DOCUMENT RESUME

ED' 238 642

### RC 014 514

TITLÉ -

INSTITUTION PUB DATE NOTE PUB TYPE

EDRS PRICE - DESCRIPTORS

Appalachian Regional Commission: 1982 Annual Report. Appalachian Regional Commission, Washington, D.C. 83 95p.; For related document, see ED 216 853. Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Statistical Data (110)

MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

Basic Skills; Census Figures; Coal; \*Community Development; Demography; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Employer Supported Day Care; \*Financial Support; Health Personnel; \*Health Services; Housing; Infant Mortality; Inservice Teacher Education; Planning Commissions; \*Program Costs; Program Descriptions; Regional Planning; Regional Programs; \*Rural Development; \*Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS

ERIC

Fiscal year 1982 was transitional for the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), as it was the last year of the broad economic development program and a year of reduced funding and new limits on programs. In 1981, Congress had requested that ARC prepare a pla: for completion of the Appalachian highway system and for a 3 to 5 year ARC finish-up development program. Activities under the last year of the traditional program included highway construction; a survey of local development districts (LDDs), the Alabama basic skills improvement program for elementary schools, and a Mississippi pilot project to upgrade training and development of vocational education teachers through inservice training. The finish-up program, begun at the end of fiscal 1982, included completion of 666 miles of highway, a regionwide jobs and private investment program, a health program for areas lacking basic health care or having high infant. mortality rates, and a special program to aid the 67 most distressed and underdeveloped Appalachian counties. ARC'received funding of \$155 million for fiscal 1983. Report sections discuss objectives and activities, finances, and projects (by category); provide maps,. county population change data, and program Categories and funding for the 13 Appalachian states; and include an address list and map of Appalachi'an LDDs. (MH)

### 1982 Annual Report Appalachian Regional Commission

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) If This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it. If Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

ED238642

T S F T G SERIC

Points of view or opinions stated in this Cocument do not necessarily represent official NIC position of policy.

-APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION-1668 Concreticul Avenue, N.W. Wannegton, D.C. 20235 V March 31, 1983 Pursuant to Section 300 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1963; we respectfully submit to you for transmittal to the Congress a report on the activities carried on under this Act during Fiscal Year 1982. The President The White House Washington, D. C. The report outlines the work of the Appalachian Regional Commission with the thirteen states that make up the Appalachian Region. / K / / WILLIAM F. WINTER Governor of Mississippi States' Co-Chairman B specifylly WINIFRED A. PIZZAN Poleral Co-Chairman



# 1982 Annual Report Appalachian Regional Commission

1666 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20235

Cover photograph: Bland County in southwestern Virginia. Photographer: Bill Blanton

ł

0


ERIC

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number 66-61155

16.5

## Table of Contents

Finances	•••••	•••••	•••••	<b>````</b>	. <b></b> .	. 1
Pròjects A	pproved in	n Fiscal Y	Year 198	2		1
Appalac	hian Regi	onal Cor	nmission	)		1
	a			-		
		•				
	(y,					
	d					
	ppi					
	rk					
	arolina					
-	• • • • • • • •					
Pennsvl	vania	line and the second				3
	arolina .					
	see					
	rginia					



# A Year of Transition

In the last days of fiscal year 1982, President Reagan appointed and Congress confirmed Winifret, A. Pizzano as federal cochairman and Jacqueline L. Phillips as alternate federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The year had been one of transition for the Commission, a fact recognized by Ms. Pizzanc at her Senate confirmation hearing. It was the last year of the broad economic development program the Commission had been executing since 1965. It was a year when ARC funds were again reduced, and the Commission adopted new limits on its programs. After describing the Region's progress and present conditions at her confirmation hearing, Ms. Pizzano said, "The challenge before the Commission is to deal . . . efficiently with these and other problems while the federal role changes and funds available to ARC are limited."

Fiscal year 1982 was also a year when the economy of the Region, which had for years been on a steady uphill climb, shuddered before signs of national recovery began to appear.

## A Difficult Period for the Region

Recession was nore intensified in parts of the Region than in the nation as a whole. Appalachian unemployment in September 1982 was 12.4 percent, well above the national average of 9.7 percent but parallel to that in cities and towns with similar industrial bases. Moreover, in 27 Appalachian counties the unemployment rate, was 20 percent or worse, and in one—McDowell County, West Virginia—it had risen to 32 percent.

e Appalachian economy was suffering more FRIC the recession than other parts of the nation for several reasons:

• The Region has a relatively large percentage of workers in manufacturing, one of the hardesthit sectors of the economy, with heavy concentrations of workers in textiles and apparel, industries related to automobile and steel production and industries dependent on the construction industry, such as furniture, lumber and wood products and primary metals.

Coal plays an important role in the Appalachian economy, and the coal export market has
recently been seriously affected by the world oil
glut, the world recession and other factors.

 Many of Appalachia's industries, such as iron and steel, lumber and wood, and apparel, are especially sensitive to competition from foreign imports.

### The Finish-Up Program

The Administration proposed in 1981 that the ARC highway program be transferred to the Department of Transportation and that the nonhighway programs be ended.

Congress, however, responded to a request from the Appalachian governors for more time to finish up the ARC economic development mission. Continuing resolutions (P.L. 97-51 and P.L. 97-85) and regular appropriations legislation (P.L. 97-88) provided \$100 million for the ARC highway programs in fiscal year 1982 and \$50 million for the nonhighway pro-\* grams of the Commission.

This funding was significantly below that of previous years, but it kept ARC intact while Congress and the Administration considered the future of the Commission beyond the expiration of its authorizing legislation September 30, 1982 (P.L. 96-506).

In appropriating ARC funds for fiscal 1981, Congress had requested that the Commission prepare a report suggesting "a plan for the completion of the Appalachian highway system" and for "a three to five year ARC area development finish-up program." Over a period of months, details of a finish-up program that would satisfy this request and provide the best use of the limited federal resources available were worked out

among all the interested parties: the Commission, the Appalachian states, the Congressional committees concerned with ARC legislation, local development districts and other local bodies and officials, and round table groups of businessmen.

At hearings held in the Region and on the Hill, the Appalachian governors reaffirmed their support for an independent ARC, of which they were members, and its partnership approach to economic development.

In December 1981, the response to the Congressional request was ready. "A Report to Congress from the Appalachian Governors Concerning the Appalachian Regional Commission," transmitted to Congress on December 31 and described in detail below, proposed major changes in the Commission's highway and nonnighway programs: that only the highest priority uncompleted segments of the planned Appalachian Development Highway System be constructed with ARC funds and that the area development activities be limited to three areas-a regionwide jobs and private investment program, a health finish up program in sections of the Region still lacking basic health care or hav-. ing high infant mortality rates, and a special program to aid the long neglected, most distressed Appalachian counties,

The report also proposed several policy changes. It set goals, dollar ceilings and time limits for all ARC programs. It limited ARC funding to a maximum of 50 percent for nonhighway projects. (In March 1983 the limitation of 50 percent was waived in the case of the distressed county program due to Congressional recognition that the requirement in these counties, where local matching funds were scarce, would eliminate many needed projects.) For the jobs and private investment program, the major part of the area development program, involvement of the private sector would have to be demonstrated for each project funded.

The report also proposed that an Appalachian foundation be established to "strengthen the public-private partnership needed to attain our ultimate objective: an Appalachia fully in the

mainstream of the American economy."

The House and Senate subcommittees responsible for ARC legislation held hearings in the spring on the proposed program. When the House Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Public Works and Transportation Committee visited Huntington, West Virginia, in January 1982, Governor John Y. Brown, Jr., of Kentucky, then ARC states' cochairman, testified on behalf of the Appalachian program, reminding the subcommittee that the year before "every Governor, all 13 of the Appalachian group, said it was the finest Federal program that they had ever had a chance to participate in at the State level."

Later in the spring, Governor Lamar Alexander of Tennessee testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Regional and Community Development of the Committee on Environment and Public Works that: "there is not a program that I know of in the Appalachian Region that is more popular with the Governors."

In all, 5 of the 13 Appalachian governors testified in support of the program, while local elected officials and private sector leaders from Appalachia also gave their recommendations on various aspects of the proposed program.

Meanwhile, the Commission undertook several initiatives to begin the transition to the modified program so that it could get under way at the beginning of fiscal 1983. At a governors' quofum meeting in July, the Commission passed a resolution setting policies to implement the three-part nonhighway portion of the program. This resolution specified the funding criteria for investments under the jobs and private investment, health finish-up and distressed county programs and described the types of projects that each could fund. In addition, it approved the list of counties eligible for the health finish-up and distressed county programs.

By the end of the year, a bill extending ARC's area development program for five years and its highway program for eight had passed the House by a 3.1 margin. A bill extending ARC for one year was unanimously passed by the Seriate. The Senate, however, declined to take up full authori-

zation of this finish up program. The two bills did not go to conference. ARC was continued in operation into fiscal 1983, however, through the continuing resolutions passed by Congress in September and extended in December funding overall government operations. As a result, ARC \* received funding of \$155 million for fiscal 1983.

### Operating a Changing Program

At the same time that the Commission was moving ahead to plan and hefine its new program, it was also continuing the last year of funding under the traditional program. Typical activities of the year are described briefly below. Most of the projects initiated during the year are in line with ARC's new finish-up emphases, but some (the upgrading of vocational education teachers in Mississippi and the maternal health care project in Coshocton County, Ohio, for instance) are examples of projects that will no longer be eligible under the new program.

Highway Construction. Of the total 3,025 miles authorized in the Appalachian Development Highway System, construction was under way or completed on 1,863.8 miles by September 30, 1982, and 1,660.2 miles were opening traffic. On the Appalachian access road system, construction was under way or completed or 745.8 miles.

LDD Survey. During the year ARC conducted a survey of its 69 local development districts (LDDs). The survey, which dealt with the impact of budget cuts on the districts, revealed that 49 percent of LDD board members were businessmen. Earlier surveys had shown that 63 percent of board members were locally elected officials, many of them business leaders serving in parttime public positions.

