESA responsive to the needs to be met and to the apparent resources at the outset of the new relationship.

BYLAWS

Governance

A Board of Directors shall be the final decision making authority in the IMESA.

Membership on the Board of Directors will be comprised
of the presidents (or their designated representatives) of
the participating universities, the directors of their
respective cooperative extension services, and a
metropolitan-area regional representative from each
extension service. The Director of the Washington IMESA
will serve as a non-voting member of the Board of Directors.

Meetings of the Board of Directors will be held
quarterly at times and dates to be established at the
first Board meeting.

Officers of the Board of Directors will include a
Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary.

Authority and Duties of the Board of Directors will
include setting priorities, formulating policy, establishing
goals, appointing a Director to serve at its pleasure,
and performing such other duties as carry out the best
interests of member institutions through the IMESA.

An Administrative Committee will operate as the Executive
Committee of the Board of Directors. Membership on the
Executive Committee will consist of each extension
service director and/or the regional designate. Meetings
will be convened once a month by the Vice-Chairman of the
Board of Directors. Special meetings can be called by
the Chairman, two members of the Committee, or the
Director. The Vice-Chairman or designate can chair
meetings. The Administrative Committee can act within
policy on behalf of the Board on any matter, except with
regard to the disposition of the Director’s role and
function.

Specifically, the Administrative Committee of the
IMESA develops policy recommendation and provides regular
guidance for the Director and any working committees or
projects coming under the auspices of the IMESA. It
fosters maximum cooperative activity on behalf of the
Board for review and ratification at the next board
meeting. Furthermore, each institutional representative
on the Administrative Committee serves as primary liaison
between the IMESA and the university. Heads of working
committees and IMESA project directors are ex-officio
members of the Administrative Committee.

Voting. While a consensus approach to decision making
shall be preferred, each extension service and its university shall possess one vote together.

**Duties and Authority of the IMESA Director**

The IMESA Director shall have the following duties and authority:

1. identify, develop, evaluate and recommend specific projects, programs, or services for IMESA Board consideration;

2. identify and seek grant funding for such projects, programs, or services approved by the Board;

3. manage cooperation of appropriate individuals, groups, and departments of the Washington IMESA member institutions in order to obtain background, concepts, and information necessary for such projects, programs, or services to be recommended to the Board. Such recommendations are to be in sufficient detail to permit initiation of proposed activity upon the approval of the Board of Trustees;

4. manage approved projects, programs, and services;

5. evaluate the effectiveness of IMESA operations;

6. prepare and distribute reports on projects, programs, and services;

7. prepare any information requested by the Board;

8. prepare and distribute through the Board annual reports to the individual Board of Trustees of the member institutions, their interest groups, and those foundations, agencies, corporations, or individual contributors toward the IMESA activities;

9. prepare, negotiate and manage the Washington IMESA budget(s);

10. serve as a Member of the Board of Directors without
vote and as Secretary;

(11) serve as ex-officio member of the Administrative Committee without vote, yet with authority to call a meeting;

(12) develop personnel criteria, job descriptions, and monitor staff and consultants; and

(13) act as principal liaison with Washington metropolitan area-wide agencies, organizations, and interest groups on behalf of the Board.

Suggested Goals. The general responses of the larger group of consultants, the specific responses and advice of the panel of experts and the overall analysis of the metropolitan Washington situation suggested that the following were suitable goals for the fiscal year 1979-80.

Development of goals should be processed by a subcommittee of the Board for board review and action. Ad hoc task forces can develop and implement plans, process, and programs to reach the goals by specified dates.

GOALS

(1) to establish, maintain, and make available to the public an inventory of educational programs, community services, projects, programs, and supportive resources available in the extension service units located in the Washington metropolitan area;

(2) to establish, inventory, prioritize and negotiate mutually acceptable schedule for public information messages that are appropriate for metropolitan residents for newspapers, radio, and television to maximize extension use of public service spots;
(3) to establish a common area-wide extension service calendar that clearly cites all those events that are limited focus (county, state) and those that are area-wide in content;

(4) to develop a central information service that both presents the content, location, and schedule of extension events and coordinates calls in response to radio, television, or newspaper public service messages;

(5) to establish a metropolitan extension glossary to facilitate information sharing;

(6) to establish an extension program exchange system to serve as an area-wide project and program clearinghouse;

(7) to familiarize area residents with the purpose, resources, courses, schedules, costs, entrance requirements, location of area public institutions of higher education as a service for personal and community development;

(8) to seek funding for the above purposes;

(9) to collaborate with extension specialists in the research, development, and funding of metropolitan area-wide joint ventures among Home Economics, Agriculture, 4-H and Youth and/or Community Resource components of participating institutions; and

(10) to provide an annual self-evaluation.

The results of the process and recommendations will be conveyed to the full Board and will include:

(1) leadership role of the Administrative Committee in relation to the Task Forces and to the designation of priorities for the forthcoming year;

(2) relationships of the Board of Directors and Administrative Committee with Task Forces;

(3) statement as to the role of goals, duties,
authority and management of the IMESA director;

(4) appropriate measures of input and output to ascertain IMESA results.

A realistic operations manual covering all phases of IMESA operations was anticipated to result from and be updated by an ongoing self-evaluation.

Organization. The study suggested that the concise organizational structure depicted in Figure 2 was suitable for the IMESA. It is entitled:

Table of Organization
Interstate Metropolitan Extension Service Authority for Metropolitan Washington

The details of the table of organization have been outlined below. These details reflected the structure and functions of an IMESA that was feasible under the Charter and Bylaws presented above.

(1) The Board of Directors will be composed of:

(3) the president of each parent land grant university

(3) the director of each participating cooperative extension service

(3) members designated by the president of each university

(1) the IMESA Director.

(2) The Executive Committee will be composed of:
Figure 1

**CITIZEN VOLUNTEER**
- Leadership/Professional Advisory Committee
  - Community
  - Professional Association
  - Business
  - Area University

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**
- 3 Presidents or Representatives
- 3 CES Directors
- 3 Designates of President
- 1 INESA Director

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
- 3 CES Directors/Representatives
- 1 INESA Director

**INESA DIRECTOR**

**Metropolitan Area Extension Specialist Advisory Committee**
- Home Economists
- Community Resource Development
- 4-H and Youth Development
- Agriculture/Horticulture

**INSEA Core Staff**
- Needs Assessment Specialist
- Program Development Specialist
- Program Operations Specialist
- Evaluation Specialist
- Government Liaison Specialist
- Media Relations Specialist

**Special Issues Group**
- Ad Hoc Committees
- Task Forces
- Panels/ Hearings
- Administrative Process Collaboration

**Media Production Group**
- Publications (Newsletter, Project Reports, Annual Reports, Public Policy Paper, Educational/Instructional Material)
- Audio/Visual (INESA Public Orientation, Publications' Complement, Promotions)
- Public Media Material Production

**SECRETARY**
- 4 Secretaries

---

* Metro area-wide chairperson representative of each extension service.
** Representatives area-wide group meets periodically.
*** Representatives area-wide group meets periodically.

*Interstate Metropolitan Extension Service Authority

*Table of Organization*
(3) the director of each participating cooperative extension service

(3) the designate of each university president

(1) the IMESA Director.

(3) The Citizenship Volunteer Leadership/Professional Advisory Committee will be composed of no less than nine nor more than 27 representatives of the three major metropolitan jurisdictions. Their membership shall reflect the interests of the community as a whole, educational institutions, business and banking, and the professions. Each extension service will be responsible for the selection of its citizen members within criteria set forth by the Board of Directors.

(4) The IMESA Director will be the chief operating officer.

(5) The Metropolitan Area Senior Extension Specialist Advisory Committee will be composed of:

(3) A home economics specialist from each jurisdiction

(3) A community resource development specialist from each jurisdiction

(3) An agricultural specialist from each jurisdiction

(3) A 4-H and youth development specialist from each jurisdiction.

(This committee will be chaired by one of the Specialists.)

(6) The IMESA core staff will be composed of:

(1) Media relations specialist for radio, television, and the print media

(4) Secretary

(1) Evaluation specialist

(1) Needs assessment specialist

(1) Program operations specialist
(1) Program development specialist (writers)

(1) Government liaison specialist (legislation and policy analysis).

Also included in the staff will be coordinated metropolitan area extension program specialists on assignment or for shared-time functions.

(7) The Media Production Group will be composed of IMESA core staff and other competent individuals who volunteer or are assigned to propose, develop, and produce materials.

(8) The Special Issues Group (SIG) will be coordinated by the IMESA Director or his designate. Membership in the SIG will include chairmen of ad hoc committees, task forces, panels, or other principals of new or continuing studies for IMESA action.

(9) The proposed organizational structure will be dynamic and provided wide flexibility of functions to allow for maximum responsiveness to opportunities for public review and for the acquisition of more resources with which to deliver service.

Decision making Process. The decision making process in the IMESA was simple and represented a management system with internal checks and balances which was open to non-systemic inputs. The various features of decision making and subsequent implementation were identified in Figure 3. The best and most representative expertise and judgement available was projected to be assessed in the process of considering commitments and in implementing them through the IMESA. The policy and interests of IMESA's sponsoring institutions and the area-wide perspective of the IMESA Director were primary factors in decision making that would be influenced by metropolitan extension and citizen advice prior to finalizing a course of action. The
IMESA MANAGEMENT DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Figure 3
process and the number of personnel were not so large as to be cumbersome, yet were constructed to be rigorous, careful, and thorough.

**Requirements for Implementation**

*Intra-extension service preparatory steps.* The results of the study suggested that a number of precautionary steps needed to be taken within each of the participating extension services. To avoid the basic mistake of creating staff resistance for lack of information, all extension service staff should be aware and appropriately involved in the planning, development, and implementation process to accommodate implementation in a non-threatening process. After all, the IMESA should be a consolidating and strengthening process and not a diffusing or demoting exercise. The IMESA should accommodate the needs of administrators to do more with what they have and accommodate the transition and new arrangement of responsibilities for all staff.