According to the survey, federal funding for district administration from FY 81 to FY 82 dropped an average of 17 percent, a drop offset to some degree by a 13.2 percent increase in state funding and a 19.6 percent increase in local funding. However, total staffing of the districts was cut 23 percent because of the funding changes. To help make up for these losses, many districts collected fees for services once provided free to local governments. New services were also offered on a fee or cost basis, to businesses as well as local governments. Further, districts successfully sought support from private foundations and philanthropic institutions.

Matching Doctors and Communities. ARC established the Appalachian Health Professions Clearinghouse, headquartered in Washington and operated by the ARC staff, to refer healthcare professionals to practices in Appalachia and to help Appalachian communities find the health care providers they need. Operated with federal and state funds with no fee charged to health professionals or communities, the clearinghouse has used newsletters and brochures to make its services known to communities and providers. A special target of its publicity has been the medical students and residents who have received loans from the National Health Service Corps for their medical education and must repay these loans by serving health manpower shortage areas. Although the clearinghouse aims its efforts primarlly at physicians, it also helps place dentists, nurse practitioners and physician assistants.

Some Appalachian states have actively participated in clearinghouse activities by estal lishing state recruitment offices through which clearinghouse efforts are channeled. These offices maintain up-to-date information on the communities that have the greatest health needs. They some . times run recruitment fairs or training workshops for communities seeking health manpower.

Assisting Development of a High-Technology Corridor. A high technology corridor in Tennessee, along the Pellissippi Parkway between Oak Ridge and the Knoxville area, will be developed with the help of \$1.2 million in ARC funds. The new nonprofit Tennessee Technology Foundation will develop the corridor, along which two high technology businesses have already located. The ARC funds will be used for start-up costs and general administrative costs

for up to five years for the foundation, whose formation was recommended by a statewide task force of business and community leaders. The foundation will build on the technical educational base in the area, which includes the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, TVA, the University of Tennessee in Knoxville and its associated Space Institute in Tullahoma.

Plans for the project include a training institute for employees of high tech industries on a new campus for the State Technical Institute of Knoxville, to be combined with the Oak Ridge campus of Roane State Community College, and a technology business center to help entrepreneurs reach production stage.

improvement of Basic Skills. A component of the statewide basic skills improvement program and the comprehensive plan of the Alabama state department of education, this four-year-old Alabama project is designed to improve the basic skills of reading, mathematics and oral and written communication. It has granted funds to ten elementary schools. While each school has worked toward the overall objectives in a slightly different way, all have used ARC funds to supply additional teaching staff and aides, to purchase or create new and more effective instructional materials and to find ways to volve parents in improving their children's basic skills. A special basic skills team from the state department of education has assisted all schools in the project. Achievement and basic skills tests are administered to help evaluate the effectiveness of the project.

Providing Maternal Health Care. A program was established to provide prenatal and postnatal care to low-income Coshocton County, Ohio, women who do not qualify for welfare and have inadequate or no health insurance. Health professionals in the dounty had noticed that increasing numbers of pregnant women were coming to the emergency room of the only hospital in the county to deliver without having any prenatal luring their pregnancies. A lack of prenatal RIC is known to contribute to infant mortality The purpose of the project is to prevent lowbirth-weight babies and high-risk deliveries. Clients are provided with physical examinations, laboratory testing, nutritional assessments and counseling on pregnancy and child care.

Encouraging Business to Establish Child Care Programs. A study by Winthrop College in South Carolina explored incentives to business and industry to subsidize child care programs. The study's four major components were (1) a - housing: survey of working women in South Carolina; (2) a review of current literature on employer-supported child care; (3) on-site visits to study models of employer-supported child care; and (4) development of a marketing package to promote the concept. This marketing package is now being used by child care providers in approaching the private sector; the package includes information on tax laws, insurance, child care standards and other regulatory factors. The projet was undertaken in response to recommendations from a governor's task force which had pointed out the large increase in the state over recent years in numbers of employed women and urged increased child support services to make it easier for more women to be employed.

Supplying a Clinic for a Rural Coal-Mining Area. In Floyd County, Kentucky, several small rural mining communities virtually isolated from large service centers receive basic health services from a clinic whose rented facility was recently destroyed by fire. ARC funds have helped to build and equip a clinic building to replace the mobile homes adapted and temporarily used by the clinic. This community of 13,000 raised \$80,000 to contribute to the cost of the permanent building.

Promoting Conversion to Coal. In FY 82, ARC developed a guidebook to help small and medium-sized industries make the decisions necessary to convert to the use of coal for electricity or heating. It also helped disseminate information on conversion at the state and local levels, working, for example, with a local devel-

opment district in southeastern Pennsylvania.

Rehabilitating Rural Housing. ARC provided \$250,000 to the Regional Housing Council of Southern Tier New York for a demonstration project in the rehabilitation of rural housing through the combined use of public and private funds. The \$250,000 in ARC funds will permit \$550,000 to be borrowed at reduced interest rates for the rehabilitation of three types of rural housing:

rental properties housing 1-4 families
 larger homes owned and occupied by an elderly person or persons, to be converted into 2-4 family units

properties foreclosed for tax delinquency.

The overall purpose of the project is to restore to good condition some of the essentially sound housing stock of rural New York and thereby increase the supply of good housing available at reasonable rates to rural residents.

Upgrading Vocational Education Teachers. In the 20 Appalachian counties of Mississippi, the number of vocational education teachers tripled during the ten years from 1969 to 1979 as a result of the ARC emphasis on establishing vocational education facilities. In order to upgrade the training and development of teachers, especially new teachers, the state division of vocational technical education has received a threeyear grant from ARC for in-service training. The program is offered at local vocational centers and off-campus locations of Mississippi State University.

This pilot project is intended eventually to be extended to other areas of the state. An effective mechanism for raising the level of vocational education, the project has developed such innovations as preparation of a directory listing industries in Appalachian Mississippi that are willing to help train vocational education teachers by letting them actually work at the industries for short periods and take part in company training programs.

16

, 3

Making Use of New SBA Program. More than 20 Appalachian local development districts (LDDs) made use of a telatively new Small Business Administration program to set up, organizations during the year that would qualify as certified development companies (CDCs). The purpose of this joint government/private-sector program is to make it possible for small businesses to obtain financing for the acquisition of land, construction and equipment. Loans can be made for up to 25 years, the type of long-term financing which is often difficult for small businesses to get.

Once it has set up a CDC, a development district can often put together a financing package to help a small bus tess obtain better terms than otherwise available. SBA can guarantee \* maximum of \$500,000 of bonds in any one package arranged through a CDC. The development districts expect eventually to make their CDCs self supporting, largely through the packaging fees they are allowed to charge.

This program constitutes a valuable development tool that is expected to help create jobs as ". Il as to aid in city and areawide development."

Assisting Small Coal Producers. In order to help small and medium sized coal producers to take better advantage of the coal export market, ARC offered technical assistance during the year in several forms. The Commission prepared a series of five reports analyzing export opportunities, the structure of the export market and port capacity problems. It provided staff and financial support for a number of seminars and conferences throughout Appalachia on the same topics. It helped to organize a cooperative of small and medium-sized coal producers in eastern Kentucky which negotiated the sale of almost half a million tons of coal to itally.

### **Appalachian Foundation**

Throughout the year the Commission explored initiatives that would lead to creation of an Appalachian foundation. The Commission was interested in launching a cooperative public/ private effort to build a pool of capital that could be used, along with other kinds of assistance, on. specific efforts for the development of the Region to complement the work of ARC. In earlier decades, much of the wealth generated by Appalachia's natural' resources had been extracted from the Region without much benefit to the Appalachian people, Many corporations and individuals have shown an increasing commitment to the communities where they are doing business.

The Commission allocated \$600,000 during the year to jaunch the Foundation and fund its first year operating costs. It also appointed a Foundation committee composed of the federal cochairman and representatives of five Appalachian states (Kentucky, Mississippi, Ohio, Tennessee and West Virginia); this committee was directed to prepare and file final incorporation documents.

(The Foundation's articles of incorporation were filed in Virginia on January 28, 1983, after the conclusion of fiscal 1982. An initial board was designated, consisting of the federal cochairman and the current and preceding states' cochairmen. This initial board was given responsibility for approving the Foundation's bylaws and electing to the board of directors not fewer than 14 directors in addition to the 13 Appalachian governors.)

### The Finish-Up Program

The finishup program, launched at the end of flscal year 1982, was designed to help the Region make the transition from dependence on assistance furnished by ARC to the point where it could continue to make economic progress without the assistance. The program called for specific goals. Within three years the basic health program was expected to be completed. Special assistance to the most distressed counties and a regionwide program to create and retain jobs and stimulate private investment was planned for five years. Completion of the most vital uncompleted highway segments was scheduled for eight years.

Changes in the Highway Program. Completion of the total planned 3,033 mile Appalachian

Development Highway System would cost approximately an additional \$7 billion in federal funds, according to estimates in late 1981, but this level of federal funding did not seem achievable. The finish up program, therefore, provides for construction of only 666 of the remaining 1,303 uncompleted miles. The criteria for segments to be selected for construction were developed by negotiation among the states and the federal cochairman in the usual ARC process. The segments to be constructed include:

• segments within each state carrying the highest overall traffic and contributing the most to economic development

• segments eliminating the most restrictive gaps in continuity of the system

 segments expected to carry the most coal traffic by 1985

 segments completing the most critical crossings of state lines.

For completion of 550 miles, a ceiling of \$2.27 billion in federal funds was set. The Appalachian states committed themselves to building an additional 116 miles of the system essentially with other resources.

The modified highway program would:

 complete approximately 79 percent of the authorized system, for a total of about 2,400 miles of improved highway

 construct the 150 miles of highway segments carrying the largest volumes of coal

 leave 26 state line crossings in adequate condition

 virtually complete 10 corridors of the 26 in the system.

Changes In the Area Development Program. The bulk of ARC area development funds—nearly 75 percent of the total—will be used for the jobs and private investment part of the program. A limit of 50 percent of the total cost is established as the maximum ARC funding permissible in projects under the jobs and private investment program and the health finish-up program. Some projects formerly eligible for ARC funding are no longer eligible: libraries, cultural centers or recreation facilities; construction of schools, hospitals or government office buildings; construction of community centers or social service facilities, except for primary care facilities under the health finish-up program, facilities eligible under the distressed counties program and facilities for industry-related child care under the jobs and private investment program; operational assistance beyond start-up and the first year of operations.

Jobs and Private Investment Program. This program will fund projects supporting the creation and retention of private sector jobs, upgrading manpower for jobs in the Region and stimulating private sector investment. All 397 Appalachian counties are eligible for funding of projects under this jobs and private investment program. All projects selected for support must provide evidence of private sector investment, such as monetary contributions, donation of space, expertise or equipment, investment in a related project as a result of project activities, or corporate or community leadership and involvement in planning and implementing project activities.

Eligible activities are those that involve: ...

creation and retention of jobs, where Commission funds are necessary to assure a firm privatesector commitment to locate, expand or stay in the area

 upgrading manpower for jobs in the Region, where Commission funds will initiate training that is relevant to the current job market or improve basic skills necessary to qualify for jobs

attracting private investments, where Commission funds are necessary to bring about specific private investments that will meet high-priority objectives substantially enhancing the economic development potential of an area.

.Projects eligible for funding under this program include:

 infrastructure projects, such as access roads, water and sewer improvements or other community facilities for or supporting enterprise sites

 human resources projects of the following types: training or upgrading to improve immediate job

2. basic skills programs for adults or secondarylevel vocational students to improve reading, writing, computational or basic computer literacy skills in direct preparation for employment or graduation

3. child care programs to meet the needs of specific industries and their employees, including construction of facilities and establishment or adaptation of programs

4. housing programs needed to support or expand business and industry

5. enterprise development programs, such as assistance in developing coal marketing and export strategies, technical assistance for small business development and energy enterprise revolving loan funds.

Funds allocated to the jobs and private investment program for fiscal 1983 total \$34.3 million.

Distressed Counties Program. This special program is designed to help Appalachians who live in the most distressed and underdeveloped counties in the Region (see list on page 6). More than one million Appalachians live in these 67 counties, where many communities lack even the most basic facilities and the resources to provide them. Unemployment and poverty rates are high and housing inadequate in these targety rural counties.

Four indicators were used to identify the 67. counties eligible under this program: per capita income, unemployment, poverty and infant mortality. Counties included fall in the bottom quarter of Appalachian counties in at least three of these four categories.

Funds under this program will be used chiefly to provide safe drinking water and affordable waste disposal, to give these counties a basis for hope of progress in the future. Funds can also be used for activities eligible under the jobs and private investment program.

Funds allocated to this program, for fiscal 1983 total \$9.6 million.

Health Finish-Up Program. This program is de-

signed to complete within three years the ARC objectives of bringing primary health care within reasonable commuting distance of people in the Region, of reducing infant mortality in counties with the worst rates and of recruiting needed health manpower in shortage areas.

Counties eligible for primary care projects, listed on page 7, were selected on the basis of being areas short in health manpower (as designated by the Department of Health and Human Services) that lacked primary care or coverage from nearby areas. Counties eligible for infant mortality reduction projects, listed on page 7, were selected on the basis of having infant mortality rates for the years 1977-79 that were 150 percent of the national average, or more.

This program will fund:

• primary care projects that provide reasonable access—generally within 30 minutes, under normal conditions—to basic day-to-day health care by a physican, physician extender, or nurse, for the general population of health manpower shortage areas. Primary care is defined as familyoriented entry-level ambulatory care and assumes responsibility for diagnosis, treatment, follow-up and referrais to more specialized services. It may include dental, preventive and home health care in addition to basic health care. Eligible- projects include establishing clinics, extending outreach or satellite services and assisting recruitment of primary care physicians.

• projects to reduce infant mortality. Eligible activities will include training courses, public education programs and prenatal services.

• recruitment technical assistance projects to help place needed health providers in health manpower shortage areas throughout the Region:

Funds allocated to this program for fiscal -1983 total \$5.1 million.

Finish-Up Program Objectives. The ARC finishup program cannot complete the job of bringing Appalachia fully into the mainstream of the American economy. Gaps will still remain between Appalachian and national levels of in-

RIC b-refevant training programs, including

come, community services, jobs, housing, health and education, but the finish-up program will further narrow many of these gaps. It is expected to complete in an orderly fashion ARC efforts nowin progress. And it will leave in place in the Region a solid base for continuing development.

21

Counties Eligible for Assistance under the Distressed Counties Program

Mississippl Alabama Benton Kemper Coosa . Marshall Lawrence Noxubee Pickens<sup>+</sup> Tippah . Randolph Webster Winston Georgia North Carolina Dawson Towns Cherokee Jackson Swain Kentucky Ohlo Adams Pike Clinton Pennsylvania Jackson Sullivan Lawrence Lincoln

" Bibb'

· Clay

**Union** 

Bath

Clay

Knott

Lee Lewis

МсСгеату Magoffin Menifee Morgan Owsley Powell Russell Wolfe

Carter

Tennessee Campbell Claiborne Clay . Cocke Cumberland **Fentress** Grundy Hancock Jackson Meigs Överton "Pickett Scott

Virginia Lee West Virginia Braxton + Calhoun Clay Gilmer · Lincoln **McDoweli** Mingo Pendleton Pocahontas Roane Summers Taylor Webster

14

10.

Ounties Eligii	ble foi	Assistance u	nder the Primar	y Care Program	sun «un	unties Eligibl der the Infant duction Prog	e for Assistance Mortality
	-1		•	<i>,</i>		uucuon rrog	
Cherokee		Chenango	Jackson	÷	•	Alabama	Virginia •
Walker		Steuben 5	Polk	1		• /	
Winston		Tioga	Van Buren			Chambers	Bland 🖏
- · ·	•		10-11-			Cherokee	Buchanan
Georgia	•	North Carolina	Virginia			Lawrence	Gileś
Banks		Yancey	Bath /		•	Winston	Russell
Cherokee ·		· ·	Dickenson*	÷		Georgia	
Jackson 🍈 🗋	`	Ohio	Floyd	· ·		Banks	West Virginia
Murray*		Carroll	Russell	•		Dawson •	Ohio
Walker		Monroe			ź	Heard	Pendleton
		Pike	West Virginia	`	•	Murray	. Pleasants
Kentucky		Vinton	Calhoun	т	- •	Towns	Pocahontas
Garrard		* (1(0))	Clay				Roane
Greenup	• . • .	Pennsylvania	Gilmer .		•.	Kentucky	Summers*
Knox		-	Hampshire	•		Bell 🌯 🔹	1 Fucker
Laurei	~	Bradford	Jefferson				- Upshur
Montgomery	•	Clinton	Mineral	· •		Lewis	· · · ·
Owsley		Crawford	Pendleton	• • •		McCreary	14 °
Rockcastle	•	Erle	<sup>4</sup> Randolph	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	Accienty .	,
Russell		Fulton	• Roane*	•		MIssissippi	•
Whitley		Juniata	Upshur ·			••	
Wolfe		Mercer	•			Lee	•
•		Monroe	• •			Lowndes	•
Mississippi	5.	Montour	•			Noxubee	
		* Sullivan				Oktibbeha	
Choctaw		Wayne	, -		···· .	Tippah	· · · ·
Clay	•			•		Webster	· •
Lowndes				1 .		→r .	
Prentiss	•		·	· •	•	Tennessee	, <sub>.</sub>
? Ishomingo Union				•		Fentress	
Union			۲			Meigs	•
• ·		•		•	,	· · · ·	:
×		, <b>*</b> •				·	t
						•	•
•		00	<u>,</u>				· Í o
		23	· 、			,	<b>2</b> .
•				•			HE .

### Counties Eligible for Assistance under the Primary Care Program

 $\operatorname{ERIC}$  led in 1983 to reflect newly acquired data.

Added in 1983 to reflect newly acquired data.

## Finances

In the 18 years the Appalachian Regional Commission has been in existence, Congress has appropriated a total of nearly \$4.9 billion for the Appalachian program, through September 30, 1983 (see Table 1 at right). Of this total, \$3.0 billion has been for the highway program and \$1.9 billion for the nonhighway program.

### Authorizations and Appropriations

The federal share of ARC funding is provided by Congress in two stages, first authorizations and then appropriations, as is the case with most federal programs, Authorizations establish both the scope of program activities and the maximum limits on amounts that may be made available to carry out these programs. For the Appalachian program, authorizations of funds for the nonhighway portion of the program have been provided for two-year periods, and for the highway program for longer periods, usually four to five years.

Within the ceilings established by the authorizations, Congress then provides annual appropriations for the Appalachian program, generally not for the full amounts authorized.

### **Highway Funds**

25 -

ERIO

The original amount authorized for the ARC highway program in 1965, was \$840 million and covered a six-year period, to 1971 (see Table 2 on page 9). Since that time Congress has raised the total authorization to \$3,140 million through 1982 as more miles have been added to the system and as the costs of construction have risen with inflation. Neither the original authorization nor the increased fund-

١.						· ·	•
à			A 2 1.4	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-	•	-
Д	nnron	iriatione	for, Appalachi	an Kemonal	130174	alonmoni	· Uroarame
	ihhi ah	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	tor mpparasm	an wegional	, <b>D</b> G V V	çi o piniçin i	riograms.
							· •
	1 1		fin tho	usandsiof dollars)			•

Table 1

· \ [		격·			-	·	
$\langle \rangle$	•	· ·	4	Nonhighway	•	· · ·	
• <u> </u>	•		Area 4	Research	• -		
Fiscal Year		Highwäy	Development	and LDD	Administrative	Total 🥐	
1965-66	÷ '	\$ 200,000	\$ 103,450	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,290	\$ 307,240	
1967.		.100,000	54,700	. 2,750	1,100	158,550	1
1968		70,000	55,100	1,600	746	127,446	
∕₅1969 — \`		100,000	70,600	, 3,000 🚽	850	174,450	
1970	•	175,000	101,958	5,500	932	283,390	2
1971		175,000	119,500	7,500	<b>⊷</b> 968	302,968	ŕ
1972		175,000	115,000	<b>7,0</b> 00 .	1 1 1 3	298,113 -	
1973	•	205,000	127,000	11,000	1,217	344,217	
1974		155,000	107,500	7,500	1,492	271 492	
1975 🍴 .	-	160,000	- 125,000	8,500	1,747	295,247 *	
1976	•	162,200	117,500	8,500	1,870	290,070	
Transition Quar	ter	37,500	8,000 •	4,500	495	50,495	٩,
1977		185,000	109,500	8,500	1,925	304,925	
1978	•	211,300	105,000	7,400	° ~ 2,083	325,783	
1979 -		233,000	137,923	7,700	2,297	380,920	
1980		229,000	. 120,000	7,500	3,105	359,605	
1981		214,600	<b>* 78,400</b> *	6,300*	3,192	302,492*	
1982		· 100,000	44,200	5,800 ,	2,900	152,900	
1983 ·		115,1 <u>33</u>	45,000	5,000	2,900	168,033	-
Total	•	\$3,002,733	\$1,745,331	\$11 <b>8,050</b>	\$32,222	\$4,898,336	
Alter rescission.	ζ.	· · ·			· .		¢
	/						1

ing, however, would be enough to complete the system. The total amount actually appropriated to date for highways, through fiscal 1982, is \$2.9 billion.