The specific preparatory steps should facilitate the strategy for implementation and the special needs of each extension service and its personnel.

*Inter-extension service preparatory steps.* It was also determined that the nature, speed, and rate of adjustments to
accommodate a new IMESA initiative should be closely coordinated to allow each extension service to be at the same place at the same time.

**Implementation strategy.** Feedback and adjustments from experts and actors in the proposed scenario helped determine that the IMESA and steps to implementation offered a reasonable course of institutional organization. As a result of consultation with them, a number of adjustments were made in the proposed implementation strategy.

It was determined that criteria to implement the IMESA should be established and implemented by the task force created to act as "institutional mid-wife." The Board of Directors for the IMESA should establish and employ criteria for policy and operations. A management-by-objectives approach to direct, measure, evaluate, and revise the flow of events toward implementation and maintenance should be used. Each feature of organization and subsequently each operational feature of the IMESA should be related to a goal, an objective, a measurable outcome, and a means to determine client and management satisfaction. Public acceptance and public accountability should be anticipated; in an organization that is fairly simple to understand and to measure, this would be quite possible.

**Stages of IMESA implementation.** The study suggested that
the following were some of the stages that would lead to implementation of an IMESA:

(1) assignment by the individual extension services of staff to review, refine, and advise upon the problems, needs, analyses, recommendations, and strategy that are precursors to a viable and feasible IMESA;

(2) involvement of metropolitan Washington citizens in the formulation and drafting of priorities that pertain to an IMESA;

(3) development by the extension services of a timeline for planning, implementing, evaluating, and revising an IMESA;

(4) identification and delineation of goals by use of specific objectives and outcomes;

(5) consultation by the extension services with metropolitan program staffs about specific approaches to area-wide planning and programming related to an IMESA structure and draft priorities and plans;

(6) drafting of program and services objectives in a process that included extension staffs, citizen advisors, local government consultants, and members of extension service's organization set;

(7) realignment of program needs, policies, procedures, and
financial capabilities to reflect immediate and long-range potential of an IMESA;

(8) adjustment of earlier drafts of priorities, goals, and objectives to conform to outcomes of points one to seven above;

(9) appointment on a tripartite basis of an ad hoc transitional working group to collaborate on development and operations issues pertaining to administration by the Board;

(10) appointment on a tripartite basis of the extension directors of an ad hoc transitional working group to be approved by the presidents of the associated universities to collaborate on development and operations issues pertaining to programs;

(11) formulation by the extension directors (with the approval of the university presidents) of metropolitan area priorities to be pursued by the IMESA (e.g., goals, organization, and operation; program development and delivery; citizen involvement; public information; accountability; finance; public policy issues; etc.);

(12) official agreement among the three universities, their respective extension services, the Extension Service
of the United States Department of Agriculture, and other necessary parties;

(13) confirmation of the IMESA Board of Director membership;

(14) site selection, personnel assignment, equipment allocation, budget adjustments, and other related steps—after consultation with and concurrence by member institutions;

(15) initiation of one or more special task forces to develop programs and to coordinate existing and new resources to increase outreach programs, improve communications, upgrade services, encourage specialized training for staff and volunteers, and facilitate effectiveness and efficiency in the metropolitan area; and

(16) convening of quarterly Board of Directors meetings and timely meetings among other parties important to the IMESA process in order to effectuate decision making and the assumption of responsibility by the IMESA.

Assuming an interest and commitment to the above process on the part of all three extension services, the extraordinary reallocation of existing budgets required to implement an IMESA needed to be set in a one- to three-year context to allow the
evolution of the new arrangement in the most favorable terms for
the benefit of the public and the investment of new public and
private funds. Regular extension staff (those employed or
"slotted") would comprise the tripartite contribution to the
new institution, while additional staff, space, equipment, and
related cost items would be logical elements for a grant
proposal or contract request to governmental or non-governmental
sources.

The schedule for the completion of the above process
would have to be developed and implemented by the three extension
services through the IMESA Board of Directors. This would allow
for the different rates of speed at which each extension service
and IMESA related bureaucracies would be able to move at the
outset. Nine to 12 months appeared to be a reasonable length
of time in which to complete the basic organization.

Recommendations

In order to implement the EMESA, action needed to be
undertaken by the three extension services, in consultation
with the Extension Service of the United States Department of
Agriculture, to develop:

(1) priorities,
(2) policies,
(3) model adjustments for actual implementation,
(4) a proposed budget,
(5) a reallocation strategy and schedule,
(6) an enabling agreement,
(7) a final table of organization,
(8) consultative relationships with metropolitan region-wide organizations that could facilitate an IMESA,
(9) a strategy for assessing the expertise of the academic departments in cooperative roles in an IMESA,
(10) a financial development plan,
(11) an implementation plan with target dates, and
(12) a public relations strategy.