### **Nonhighway Funds**

. Appalachian nonhighway funds have been

used for a number of programs, including health, vocational and other education, mine area restoration, housing, water and sewer treatment, other community facilities, land stabilization, timber development, support of the multicounty local development districts (LDDs), research and supplemental grants. Originally, these funds were allocated to each state in a specific amount for each program

-	· ·	· •	Aircount of	Authorization
Appalachian Legislation	* Period (	Covered	Added	Cumulative
1965 Act	through '	1971	\$840.0	\$ 840.0
1967 Amendments	through	1971	175.0	• 1,015,0
1969 Amendments	through	1973	150.0	1,165.0
1971 Amendments	through	🎽 1978	925.0	2,090.0
1975 Amendments	through	1981	840.0	2,930.0
1980 Amendments	through	1982	260.0	3,190.0
1982 Reconciliation Act	through	1982	- 50.0	3,140.0

f Table 2 Appala nian Highway Authorizations

(in milions of dollars)

Cumulative authorization through 1982, \$3,140 million, Cumulative appropriation through 1982, \$2,887.6 million.

then in existence. in 1971, Congress changed this system of authorization by allocating the nonhighway funds as a block. In response to this Congressional action, which gave the Commission greater flexibility in investing its funds according to individual state priorities, the Commission designed a new allocation system under which each state was given a single allocation, called an area development allocation, for four major programs: health and child development, vocational education, mine area reclamation and supplemental grants. Each state could-determine how much of its area development allocation it wanted to use for reach of these programs.

Since 1975, this single allocation system has expanded to cover all ARC nonhighway programs, except for Commission research and evaluation and the support of the LDDs.

The area development appropriation is divided among the states according to a formula that takes into account the land area, the population and the per capita income of the Appalaan portion of each state.

### Sources of Funding

The commitment of the federal-state partners to the ARC process is demonstrated by the fact that the responsibility for funding is shared just as the decision-making process is. Appalachian and other federal funds have made up 61 percent of the total costs of all Appalachian projects (63 percent of highway projects and 59.5 percent of nonhighway projects—see Table 3 on page 10). The remainder of the costs has been paid by state, local and/or private funds, so that the federal government on the one hand and state, local and private funds on the other have invested close to equally in the program.

Over the years, the federal share of funding for grant-in-aid projects has been increased by legislation, and this increase is reflected in the Appalachian program. During the initial years, the federal share of the ARC highway program was slightly over 50 percent, but rose to 80 percent in fiscal 1982. The federal share of the nonhighway (anding has also risen over the years, although not so steeply---from an original share of about 50 percent to 63.8 percent in fiscal 1982 and 59.5 percent on a cumulative basis.

### Supplemental Grants

Because of their rural character, their relative poverty and their low tax bases, many Appalachian states and communities found it difficult to come up with the matching share required by law in many programs before federal funds can be granted. Although they were eligible in all other ways for grants for the construction of basic public facilities, before the existence of ARC they often could not take advantage of a number of federal programs.

In response to this problem, Congress designed a unique feature of the Appalachian legislation, the supplemental grant program. Under this program, the federal share in grant programs may be raised (from the usual 30 to 66 percent) to as much as 80 percent of the

 $\mathbf{28}$ 

• 9

	· · · · ·				· · · · · ·							
47		Highwa	y Projects	•		Nonhigh	way Projects		~	` <b>A</b> I	Projects	
	19	82	Cumul	ative	19	1982		ative	1982		Cumulative	
*•	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	'Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
,			- <u> </u>				, rd • _+					
ARC Funds	\$105.8	<b>80.</b> 0%	\$2,863.7	. 63.0%	\$ 62.2	. 25.6%	\$1,817.6	30.1%	\$168.0	45.0%	\$ 4,681.3	44.2%
Other Federal Funds					92.5	38.2	1,778.0	29.4	-92.5	24.7	1,778.0	16.8
Total, Federal	\$105.8	80.0%	\$2,863.7	63.0%	\$154.7	.:63.8%	\$3,595.6	59.5 <mark></mark> %	\$260.5	69.7%	\$ 6,459.3	61.0%
State Funds	\$ 24.7	19.3%	\$1,669.0	36.7%	\$ 23.5	9.7%	~ \$513.3	8.5%	 \$48.2	17.4%	\$ 2.162.3	<sup>1</sup> /20.6%
Local Funds	0.7	0.7	13.3	0.3	64.1	26.5	1.935.4	32.0	64.8	12.9	1.948.7	18.4
Total, State									<u> </u>		1.040.r	
and Local	\$ 25.4	20.0%	\$1,682.3	<u>37.0%</u>	\$ 87.6	36.2%	.; <b>\$2,448.7</b>	<u>40.5%</u>	\$1,13.0	30.3%	\$ 4,131.0.	39.0%
Total Eligible Costs*	\$131.2	100.0%	\$4,546.0	100.0%	\$242.3	400.0%	\$6;044.3	100.0%	\$373.5	100.0%	\$10,590.3.	100.0%

### Table 3 Distribution of Total Cost among Sources of Funds for Approved Projects

(in millions of dollars)

Ineligible costs of projects, which are not eligible for matching federal grants, must be borne by the applicants.

cost of construction, so that the state or community can participate by putting up as little as 20 percent as its matching share. The Appalachian states have used supplemental grants to construct many types of public facilities, including vocational education schools, colleges, health facilities, water systems, sewage treat. ment plants, recreational facilities, libraries and airports.

Each year the Commission utilizes supplemental grant funds in a slightly different manner, in accordance with priorities determined at the time by the Appalachian states (see I once accounted for about 26 percent of these Table 4 on page 11). The proportion used for water, sewer and sewage treatment facilities. which previously amounted to about 20 percent of these funds, rose steadily-from 38 percent in fiscal year 1973 to nearly 70 percent in fiscal year 1978--and then dropped to 52 percent by 1981; in 1982 it was up again to 66 percent. In 1982, industrial site development and community improvement utilized 24 percent of these funds, as compared to 21 percent in 1979 and 33 percent in 1981.

Heaith facilities, on the other hand, which

funds, utilized about 17 percent in 1975 and dropped to less than 2 percent in 1980 and less than 1 percent in 1981 and 1982. The share of education projects has dropped from an earlier 57 percent to somewhat more than 7 percent in the 1980-82 years.

It should be noted, however, that these amounts do not reflect completely the amounts of ARC funds used for construction of health and vocational education facilities since these may also be funded under ARC's basic health and vocational education programs.

30

e 1

· /*		,		S			
•		1982 Progr	am •		Cumulative through 198		•
	No.	Amount	Percent	No. 3	Amount `	Percent	
Community Development:		*		; •		· · · ·	
Water System	.36	\$ 9,129	36.9%	557	\$158,716	23.1%	
Water and Sewer	5	1,757	7.1	97	24,809	3.6	
Waste Treatment	24	5,377	21.8	474	95,244	13.9	
Pecreation and Tourism	- 3	364	1.5	149	23,576	3.4	
Community Improvement	4	1,585		86	22,343	3.3 (0:	
industrial Site Development	.18	4,260	17.2	157 1	40,575	5:9 👌 💆	1
Airports	2	<b>, 45</b> 2	1.8	, <b>153</b> -	18,838	2.7	1
Solid Waste	_	· _	— .	47	7,314	. 11.1	۰. ب
Other at		· _	· `	20	. 3,501	0.5	
Subtotal	92	\$22,924	92.7%	1,740	\$394,916	57.5%	
Education:							
Vocational Education	2	\$ 160	0.7%	586	\$ 84,478	12.3%	
ty- Higher Education	3	1,038	4.2	246	63,249	9.2	
Libraries	3	551	2.2	174	21,315	3.1	
ETV and NDEA	÷	_		103	14,772	2.2	
Subtotal	8	\$ 1,749	· 7.1%	1,109	\$183,814	26.8%	
Health Facilities	_1	\$ <u>54</u>	0.2%	455	\$107,759	15.7%	
Totz!	10 <u>1</u>	\$24,727	100.0%	3,304	\$686,489	100.0% ?	
. <b>फ</b> ੋ;							

# Table 4 Supplemental Grant Projects Approved by Type of Program (in thousands of dollars)

31

1

. . .

h.)

ć.

31

к<sup>, с</sup>

# **Projects Approved in Fiscal Year 1982**

# Appalachian Regional Commission

### Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982

•		ARC Share				
Program Category	Number of Projects	Amount	Percent of Total ARC Funds	Other Federal Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Cost
Health :	29	\$ <sup>\$*2</sup> 4,968,241	· 8.0%	\$ 1,470,324	\$ 5,327,057	\$ 11,765,622
Child Development	7	<b>3,285,299</b>	5.3	1,611,568	3,905,410	8,802,277
Vocational Education and	134			•		-
Other Education	27	7,955,740	. 12.8	573,27,9	17,404,282	25,933,301
Community Development	94	23,923,998	38.4	88,630,683	53,978,532	166,533,213
Energy and Enterprise	25	8,928,098	14.3	0	849,187	9,777,285
Environment and Natural	• **			•		
Resources	4	771,286	.1.2	. 0	335,550	1,106,836
Other Programs and Special		· · · • ·	•	+		
Demonstrations	· 3	913,467	1.5	98,180	1,894,885	y 2,906,532
Housing	· 7	3,274,108	5.3	55,000	1,310,841	4,639,949
Local Development District			*	•		• • •
Planning and Administration	0	4,550,655	7.3	´ 0	1,802,599	6,353,254
Research and Technical				•		•
Assistance *	34	3,666,736	5.9	45,187	755,751	4,467,674
Total	230	\$62,237,628	100.0%	\$92,484,221	\$87,564,094	\$242,285,943



<i>,</i>		•		
	·			
•		-	• •	and the second
· · ·		;		
laba	m	<b>א</b> גי		
Mara	11.14	A., 19	•	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
· .		. y	·	
Denulation.			еч.	
Population .	*			
(in thousands)				
<b>*</b>		•	Percentage of Change	
	·1980.	1981	or Change 1980-81	
	13041	1301	1900-01	
State Total	3 <b>,893.9</b>	3 <b>.920.</b>	0.7%	
	•	• ; · ·		
Total of Counties				I \ / / /
in Appalachia	2,430.1	2,447.8	0.7%	
	157		· •	
Bibb	15.7			
Blount Calhoun	36.5 119.8			
Chambers	39.2			
Cherokee	18.8		,	
Chilton	30.6			in the second se
Clay	13.7		.01	
Cleburne '	12.6		.4	
Colberte .	54.5	54.9	8	
Coosa	11.4	11.4	.1 *	
Cullman	61.6			
De Kalb 📌	53.7		15	St. Clair 41.2 42.5 3.1 Shelby 66.3 69.5 4.8
Elmore	43.4		17 17 5	Talladega 73.8 74.5 .9
Etowah .	103.1			Tallapoosa 38.7 38.9 .7
Fayette	18.8			Tuscaloosa 137.5 138.7 .9
Frankiin Jackson	28.3 51.4			Walker 68.7 69.4 1.1
Jefferson	671.3			Winston 22.0 22.3 1.6
Lamar	16.5			
Lauderdale	80.5			
Lawrence	· 30.2	30.3	.5	Finner for 1980 the 1980 Community of Depute
Limestone	46.0	) 46.1	.3	Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Popula- tion. <u>Number of Inhabitants</u> (PC 80-1 series, state re-
Madison .	197.0		.2	ports). County figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend
Marion	30.0			projections based on 1976.78-80 years, adjusted to
Marshall	65.6			1981 revised Census state total populations. State figures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Reports</u> .
Morgan	90.2			"Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1981
Pickens Randolph	21.5			and 1982" (series P-25, No. 927), U.S. Bureau of the
Randolph 🔍	.,20,1	20.1	.2	Census, March 1983.
- 73 - 144 - H 126 -	that a	•	,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

τ.

## Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982 .

Program Category	•	ARC Funds	Other Federai Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs
Health		\$ 599,182	\$ 0	\$ 339,048	\$ 938,230
Vocational Education and Other Education		1,288,800		9,772,200	11,061,000
Community Development	•	1,150,948	4,114,258	1,325,666	6,590,872
Energy and Enterprise Development		223,960	0	70,000	293,960
Local Development District Planning and Administration	•	435,000	. 0	145,002	580,002
Research and Technical Assistance		353,307	. 0	3 <b>2,</b> 334	386,641
Total	-	\$4,051,197	\$4,114,258	\$11,685,250	\$19,850,705

**3**6

ERIC


17

. . . .

18

# Georgia

<b>Population</b> (in thousands)	1000	•	Percentage	
•	19 <b>80</b>	19 <b>8</b> 1	1980-81	
State Total	5 <b>,463.</b> 1	5,565.	1.9%	
Total of Counties	`		•	
🗧 In Appàlachia	1,104.1	1,135.0	2.8%	
Banks	8.7	9.0	3.5%	
Barrow	21.4	· ,21.8	2.1	
Bartow	40.8	. 41.6	2.0	
Carroll	56.3	57.2	1.5	
Catoosa	37.0	38.0	2.7	•
Chattooga	21.9	22.0	.5	
Cherokee -	51.7	<u> </u>	4.4	
Dade	12.3	·12.5	1.5	
Dawson	4.8	4.9	3.4	
Douglas	54.Ģ	. 56.8	4.1	
Fannin	14.7	. 14.9	1.3	
Floyd	79.8	80.6	1.0	
Forsyth	.28.0		3.9	
Franklin	15.2	. 15.5	2.2	
Gilmer	11.1	11.4	2.8	
Gordon	30.1	30.6	1.9	
Gwinnett	166.9	177.5	6.4	
Habersham	25.0	25.5	2.0	
Hall	75.6	77.5	2.5	
Haralson	18.4		1.4	
Heard	6.5	6.7	2.6	
Jackson	25.3	25.8	1.7	
• Lumpkin	10.8	11.0	2.7	
Madison '	17.7	18.2	. 2.5	
Murray	19.7	20.4	3.5	
Paulding	26.1	27.1	3.8.	
Pickens,	11,7	11.9	2,1	
Polk	32.4	32.5	.5 .	



38

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Population. <u>Number of Inflabitants</u> (PC 80-1 series, state reports). County figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend projections based on 1976-78-80 years, adjusted to 1981 revised Census state total populations. State figures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population\*Reports</u>, "Estimates of the Population of States; July 1, 1981 and 1982" (series P-25, No. 927), U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 1983.

•

- 3

40

1

## Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982

**3** 9c

ERIC

Program Category		AR© Funds	Óther Federal Funds	State and Local\Funds	Total Eligible Costs
Health	\$	619,302	\$0-	-\$, 331,104	\$ 950,406
Child Development		243,392	27,527	80,936	351,855
Vocational Education and Other Education		631,195	0	167,405	798,600
Community Development		1,284,854	527,592	2,216,986	4,029,432
Energy and Enterprise Development		221,173	· 0	7,500	228,673
Housing		532,522	0	10,841	543,363
Local Development District Planning and Administration	r	409,655	. 0	133,300	542,955
Research and Technical Assistance	_	316,541	<u> </u>	33,800	350,341
Total	· \$	4,258,634	\$555,119	\$2,981,872	\$7,795,625

# Kentucky

### Population (in thousands)

20

(in thousands)		,	_
		-	Percentage
: ;	1980	1981	of Change 1980-81
State Total	3,660.8	3,665.	. 0.1%
Total of Counties			•
in Appalachia	1,077.1	1,087.5	1.0%
Adair	15.2	15.3	.2%
Bath .	10.0	. 10.0	4,
Bell	3/4.3	34.2	5
Boya	55.5	55.4	·1
Breathitt	17.0	17.2	1,0
Carter	25.1	25.4	1.4
Casey ·	14.8	14.8	.1
Clark	28.3	28.4	.2
Clay	22.8	· 23.0	. :9
Clinton	9.3	9.3	.1
Cumberland ,	7.3	7.3	.1
Elliott_	. 6.9	7.0	1.1
EstIII	:4.5	ં 14.5	.4
Fleming	. 12.3	<u> </u>	.́ –.5
Floyd	48.8	49.6	1.8
Garrard	10.9	10.9	.6
Green	11.0	11.0	5
Greenup	39.1	39.5	.9
Harlan	41.9	41.8	2
Jackson ·	ì2.0	12.1	1.0
Johnson .	24.4	² 25.0	2.2
Knott v	9.לו	18.0	.4
Knox	30.2	, 30.7	1.4
Laurel	39.0	- 39.9	2.5
Lawrence	14.1	14.4	1.6
Lee	7.8	• 7.8	.6
Leslie	14.9	15.1	.1.6
Letcher'	. 30.7	<sup>6</sup> 31.1	1.4


			,		
	Lewls	14.5	14.7	.9	•
•	Lincoln	19.1	19.1	.5	
	McCreary -	15.6	15.8	1.2	۲
	Madison	53.4	53.9	1.0	
	Magoffin	13.5	13.8	1.8	
	Martin	13.9	14.3	2.9	
	Menifee	5.1	5.2	1.4	
	Montoe	12.4	12.3	ð	
	Montgomery	20.0	20.3 -	1.2	
	Morgan	12.1	12.2 *	.6	
	- Owsley	5.7	5.8	.9	
	Perry	33.8	34.3	1.4	
	Pike	8i.1 °	82.4	· 1.6	
	Powell -	· 11.1	11.4	2.7	
	Pulaski	45.8	46.2	,9	
	Rockcastle	14.0	14.0	.3	
	Rowan	19.0	19.1	.4	
	Russell	13.7	i3.9	1.2	
	Wayne 🕔	17.0	17.1	.7	
	Whitley	-33.4	34.1	2.0	
	Wolfe	6.7	· 6.7	4	

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Population, <u>Number of Inhabitants</u> (PC 80-1 series, state reports). County figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend projections based on 1976-78-80 years, adjusted to 1981 revised Census state total populations. State figures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Reports</u>. "Estimates of the Population of Statest July 1, 1981 and 1982" (series P-25. No. 927), U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 1983.

٠.

## Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982

·,	Program Category	ARC Funds	Other Federal Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs
	Health	\$ 820,000	\$ 0	\$ 1,126,987	\$ 1,946,987
	Vocational Education and Other Education	/ 23,369	0	-33,731	57,100
	Community Development	- / 2,583,611	1,275,594	2,307,388	6,166,593
	Energy and Enterprise Development	120,000	ŕ 0.	* 55,374	175,374
	Environment and Natural Resources	26.250	0	8,750	35,000
	Housing	745,529	5,000	750,000	1,550,529
	Local Development District Planning and Administration	592,000	• 0	197,336	789,336
	Research and Technical "Assistance	310,825	<u>, 0</u>	129,109	439,934
	Total	\$5,221,584	\$1,330,594	\$4,608,675	\$11,160,853



42

ERIC

\*

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE** 

Maryland	
----------	--

Population (in thousands)	, 1980	1981	Percentage of Change 1980-81
State Total	4,217.0	4,259.	1.0%
Total of Counties			· · · · · ·
ू in Appalachia	220.1	222.0	0.9%
Allegany	80.5	80.4	2%
Garrett	26,5	27.2	2.7
Washington	113.1	• 114.4	1.2

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Popula-tion. <u>Number of Inhabitants</u> (PC 80-1 series, state re-ports). County figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend projections based on 1976-78-80 years, adjusted to 1981 revised Census state total populations. State fig-ures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Reports</u>. "Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1981 and 1982" (series P-25, No. 927), U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 1983.