For management purposes, the many aspects of implementing, maintaining, evaluating, and revising an IMESA needed to be considered as a totality and as a series of "packages." Each coherent aspect or part needed to be evaluated for its purpose, process, product, and cost alone and as part of the IMESA. In this way, performance could be measured and guided and funding could be facilitated for the total enterprise and for its sub-units.

The implementation and operation of an IMESA offered a rare opportunity for research. The political, financial, personnel, administrative, fiscal, legal, sociological, and
psychological ramifications of the enterprise deserved study, analysis, and interpretation for the purpose of understanding an IMESA and improving the use of extension resources in metropolitan regions.

Considering the thrust of the President's Reorganization Project under the Carter Administration, the innovative role of extension services in metropolitan Washington offered serious options to those who would reconsider the present location of the Extension Service at the Department of Agriculture. While not detracting from the well-established area of historical accomplishments, the proposed innovative administrative vehicle offered a rejuvenated perspective of extension, which suggested the possibility of a more dynamic role than continuation of existing prerogatives and resources.

Conclusions

It was possible for metropolitan Washington to have an interstate metropolitan extension service authority that would incorporate the top management from each extension service with Washington region-wide extension staff as collaborators. An IMESA could operate from an independent location or adjunct facility of one extension service. All three would benefit from the effect of a coordinated approach to area-wide public relations. Each would benefit from the consultative expertise and experience
of the others. A coordinated schedule of public events would create broader public participation in any one event. Careful dispersion and timing of events that required limited participation could be accomplished.

A coordinated metropolitan regional extension policy with priorities, programs, and projects clearly demonstrating regional concepts would permit access by cooperating parties to higher priority for available federal funds and provide access to federal funds distributed according to OMB circular A-95 criteria and related regional emphasis guidelines. For example, Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 gave special priority to regional projects and assigned up to 10% of its annual funds for regional projects alone. The prospects for access to funds would be enhanced as a result of the interlinking system an IMESA would provide. Private and quasi-public funding sources in the Washington metropolitan area would more readily support regional ventures if given research, education activity, or community services that took the full area into consideration. United Way of the National Capital Area and the Metropolitan Board of Trade offered two examples of organizations so inclined.

If the three extension services converging in the metropolitan area were to merge, they would provide:
(1) more efficient use of existing resources;
(2) increased availability of collective and individual resources;
(3) minimum adjustment problems within cooperating extension services;
(4) minimum difficulty for non-extension service understanding, acceptance, and cooperation; and
(5) greater public recognition and support.

Obstacles and Facilitators. The difficulties in achieving a tripartite cooperative functional working relationship were real. There were traditions of independent institutional development. There were professional vested interests in the extension service and each extension service's relationship with its university. New additional areas of service are easier to introduce than any replacement or substitution of existing services. There was the problem of institutional autonomy. A certain amount would have to be given up to make cooperation work, but giving up too much would undermine the independence or viability of the individual institutions (Burns, 1973). This may be why most successful academic consortia aimed at "support services" more than academic enterprises (Heston, 1976).

Features Peculiar to Washington. There were few features that were peculiar to the Washington area in establishing an IMESA
arrangement. The two features that would make the implementation of an IMESA in Washington different from implementation in the other 37 localities with interstate metropolitan areas were 1) the fact that the District of Columbia was a federal jurisdiction subject to more steps in authority changes in local/federal projects, and 2) the fact that one of the jurisdictions was predominantly black.

Replicable Features. Since the study did not examine any of the other 37 jurisdictions with interstate metropolitan areas, the author did not draw conclusions about which features of the proposed model would be replicable elsewhere. It should be the focus of another study to examine how the proposed Washington IMESA could be used by other extension services.
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CONSULTANTS

The following list of expert consultants assited the progress of research and development of this study. Within the list, the Panel of Experts is asterisked to identify those people most important to the process of interpreting and implementing the IMESA.
Consultants

1) Dr. Loyd Andrew, Associate Professor, Division of Administrative and Educational Services, College of Education, Virginia Tech.

2) Mr. Richard Angus, State Leader of 4-H and Youth Development, Maryland Extension Service, University of Maryland.

3) Mr. John Anthony, Citizen member of the Transportation, Safety, and Environmental Committees of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

4) Mrs. Margaret Beatty, former Director of the District of Columbia Title I, Higher Education Act, 1965 Committee.

5) Dr. Norman Beckman, former Deputy Director, Congressional Reference Service, Library of Congress, currently United States Civil Service Commission Staff Director.*

6) Dr. Clement Bezold, Director, Institute of Alternative Futures, Law School, Antioch College.

7) Dr. Richard Biggs, Agriculture Program staff, Maryland Extension Service, University of Maryland.

8) Dr. William Butler, Chancellor, University of Maryland

9) Dr. Beverly Cassara, Dean of Graduate Studies, University of the District of Columbia

10) Ms. Jane Cohen, former Director of Community Service Programs, WRC-TV, Channel 4, Washington, D.C. Vice President, Public Broadcasting System.

11) Mr. Joseph Danzansky, President, Giant Food Company.

12) Dr. Leonard DeFiore, Superintendent, Archdiocese of Washington Schools.
13) Mr. Theodore Demmons, Regional Vice President, McDonalds Restaurants Incorporated.

14) Dr. Cleveland Denard, former President, Washington Technical Institute.

15) Mr. Leonard Diebert, General Manager, WTOP-TV, Channel 9, Washington, D.C.

16) Dr. Del Dyer, State 4-H Leader, Extension Division, Virginia Tech.

17) Mrs. Martha Edwards, Public Service Coordinator, WMAL-TV, now WJLA-TV, Channel 7, Washington, D.C.

18) Mr. Clarence Errata, Executive Director, Washington Metropolitan Board of Trade.

19) Mrs. Elizabeth Frazier, Assistant Director, The Redskins Foundation.

20) Mrs. Ida Mae Garrot, former member, and chairman of the Montgomery County Council, Maryland.

21) Mr. Roosevelt Greer, Deputy Director, Department for Community and Urban Development, District of Columbia Government.

22) Dr. T. Marshall Hahn, former president of Virginia Tech.

23) Mr. Royce Hanson, former president Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.*

24) Ms. Frances Hartwig, Director, Alexandria Extension Division Office, Virginia Tech.

25) Mrs. Tommie Lou Hunter, Coordinator, Region 23 Planning Council, Northern Virginia, and member of area Extension Division staff for Virginia Tech.

26) Dr. John Jenkins, former Director, D.C. Cooperative Extension Service and Acting Dean, School of Education, University of the District of Columbia.*

27) Mr. Allan Jenner, Staff, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.
28) Dr. Edwin Kirby, former Administrator, Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

29) Dr. Jerry Klement, former State leader, Community Resources Development, University of Maryland, Extension Service, now Rural Development Administration, USDA.

30) Mr. James Kunen, Executive Director, The Meyer Foundation.

31) Dr. Ned Lester, Assistant Director, Extension Division, Virginia Tech.

32) Dr. William J. Mc Keefery, former, executive vice president, Virginia Tech.

33) Dr. Thornell Page, Associate Director, District of Columbia Cooperative Extension Service, University of the District of Columbia.

34) Mr. Richard Paioli, Director of Program Development, WETA-TV, Channel 26, Washington, D.C.


36) Mr. Jody Pfanzstiel, Director of Public Relations, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WAMATA).

37) Mr. Rudolph Pruden, Assistant to the Administrator for Relations, Extension Service, USDA.

38) Dr. George Rhodes, Deputy Assistant to the Commissioner, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

39) Dr. Donald Rotunda, Assistant to the Director, Economic Development Division, President's Reorganization Project, Office of Management and Budget, The White House.*

40) Dr. Wendell Russell, former president of Federal City College.

41) Mr. Thomas Scott, Coordinator, Fairfax County Extension Division Office, Virginia Tech.

42) Mr. Paul Royston, Assistant for Minority Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, The White House.*
43) Mrs. Madalyn Schaller, general staff of the Executive Director, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

44) Dr. Neil Schaller, former Director, Farm Foundation, now Administrator, Extension Service, USDA.*

45) Mr. Marc Schreiber, Executive Director, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.*

46) Dr. William E. Skelton, former Director, Extension Division, Virginia Tech.*

47) Dr. Harold G. Smith, Associate Director, Maryland Extension Service, University of Maryland.

48) Dr. Joel Sobitsky, National 4H Leader, Extension Service, USDA.

49) Mr. Reginald Taylor, State Leader for 4H, D.C. Extension Service.

50) Mr. Sterling Tucker, Chairman, District of Columbia, City Council.

51) Dr. Dean Vaughn, Director of 4H and Youth Development, ES-USDA.

52) Dr. Milford Vaughn, University of the District of Columbia.

53) Dr. Robert Wagner, Director, Maryland Extension Service, University of Maryland.*

54) Mr. Leroy Washington, Director, Commission for Post Secondary Education and Title I HEA, 1965 for the District of Columbia.

55) Dr. Wayne White, Acting Superintendent of Fairfax City Schools and faculty member, College of Education, Virginia Tech.

56) Dr. Wayne Worner, Professor, College of Education and Director of its Division of Administrative and Educational Services, Virginia Tech.

57) Ms. Mitzi Worheim, Assistant Director, The Cafritz Foundation.


60) Virginia Title I, Higher Education Act, 1965 Committee.
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CONSULTANT INVOLVEMENT CHART

This chart indicates the types of contact the author had with the expert consultants.
CONSULTANT INVOLVEMENT CHART

**KEY:**
- A=Research problem discussion;
- B=Questionnaire I;
- C=Consultation;
- D=First Three Chapter Review;
- E=Questionnaire II;
- F=Version I
- Model (W-MESS);
- G=Version II Model;
- and H=Questionnaire III.