న్ Ø ക്ര

\*\*\*\*\*

**4**5

44

COPY AVAILABLE

22 👉

 $\mathcal{U}_{1} \sim$ 

## Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982

**4**6

. :

Program Category	ARC	Other Federal Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs
Health	\$ 109,810	\$ \$	\$ 37,286	\$ 147,196
Child Development	53,760	164,263	258,763	476,786
Vocational Education and Other Education	107,550	· '0	39,250	146,800
Community Development	1,279,093	13,444,520	4,168,287	18,891,900
Energy and Enterprise Development	35,200	· 0	29,800	65,000
Housing .	1,200,000	0	0	1,200,000
Local Development District Planning and Administration	83,000	0	43,811	126,811 \-
Research and Technical Assistance	21,250	0	<u> </u>	21,250
Total	\$2,889,663	\$13,608,783	\$4,577,197	\$21,075,643

۲ .

j

23

Mississippi	
-------------	--


\*

			<u> </u>
Population			
(în thousands)			Percentage
			of Change
`,	1980	1981	1980-81
State Total	2,520.6	2,536.	0.6%
Total of Countles			
in Appalachia	482.7	486.4	0.8%
$\sim$	, 		
Alcorn	33.0	33.6	1.7% .
Benton	8.2	8.2	.7
Chickasaw	17.9	17.9	.1
Choctaw	9.0	9.0	.2 ~
Ċlay	21.1	21.2	.6
<u>Itawamba /</u>	<u> </u>	20.7	1.0
Kemper	10.1	10.0	-1.6
Lee	<b>57.</b> 1	57.8	1.3
Lowndes '	57.3	57.7	.6
Marshall	29.3	29.4	.3
Monroe	36.4	36.5	.2
Noxubee	13.2	13.1	7
Oktibbeha	、 36.0	36.6	1.7
Pontotoc	20.9	21.2	1.2
Prentiss	24.0	24.3	1,2
Tippah	18.7	18.9	.9 ′
Tishomingo	18.4	18.7	1.6
Union	21.7	21.8	.5
Webster	10.3	10.3	3
Winston	19.5	19.4	-,3

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Population, <u>Number of Inhabitants</u> (PC 80-1 series, state reports). County figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend projections based on 1976-78-80 years, adjusted to 1981 revised Census state total populations. State figures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Reports</u>. "Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1981 and 1982" (series P-25, No: 927), U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 1983.

4

C. Garman St. Ca



49

Program Category	۶ ۲	ARC Funds	Othe Feder Fund	al j		State and scal Funds	Total Eligible Costs
iealth	. \$	365,557	\$	0	\$	114,078 \$	479,635
Child Development		254,681	549,	129	`	491,336	1,295,146
/ocational Education and Other Education		, 267,672		´ 0 _		113,028	380,700
Community Development		678,094	1,077	,014		1,286,807	3,041,915
Energy and Enterprise Development		26,346		0		0	26,346
Environment and Natural Resources	1	520,472		0	,	303,61 <del>6</del>	824,088
iousing	• •	63,132		ο.		0	63,132
ocal Development District Planning and Administration		219,000	1	0		93,104	312,104
Research and Technical Assistance		639,493		0		130,000	769,493
Total	\$	3,034,447	\$1,626,	143	\$	2,531,969	7,192,559

• .


FRIC

**5**0

Population (in thousands)		•	<u>.</u>	Percentage of Change
	- 1 <b>980</b>	1	981	1980-81
State Total	17.558.1	17,	<b>598.</b> '	0 <b>.2%</b>
Total of Counties	r <sup>s</sup>		•	,
) în Appalachia	1,083.2	1,	0,91.6	0.8%
Allegany	51.7		<sup>•</sup> 52.4	1.4%
Broome	213.6		214.4	.4
Cattaraugus	85.7		86.6	1.0 •
Chautauqua	146.9	_	147.8	.6
Chemung	97.7	¥	97.9	.3 ´
Chenango	49.3		50.0	1.4
Cortland .	48.81		49.2	<b>.9</b>
Delaware	46.8		47.3	,9
Otsego	59.1		59.6	1.0
Schoharie	29.7		30. <b>2</b>	1.6 ·
Schuyler	17.7		17.8	.8
Steuben	99.2		99.8	-
Tioga	49.8		. 50.5	
Tompkins	87.1		88.0	1.1

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Population, <u>Number of Inhabitants</u> (PC 80-1 series, state reports). County figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend projections based on 1976-78-80 years, adjusted to 1981 revised Census state total populations. State figures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Reports</u>, "Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1981 and 1982" (series P-25, No. 927), U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 1983.

52



## **New York**

## Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982

54

	Program Category	-	ARC Funds	Other Federal Funds	-	tate and cal Funds		Total Eligible Costs
	Health	\$	504,490 25,100	\$ 46,600	\$	634,585	\$	1,185.675
	Child Development Vocational Education and Other Education		300,744	18,424 39,593		15,144 246,434		58,668 586,771 `
	Community Development.		1,188,200	2,419,059		1,560,019		5,167,278
	Energy and Enterprise Development		921,405	0		232,823		1,154,228
	Other Programs and Special Demonstrations		156,800	98,180		458,493		713,473
	Housing		250,000	0		550,000		800,000
·	Local Development District Planning and Administration		186,000	0		62,001		248,001
•	Research and Technical Assistance		506,945	 45,187	_	172,483		724,615
•	Total	\$4	<b>1,039,684</b>	\$ 2,667,043	\$3	<b>3,931,9</b> 82	\$1	10,638,709

55

Ú,

- 27

Δ


### .

# North Carolina

Population (in thousands)	1980	1981	Percentage of Change 1980-81
State Total	5,881.8	5,952.	1.2%
Total of Counties in Appalachia	1 <b>,2</b> 17.7	1,236.0	1.5%
Alexander	25.0	25.5	2.0%
Alleghany	9.6	• 9.7	1.3
Ashe	22.3	- 22.7	1.7
Avery	14.4	14.8	2.5
Buncombe	160.9	161.5	4
Burke	72.5	73.2	· .9
Caldwell	67.7	68.1	.5
Cherokee	18.9	19.2	1.4
Clay	6.6		5.0
Davie	24.6	26.5	7.7
Forsyth	243.7	246.5	1.2
Graham	7.2	7.0	-2.4
Haywood	46.5	46.9	
Henderson	58,6	60.5	3.3
Jackson	25.8	26.4	2.4
McDowell	35.1	35.8	1.9
Macon	20.2	21.2	4.9
Madison	16.8	17.5	4.0
Mitchell	14.4	14.5	.5
Polk	13.0	13.4	- 3.2
Rutherford -	53.8	54.5	1.3
Stokes	33.1	34.0	2.8
Surry ,	59.4	59.8	.6
Swain	10.3	10.3	.6
Transylvania	23.4	23.8	1.8
Wataugo	31.7	32.6	3.0
		-	

ST COPY AVAILABLE

50



Wilkes	58.7	59.1	.8
Yadkin	28.4	29.0	1.9
Yancey	14.9	15.0	.4

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Population, Volume I. Figures for 1981 are from the North Carolina Office of State Budget and Management. "Provisional Estimates of North Carolina Counties and Metropolitan Areas: July 1, 1981." November 1982, adjusted by ARC to the revised state estimate published by the Census Bureau in March 1983. ARC ratio-trend projected estimates give a total of 1,233.3 thousand for Appalachian North Carolina.

57

Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982					
Program Category	ARC Funds	Other Federal Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs	
fealth * *	\$ 138,320	\$ 0	\$ 110,408	\$ 248,72	
Child Development	1,509,679	715,329	1,946,971	4,17,1,97	
Community Development	1,773,1,77	1,031,800	6,006,223	8,811,20	
Energy and Enterprise Development	· 35,131	۸ ۵	0	- 7 35,13	
ocal Development District Planning and Administration	417,000	0	145,391	562,39	
Research and Technidal Assistance	290,342	0	96,442	386,78	
lotal	\$4,163,649	\$1,747,129	\$8,305,435	\$14,216,213	

٠

.

٩.



. 29

**5**9


• \*

Ohi	0
-----	---

ERIC T COPY AVAILABLE

Population (in thousands)	1980	1981	Percentage of Change 1980-81	
State Total	10,797:61		-0.04%	
Total of Counties	1,262.6	1,274.1	~ 0.9%	•
Adams	24.3	24.7	1.5%	
Athens	56.4	57.0	• 1.1	
Belmont	82.6	82.4	2	
Brown	319	32.3	1.3	
Carrol:	25.6	25.9		
Clermont	128.5	131.9	2.7	
Coshocton	36.01	ر 36.1	.3	
Gallia	· 30.1	/ 30.7	2.1	•
Guernsey	42.0	42.2	.5	
Harrison	18.2	N 18.1	1	
Highland	33.5	33.8	1 <b>.1</b>	'
Hocking	24.3	24.6	1.4	
Holmes	29.4	30.0	2.0	
Jackson	• 30.6	, 30.8	.7	
Jefferson	91.6	90.9	7	
Lawrence	63.8	64.4	.9	
Meigs	23.6	24.0		
Monroe	17.4	17.6	1.2	
Morgan	14.2	14.3		
Muskingum	.83.3	83.9		
Noble	11.3	11.4		
Perry	31.0	31.4		
Pike	22.8	23.1		
Ross	65.0	65.6		
Scioto	84.5	85.0		
Tuscarawas	. 84.6	85.1	.6	
			,	

**6**0



61,

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Popula-tion, <u>Number of Inhabitants</u> (PC 80-1 series, state re-ports), County figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend projections based on 1976-78-80 years, adjusted to 1981 revised Census state total populations. State fig-ures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Reports</u>, "Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1981 and 1982" (series P-25, No. 927), U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 1983.

Vinton

## Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982

أحر

Program Category			ARC Funds	Other Federal Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs
Health Child Development	•	\$	342,961	\$ 7,000 7,496	\$ 681,203 137,126	\$ 1,229,831 557,583
Vocational Education and Other Education Community Development Energy and Enterprise Development	Jan		198,456 1,139,000 78,170		34,752 2,554,750 . 9,750	233,208 4,539,250 87,920
Housing Local Development District Planning and Administration	₩		. 307,271 191,000	0	0 116,112	307,271 307,112
Research and Technical Assistance	-	\$3	242,439 3,040,925	0 \$929,996	57,000 <b>\$3,590,693</b>	299,439 \$7,561,614

62

31

، ب روب

32 -

Population	1980	1981	Percentage of Change 1980-81
•			1900.01
State Total	<b>4</b> 1,86 <b>3.9</b>	11,875.	0.1%
Total of Countle	s		•
in Appalachia	5,994.2	6,003.4	0.2%
Allegheny	1,450.1	- 1,437.5	9%
Armstrong	77.8	77.9	<b></b> .2
Beaver	_ 204.4_		
Bedford	46.8	. 47.3	1.0
Blair	136.6	137.0	
Bradford	62.9	63.5	.9
Butler 🗳	147.9	150.0	1.4
Cambria	183.3	183.0	2
Cameron	6.7	6.7	2
<ul> <li>Carbon</li> </ul>	53.3	53.6	.5
Centre ·	112.8	<u> </u>	1.0
Clarion	43.4	43.9	1.2
Clearfield	83.6	84.6	1.2
Clinton	39.0	. 39.1	.4
Columbia 👝	62.0	62.6	1.0 ·
Crawford	88.9	89.4	.6
( Elk	38.3	38.3	.0
Erie	279.8	280.7	<b>`</b> .3
Fayette	159.4	• 160.1	.4
Forest	5.1	5.1	.7
Fulton	12.8	13.0	1.2
Greene	40.5	41.0	1.3
Huntingdon	42.3	42.6	.7
Indiana 🔹 🔹	• 92.3	93.6	1.5 .
Jefferson	48.3	48.9	1.1
' Juniata	19.2	19.5	1.4
Lackawanna	227.9	227.5	2 `
Lawrence	107.1	107.3	.1
Luzeme	343.1	342.8	1
* *			ł

Lycoming	1 18.4	118.7	<b>.2</b> ·	
McKean .	50.6	50.7	.2	
Mercer	128.3	128.3	.0	
Mifflin	46.9	47.2	.6	
Monroe	69.4	71.9	3.6	
Montour	16.7	16.6	2	
Northumberland	100.4	100.4	0-	
Perry	35.7	36.5	2.2	
Pike	18.3	18.9	3.3	•
Potter	17.7	17.8	.6	
Schuylkill	_160.6	160.7	.0	1
Snyder	33.6~	34.0	1.1	
Somerset	81.2	81:9	9	
Suliivan	6.3	6.4	.9	
Susquehanna	37.9	38.1	.7	
Tioga	41.0	40.9	1	
Union	32.9	33.2	1.1	
Venangò	64.4	64.7	.3	
Warren	· 47.4	· 47.4	.0	
Washington	217.1	217.8	.3	
Wayne	35.2	35.8	1.6	
Westmoreland	392.3	394.2	.5	
Wyoming	26.4	27.2	2.9	

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Population, <u>Number habitants</u> (PC 80-1 series, state reports). County Hyures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend, projections based on 1976-78-80 years, adjusted to 1981 revised Census state total populations. State figures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Reports</u>, "Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1981 and 1982" (series P-25, No. 927), U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 1983.

, t

## Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982

Program Category		ARC Funds	Other Federal Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs
Health	,\$	849,754	\$ 63,000	\$ 823,244	\$ 1,735,998
Child Development		197,483	0	282,643	- 480,126 /
Vocational Education and Other Education	•	1,853,013	533,686	5,415,352	7,802,051
Community Development	•	1,341,184	6,463,550	4,339,063	12,143,797
Energy and Enterprise Development		5,320,223	0	43,500	5,363,723
Environment and Natural Resources	•	64,804	0	23,184	87,988
Other Programs and Special Demonstrations		691,667	0	.1,436,392	2,128,059
Local Development District Planning and Administration		568,000	- 0	223,417	791,417
Research and Technical Assistance	_	79,593	^0	57,333	136,926
<b>Total</b>	\$	10,965,721	\$7,060,236	\$12,644,128	30,670,085
,					



BEST COPY AVARABLE

33

**South Carolina** 

Population (in thousands)	1980	1981	Percentage of Change 1980-81
State Total	3,121.8	3,170.	1.5%
Total of Counties		•	
in Appalachia	~ 791.9	804.7	1.6%
Ande rson	133.2	136.2	2.2%
Cherokee	41.0	41.4	1.1
Greénville	287.9	292.3	1.5
Oconee	48.6	49.2	1.3
Pickens	79.3	81.2	2.4
Spartanburg	201.9	204.5	1.3


Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Population, <u>Number of Inhabitants</u> (PC 3<sup>n</sup> I series, state, reports). Counly figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend projections based on 1976-78-80 years, adjusted to 1981 revised Census state total populations. State figures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Reports</u>, "Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1981 • and 1982" (series P-25, No. 927), U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 1983.

4815

67

RECT.

ERIC



**6**8

				1	
Program Category	•	ARC Funds	Other -Federal Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs
fealth	\$	380,99 <mark>8</mark>	\$ 1,353,724	\$ 1,119,314	\$ 2.854,036
Child Development		545,843	0.	428,591	974,434
ocational Education and Other Education		.807,656	<b>, 0</b>	430,221	1,237,877
Community Development		1,798,651	0	. 3,590,151	5,388,802
Energy and Enterprise Development		91 <b>,685</b>	0	<sup>,</sup> 88,678	180,363
ocal Development District Planning and Administration	,	136,000	0	45,334	181,334
Research and Technical Assistance		48,750	0	16,250	65,000

1 × 1

.

,a

ο.

**6**9

Ť

÷ \*

ERIC<sup>®</sup>

4

.

٠.

。 35

Population (in thousands)	<b>198</b> 0	1981	Percentage of Change 1980-81	· · ·
State Total	4,591.1	4,624.	Ó.7%	
Total of Counties in Appalachia	2,073.8	2,092.2	0.9%	Marion 24.4 24.6
<b>*</b> - <b>1 •</b> -	67.2	67.0	0.07	Meigs 7.4 7.7 3
Anderson	_ 67.3 9.5	67.9 ' 9.6	.8% .9	Monroe 28.7 29.1 1
Bledsoe	9.5 77.8	78.8	.9 1.3	Morgan 16.6 16.9 2
Blount Bradlev	67.5	68.6	1.5	Overton 17.6 17.7 1
Campbell	34.9	35.5		Pickett 4.4 4.3 -
Campbell Cannon		10.3	1.8 1.0	* Polk 13.6 13.7 1
	10.2 50.2	50.3		Putnam 47.7 48.5 1
Carter		25.1	.3 2.0	Rhea 24.2 24.8 2
Claiborne Clau	24.6 7.7	25.1 7.7		Rgane 48.4 49.4 2
Clay	28.8		.9 .3	Scott 19.3 19.6 1
Cocke	20.0 38.3	28.9 38.6	د. 9.	Sequatchie 8.6 8.8 2
Coffee				Sevier 41.4 42.5 2
Cumberland	28.7	29.3	2.3	Smith 14.9 15.0
DeKalb	13.6	4	.6	Sullivan 144.0 144.3 🗸
Fentress	14.8	14.9	.7	Linicoi 16.4 16.4
Franklin	32.0		1.0	Union 11.7 12.0 2
Grainger	16.8		1.3	Van Buren 4.7 4.8 1
Greene ,	54.4	,	.4 ′	Warren 🔪 32.7 33.0
Grundy	, 13.8 49.3		1.5	Washington 88.8 <b>8</b> 9.1
Hamblen	49.5	49.8 288.6	1.0	White 19.6 19.8 1
Hamilton	6.9	200.0	.s .0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Hancock	43.8		.0 1.6	•
Hawkins	43.0 9.4	44.2 9.5	۱.0 29	Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Po
Jackson Infference	9.4 31.3		,9 1.9	tion, Number of Inhabitants (PC 80-1 series, sta
Jefferson Johanna	13.7	13.9		ports). County figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-
Johnson Kaan			1.1	projections based on 1976-78-80 years adjust 1981 revised Census state total populations. Stat
Knox	319.7	321.1	.4	ures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Re</u>
Loudon	28.6		.5	* Estimates of the Population of States: July 1.
McMinn	41.9		.2	and 1982" (series P-25, No. 927), U.S. Bureau o
Macon	15.7	16.0	1.9	Census, March 1983.

ς,

.

ERIC.

- 36

ş.

## **Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1982**

72

Full Text Provided Toy, STOR


Piogram Category	· ARC Funds	Other Federal Funds	• State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs
Child Development Vocational Education and Other Education Community Development Energy and Enterprise Development Local Development District Planning and Administration Research and Technical Assistance	\$ 112,400 445,878 4,582,426 1,473,369 379,000 18,300	\$59,400 0 1,901,622 0 0 0	\$ 263,900 148,626 8,293,169 311,762 126,335 0	\$435,700 594,504 14,777,217 1,785,131 505,335 18,300
Total	\$7,011,373	\$1,961,022	\$9,143,792	\$18,116,187



73

BEST CORY AVAILABLE

Virginia									
Population (in thousands)	1980	1 <del>9</del> 81	Percentage of Change 1980-81	•					
State Total	5,346.8	5,425.	1.5%						
Total of Countles in Appalachia	549.9	552.0	، 0.4% ·						
Alleghany	14.3	14.2	9%						
Bath	5.9	5.3	-8.9						
Bland	6.3	6.4	1.5						
Botetourt	23.3	24.1	3.4						
Buchanan	38.0	38.1	.4						
Carroll	27.3	28.1	3.2						
· Craig	. 3.9	3.7	-5.2						
Dickenson	19 <b>.8</b>	20.1	1.5						
Floyd	11.6	12.0	3.4						
Giles	17.8	17.8	2						
Grayson	16.6	15.6	-5.7						
Highland	2.9	2.9	-2.5						
Lee	26.0	26.4	1.7						
Pulaski	35.2	35.1	4						
Russell	31.8	32.0	.7						
• Scott	25.1 33.4	25.2 33.4	.4						
Smyth Tazewell	50.5	51.2	.0 `1.3						
Washington	46.5	47.7	2.4						
Wise	43.9	44.1							
Wythe	25.5	25.7	.5						
Bristol City	19.0	18.2	-4.6						
Clifton Forge City	5.0	4.9	-3.8						
			-						



	Covington City Galax City	9.1	8.7	-3.7	
	Galax City	6.5	6.8	3.4	
	Norton City	4.8	. 4.6	-4.4	
		•			
į.	· .				