**Involvement:**
- X=contact; and
- Circled X=response by writing, call, person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>36.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>39.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>40.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>47.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>49.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>51.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>52.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>53.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>54.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>55.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>56.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>57.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>58.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>59.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE I

This is the original, open-ended questionnaire presented to the consultants.
Questionnaire 10/15/75

Exploring the Feasibility of a Coordinated Approach to
Extension Service in the Metropolitan Washington Area

1. Do the three extension services currently provide enough programs, services and personnel in your portion of metropolitan Washington?

2. Can your extension service legally cooperate with another? Conditions?

3. Does your extension cooperate with one or more extensions? Metrowide?

4. Have results from joint venture been satisfactory? As intended? Other?

5. What circumstances would cause your extension service to consider cooperation formally with another metro area extension service to resolve metro area problems? Under what conditions?

6. Besides current operating funds, can your extension service accept federal, state, local, foundation, business or other funds for projects?

7. Have your individual programs (4h, CRD, et al) cooperated with their counterparts in the metropolitan area?

8. What is the basis of metropolitan extension cooperation without additional funds?

9. Do metropolitan area extension services have compatible information systems, plans of work, statistics add data analysis and evaluation?
10. Do national extension regional groupings provide a natural umbrella under which multistate cooperation can advance?

11. Does extension have a rural, suburban and urban mission in your state?

12. What are you extension's to priorities at present?

13. Are rural considerations predominant in your extension service?

14. Are federal, state, county and municipal funds your primary resource?

15. Does your extension participate in regional organizations in-state?

16. Can federal laws and regulations that foster regional approaches on an interstate basis benefit your state through extension?

17. Has your extension sought regional funding for a program?

18. How often does your metropolitan Washington staff use the Council of Governments as a community resource for planning purposes?

19. Could a regional interstate metropolitan extension group facilitate your state extension priorities?

20. Are you familiar with OMB Circular A-95(1969) and supplements?

21. Would your extension service agree to participate in a metropolitan consortium like arrangement for a set time? with a grant? otherwise?

22. How close does extension in the metropolitan Washington area come to a consortium or other cooperative arrangement?

23. Does your land grant university participate in any consortium?

24. Is it worthwhile to pursue the development of a metrowide approach by extension to the tristate metropolitan Washington area?
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE II

This is the multiple-choice questionnaire developed after review of responses to the first questionnaire.
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE 4/15/76
Exploring the Feasibility of an
Interstate Metropolitan Extension Service Authority
(IMESA)

A. Has your extension service cooperated with another extension service in the National Capitol Area?
Considered it ___ Discussed it ___ No ___ Yes ___ Occasionally ___ Frequently ___

B. How has your extension service cooperated with other extension services in the National Capital Area?
Planning ___ Projects ___ Public Relations ___ in the Council of Governments ___
Programs ___ Special Events ___ Recruitment of Volunteers ___ Recruitment of Clients ___ Service Delivery ___

C. Which extension service programs and administrative units are involved in cooperation with other units in your extension service?

Agriculture/Horticulture ___
4-H and Youth Development ___
Home Economics ___
Community Resource Development ___
Public Relations ___
Personnel ___
Affirmative Action ___
Training Office ___
Management ___

D. What positive outcomes can come from cooperation among the extension services in the metropolitan Washington area?

1. ___ Improved access to public media
   1-1 ___ television
   1-2 ___ radio
   1-3 ___ newspapers
   1-4 ___ magazines

2. ___ Public perception of efficiency
3. ___ Public perception of economy
4. ___ Improved availability of programs
5. ___ Improved availability of services
6. ___ Higher priority/access for federal grants

   6-1 ___ USDA
   6-2 ___ USDL
   6-3 ___ USDHEM
   6-4 ___ USDOT
   6-5 ___ CETA
   6-6 ___ Summer employment
   6-7 ___ Other
   6-8 ___ Education
   6-9 ___ Women
   6-10 ___ Health
   6-11 ___ Aging
   6-12 ___ Social Services
   6-13 ___ Youth
7. Higher priority for state grants to individual extension service in metropolitan area of one or all states?

- education
- manpower training/employment
- health
- social services
- environment
- agriculture
- community development
- communication
- youth development
- home economics

6. Higher priority for or access to financial or other support from area and/or regionally oriented.

- businesses
- foundations
- organizations
- banks
- institution of higher education
- public media
- television
- radio
- newspapers

9. Increased demands for service
10. Increased need for personnel
11. Improved use of personnel on an area-wide basis
12. Improved quality of life for area residents
13. Increased influence by which to acquire other

- extensive resources
- university resources
- county resources
- local government resources

14. Expeditions treatment in the CSB A-95 Clearinghouse process to review grants made to programs in a standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA)?
16. Reduced conflict/misunderstanding pertaining to metro area extension service

16-1 Scheduling extension service regular and special events.
16-2 Grants pursuit among local agencies and foundations.
16-3 Public media usage for extension services.
16-4 check business or individuals as resource for extension services.
16-5 check other jurisdictional "turf" issues pertaining to extension services.
16-6 check relationships with other organizations serving one, part, or all of the metropolitan jurisdictions.

17. economies of scale (savings from a coordinated approach).
   - office space costs and uses.
   - telephones
   - personnel usage - regular - specialized
   - public relations
   - publications production
   - special events (fairs, field demonstration, workshops)
   - transportation
   - other

5. What negative outcomes can come from cooperation?
   1. the same or less access to public media?
      - television
      - radio
      - newspapers
      - magazines

2. Public perception of inefficiency.
3. Public perception of disorganization.
4. Less availability of programs.
5. Less availability of services.
6. lower the same priority/access to federal grants
   - USDA
   - USDOJ
   - USDEW
   - USSOT
   - USEPA
   - USAID
   - USEnergy Department
   - USDA Department of Justice

7. lower priority for state grants to individual?
   - education/extension services in the metropolitan area.
   - training/employment
   - health
   - social services
   - environment
   - agriculture
   - community development
   - communication
   - home economics/family development
P. ______ lower priority for access to financial or other support from area and/or regionally oriented

  8-1 ______ business
  8-2 ______ foundations
  8-3 ______ organizations
  8-4 ______ banks
  8-5 ______ colleges and universities
  8-6 ______ public media

  8-6-1 ______ television
  8-6-2 ______ radio
  8-6-3 ______ newspapers
  8-6-4 ______ magazines

9. ______ decreased demand for service.
10. ______ less need for personnel.
11. ______ less use of personnel on area-wide basis.
12. ______ worsened quality of life for area residents.
13. ______ lessened influence by which to acquire

  13-1 ______ extension service resources
  13-2 ______ university resources
  13-3 ______ county resources
  13-4 ______ local government resources

14. ______ slower GOD-AVS ______ same GOD-AVS
15. ______ worsened GOD relations ______ same
16. ______ increased conflict ______ same.

  16-1 ______ scheduling
  16-2 ______ grants
  16-3 ______ media
  16-4 ______ area-wide business
  16-5 ______ other jurisdictions
  16-6 ______ inter organizational relationships

17. ______ diseconomies of scale.

  17-1 ______ office space
  17-2 ______ telephones
  17-3 ______ personnel
  17-4 ______ public relations
  17-5 ______ publications
  17-6 ______ special events
  17-7 ______ transportation
  17-8 ______ other

F. Does metropolitan wide extension service cooperation leave positive or negative implications for

  1. ______ landgrant universitites P or N
  2. ______ private university P or N
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QUESTIONNAIRE III

These questionnaires were used to determine the acceptability of the IMESA model among the panel of experts. The earlier questionnaire (5/77) and the later questionnaire (8/77) were two versions of the same questionnaire.
Follow-up Questionnaire on an INESA
for the Washington, D.C. Area (8/77)

Dear Colleague:

Having reviewed the current model of an interstate metropolitan extension service authority (INESA), could you please respond to the following questions, giving your opinion as a professional person considering the feasibility of the INESA as a proposal?

1-Do you believe that an INESA can be created and operated in metropolitan Washington, D.C.?

2-Do you believe that an INESA will have practical effects that can be experienced, understood and appreciated at the community level?

3-Is it possible to justify an INESA within the universities and the states as a(n) a-administrative device; b-consultative device; c-program device; d-project mechanism; e-financial investment; f-fiscal device; g-economy of scale measure; h-special grant item; i-regular budget item; j-all of the above; k-none of the above?

4-Is INESA important because it can:
   a-present a rejuvenated image of extension in new circumstances; b-maintain a positive, competitive image of land grant universities in urban settings; c-demonstrate more efficient, effective use of federal, state and local monies to legislators and citizens? d-apply extension know how more effectively than at present to a present mandated responsibility?

5-An INESA can be funded by: a-regular budgets; b-expanded regular budgets; c-federal grants, regular and earmarked for metropolitan areas; d-federal contracts; e-foundation grants; f-business and private non-profit research funds; g-human service delivery overhead; h-membership fees for institutions, organizations, and individuals; i-other; j-all of the above; k-none of the above?
6-Will an IMESA be readily understood by the public?
7-Can an IMESA be accountable as a separate organization and to 3 extensions?
8-What performance criteria suits an IMESA? How are economies of scale and progress measured in an IMESA?
9-What is the greatest problem foreseeable in the implementation and maintenance of an IMESA?
10-How can you facilitate the evolution of an IMESA in Washington? Elsewhere?
IMESA Questionnaire
(5/77)

1. Is the rationale for the consideration of a new approach to cooperation among extension services in metropolitan Washington acceptable for initial planning purposes?

2. Is the proposal for an IMESA a reasonable approach to apparent problems and opportunities for extension services in the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area?

3. Is it accurate to describe the IMESA structure and function as a complement to existing extension service capability in the metro area?

4. Are the benefits from an IMESA relationship clear and probable from the perspective of your extension service?

5. Are your extension service staff members in the metropolitan area capable of distinguishing IMESA related and regular assignments in the short run? In the long run?

6. What is the highest value you place on metropolitan area cooperation among extension services?

   Maximization of use of existing resources
Access to and use of new resources

Increased extension service viability in the community

Demonstration of ES viability in new situations for now and the future

Concentrated influence for ES in a complex setting

ES of the above

All of the above

None of the above

7. Is it possible to manage existing human, physical, and financial extension service resources to create a basic IMESA entity in the near future for a limited time within which time additional resources should become evident?

8. Will the greatest resistance to the apparent changes involved in implementing an IMESA be from (rank order)

Extension Service

State University

Legislature

U.S.D.A.

Public your ES serves

Other universities

Other community service institutions
9. Will the new Extension Service arrangement in metropolitan
Washington create expectations, criticisms, or other re-
actions from the public or special interests within the public
that could be unmanageable and or not expected in the IMESA
feasibility study? What are they? How will ES manage them
in the future?

10. What is an appropriate "take off" period for an IMESA?

   ______ 6 months
   ______ 12 months
   ______ 18 months
   ______ 24 months
   ______ 30 months
   ______ other

11. Should the initiation of a process in which an IMESA can
evolve be first through

   ______ Administrative cooperation
   ______ Projects
   ______ Programs
   ______ Services
   ______ Some of the above (Specify)
   ______ All of the above
   ______ None of the above
   ______ Other
12. Can ES assert a leadership role through an IMESA that is significant for
   ___ ESUSDA
   ___ Land-grant universities
   ___ State
   ___ Counties
   ___ the Public

13. Is your ES capable of adaptation to a new arrangement as in an IMESA in less than
   ___ 6 months
   ___ 12 months
   ___ 18 months
   ___ 24 months
   ___ 30 months
   ___ 36 months
   ___ Other

14. What is the earliest date for further consideration of an IMESA within your ES?

15. Which members of your staff would be involved in early deliberation?
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There are 38 interstate standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSAs) throughout the United States (Office of Management and Budget, 1975).
Interstate Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (38)

Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pennsylvania-New Jersey
Augusta, Georgia-South Carolina
Binghamton, New York-Pennsylvania
Chattanooga, Tennessee-Georgia
Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana
Clarksville-Hopkinsville, Tennessee-Kentucky
Columbus, Georgia-Alabama
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Illinois
Duluth-Superior, Minnesota-Wisconsin
Evansville, Indiana-Kentucky
Fall River, Massachusetts-Rhode Island
Fargo-Moorhead, North Dakota-Minnesota
Fort Smith, Arkansas-Oklahoma
Huntington-Ashland, West Virginia-Kentucky-Ohio
Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol, Tennessee-Virginia
Kansas City, Missouri-Kansas
Lawrence-Haverhill, Massachusetts-New Hampshire
Louisville, Kentucky-Indiana
Lowell, Massachusetts-New Hampshire
Memphis, Tennessee-Arkansas-Mississippi
Minneapolis-Saint Paul, Minnesota-Wisconsin
New London-Norwich, Connecticut-Rhode Island
New York, New York-New Jersey
Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Portsmouth, Virginia-North Carolina
Omaha, Nebraska-Iowa
Parkersburg-Marietta, West Virginia-Ohio
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania-New Jersey
Portland, Washington-Oregon
Providence-Warwick-Pawtucket, Rhode Island-Massachusetts
Saint Louis, Missouri-Illinois
Sioux City, Iowa-Nebraska
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Massachusetts-Connecticut
Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio-West Virginia
Texarkana, Texas-Texarkana, Arkansas
Toledo, Ohio-Michigan
Washington, District of Columbia-Maryland-Virginia
Wheeling, West Virginia-Ohio
Wilmington, Delaware-New Jersey-Maryland
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"A Proposed Model for an Interstate Metropolitan Extension Service Authority for Metropolitan Washington"

by Michael John Lenaghan

ABSTRACT

This study showed that Extension Services, like any other human service organizations, are having difficulty in serving diverse populations where there are overlapping political jurisdictions. One example of such a situation was the interstate metropolitan region that included Washington, D.C., Maryland and Virginia. This region is one of 38 such regions in the United States.

The three extension services in metropolitan Washington appear to be failing to meet the need for nutrition education, consumer education, urban horticulture, street safety, and volunteer civic leadership and other needs because they are not fully utilizing available resources and are unable to capitalize on such earmarked resources as those designated by the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95 review process which requires areawide consultation and regional planning.
An organizational model was developed as part of the study and appears to satisfy such criteria as maximizing resource utilization and access to new resources while minimizing friction among the land grant universities and related institutions in the region. In clarifying needs and refining issues, over 50 knowledgeable consultants were involved in the study. In developing the model and testing for feasibility the ten key actors on policy matters that would become involved in accepting and implementing the model were used as a panel of experts. They further defined needs and approaches, critiqued the preliminary models, and eventually agreed upon the proposed model presented in the study.

The result of the study is "A Proposed Model for an Interstate Metropolitan Extension Service Authority for Metropolitan Washington." The model has five major elements: a proposed charter, a set of bylaws, a table of organization, a decisionmaking process, and recommendations for implementing the model are included in the study.