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Popula-tion. Volume I. Figures for 1981 are from "Estimates of the Population of Virginia Counties and Cities: July 1. 1981 (Provisional)" by Julia H. Martin and Michaei A. Spar, Taylor Murphy Institute. (Iniversity of Virginia. adjusted by ARC to the revised state estimate published by the Census Bureau in\_March 1983. ARC ratio-trend projected estimates give a total of 559.1 thousand for Appalachian Virginia.

75

74

ERCI COTY AVAILABLE

Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year 1282							
Program Category	1			ARC Funds	Other Federal Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs
Vocational Education and Other Education Community Development Energy and Enterprise Development Local Development District Planning and Administration Research and Technical Assistance	ı •	•	\$	731,407 238,500 86,000 355,000 150,000	\$0 115,000 0 0	\$ 303,283 201,035 0 215,951 30,000	\$ 1.034,690 604,535 86,000 570,951 180,000
Total			\$1 ,	<b>1,610,907</b>	\$115,000	\$750,269	\$2,476,176

6,

ERIC

77

ð

\*6

. \$

# West Virginia

### Population

40

າ (in t <b>h</b> ousands)	•		Percentage of Change
	1 <b>9</b> 80 -	1981	1980-81
State Total	1,949.6	1,946.3	-0.2%
Total of Counties in Appalachia	1,949.6	1,946.3	-0.2%
in rippoidenta	1,545.0	1,0-14.0	-0.2.76
Barbour	16.6	16.6	.0%
Berkeley	46.8	47.1	.8
Boone	30.4	30.6	.5
Braxton	13.9	13.8	' –.4
Brooke	31.1	30.7	-1.2
Cabell	106.8	105.5	-1.3
Calhoun	8.2	8.3	.6
Clay	11.3	11.4	.9
Doddridge	7.4	7.5	.7
Fayette	57.9	- 58.1	.4 •
Gilmer	8.3	8.3	7 ·
Grant	<sup>10.2</sup>	10.3	.5
Greenbrier	37.7	37.9	
Hampshire	14.9	15.0	1.1
Hancock	40.4	39.8	-1.4
Hardy ·	10.0	10.0	<b>∸</b> .2 .
Harrison	77.7	77.0	9
Jackson -	25.8	26.1	1.2
Jefferson	30.3	30.9	1.9
Kanawha	231.4	229.0	
· Lewis	18.8	18.7	9
Lincoln	23.7	23.9	.9
Logan	. 50.7	50.6	1
McDowell	49.9	49.1	-1.5
Marion	65.8	65.4	6
Marshall	<sup>41.6</sup> 27.0	•41.5	4
Mason ·		26.9	4
Mercer	73.9	74.1	.2
Mineral	27.2	27.2	.0
			• *

- -.

	Mingo	37.3	37.4	.2
	Monongalia	75.0	74.9	2
,	Monroe	12.9	12.9	.2
	Morgan	10.7	10.9	1.3
	Nicholas	28.1	28.4	1.0
	Ohio	<b>61.4</b>	60.2	-1.9
	Pendleton	7.9	7.9	5
	Pleasants	8.2	8.2	.0'
	Pocahontas	9.9	10.0	.4
	Preston 🐋	30.5	30.5	.3
	Putnam	38.2	38.9	1.8
	Raleigh	86 8	87.6	.9
	Randolph	. 28.7	28.7	·1
	Ritchie	11.4	<b>*</b> 11.4	4
	Roane	16.0	15.9	1
	Summers	15.9	16.1	1.1
,	Taylor	16.6	16.6	.1
	Tucker	8.7	8.7	.6
1	Tyler	11.3	11.4	.4
	Upshur	23.4	23.6	.6.
	Wayne	46.0	46.4	.8
•	Webster	12.2	12.4	1.0
	Wetzel 🧹	21.9	21.7	~.8
	Wirt	4.9	4.9	•
	Wood	93.6	.93.2	4
	Wyoming	36.0	36.2	.4 '
				L L

Figures for 1980 are from the 1980 Census of Population, <u>Number of Inhabitants</u> (PC 80-1 series, state reports). County figures for 1981 are ARC ratio-trend projections based on 1976-78-80 years, adjusted to 1981 revised Census state total populations. State figures for 1981 are from <u>Current Population Reports</u>. "Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1981 and 1982" (series P-25, No. 927), U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 1983.




 $\overline{78}$ 


Project Totals Approved in Fiscal Year	r 1982			·
Program Category	ARC Funds	Other Federal Funds	State and Local Funds	Total Eligible Costs
Health	\$ 39,200	\$,	\$ <u>9,8</u> 00	\$ 49,000
Vocational Education and Other Education	300,000	0	700,000	1,000,000
Community Development	4,836,260 100,000	55,415,174 • 0	16,128,988 0	.76,380,422
Local Development District Planning and Administration	580,000	0	255,505	835,505
Total	\$5,855,460	\$55.415,174	\$17,094,293	\$78,364,927



ERIC Fulltaxt Provided by ERIC

í,





### Local Development Districts

See the map opposite.

#### Alabama

- 1A: Northwest Alabama Council of Local Governments P.O. Box 2603 Muscle Shoals, Alabama 35660 205/383-3861
  - <u>Counties</u>: Colbert, Franklin, Lauderdale, Marion, Winston
- 1B: North Central Alabama Regional Council of Governments P.O. Box C Decatur, Alabama 35602 205/355-4515

Counties: Cullman, Lawrence, Morgan

1C: Top of Alabama Regional Council of Governments 115 Washington Street, S.E. Huntsville, Alabama 35801 205/533-3330

> <u>Counties</u>: DeKalb. Jackson, Limestone. Madison, Marshall

- 1D: West Alabama Planning and Development Council Tuscaloosa Municipal Airport Terminal Building, 2nd Floor North Port, Alabama 35476 205/345-5545
  - <u>Counties</u>: Bibb. Fayette. Lamar. Pickens. Tuscaloosa (Greene. Hale)

 1E: Birmingham Regional Planning Commission
 2112 Eleventh Avenue, South Magnolia Office Park, Suite 220 Birmingham, Alabama 35256
 205/251-8139

Counties: Biount, Chilton, Jefferson, St. Clair, Shelby, Walker

 1F: East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission
 P.O. Box 2186
 Anniston, Alabama 36202
 205/237-6741

> <u>Counties</u>: Calhoun, Chambers, Cherokee. Clay, Cleburne. Coosar Etowah, Randolph, Talladega, Tallapoosa

Central Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission 500 Eastern By-Pass, Suite 202 Montgomery, Alabama 36117 205/271-2866

Counties: Elmore (Autauga, Montgomery)

#### Georgia

1H:

2B:

 2A: Coosa Valley Area Planning and Development Commission
 P.O. Drawer H, Jackson Hill Drive
 Rome, Georgia 30161
 404/295-6485

> <u>Counties</u>: Bartow, Catoosa, Chattooga, Daâe, Floyd. Gordon, Haralson, Paulding. Polk, Walker

Georgia Mountains Planning and Development Commission P.O. Box 1720 Gainesville, Georgia 30503 404/536-3431

43

Counties: Banks, Dawson, Forsyth, Franklin, Habersham, Hall, Lumpkin, Rabun, Stephens, Towns, Union, White (Hart)

2C: Chattahoochee-Flint Area Planning and Development Commission P.O. Box 2308 Newnan, Georgia 30264 404/253-8521

Counties: Carroll, Heard (Coweta, Meriwether, Troup)

Atlanta Regional Commission Suite 1801 100 Edgewood Avenue, N.E. Atlanta, Georgia 30335 404/656-7700

2D:

<u>Counties</u>: Douglas, Gwinnett (Clayton, Cobb. DeKalb, Fulton, Rockdale)

2E: Northeast Georgia Area Planning and Development Commission 305 Research Drive Athens, Georgia 30601 404/548-3141

> Counties: Barrow, Jackson, Madison (Clarke, Elbert, Greene, Morgan, Oconee, Oglethorpe, Walton)

2F: North Georgia Area Planning and Development Commission 503 W. Waugh Street Dalton, Georgia 30720 404/272-2300

> Counties: Cherokee, Fannin, Gilmer, Murray, Pickens. Whitfield

> > 84

83

Parentheses indicate non-Appolacitian counties and Independent cities included with the development districts.

Kentu	cky	3F: \	Lake Curnberland Area Development District, Inc.		
<b>3A:</b>	Buffalo Trace Area Development District. Inc. 327 West Second Street Maysville. Kentucky 41056 606/564-6894		P.O. Box 377 Jamestown, Kentucky 42629 502/343-3154 <u>Counties:</u> Adair, Casey, Clinton, Cumberland, Green, McCreary, Pulaski, Russell, Wayne (Taylor)		
3B;	Counties: FlemIng, Lewis (Bracken, Mason, Robertson) FIVCO Area Development District P.O. Box 636 Catlettsburg, Kentucky 41129 606/739-5191 Counties: Boyd, Carter, Elliott, Greenup, Lawrence	3н:	Curnberland Valley Area Development District, Inc. ADD Office Building London, Kentucky 40741 606/864-7391 <u>Counties</u> : Bell, Clay, Harlan, Jackson, Knox, Laurel, Rockcastle, Whitley		
3C: 3D:	Bluegrass Area Development District, Inc. 3220 Nicholasville Road Lexington, Kentucky 40503 606/272-6656 <u>Counties</u> : Clark, Estill, Garrard, Lincoln, Madison, Powell (Anderson, Bourbon, Boyle, Fayette, Franklin, Harrison, Jessamine, Mercer, Nicholas, Scott, Woodford) Gateway Area Development District, Inc. P.O. Box 107 Owingsville, Kentucky 40360 606/574-6355 <u>Counties</u> : Bath, Menifee, Montgomery, Morgan, Rowan	31; 3J:	Kentucky River Area Development District. Inc. 381 Perry County Park Road Hazard, Kentucky 41701 606/436 3158 <u>Counties</u> : Breathitt, Knott, Lee, Leslie, Letcher, Owsley, Perry, Wolfe Barren River Area Development District. Inc. P.O. Box 2120 Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101 502/781-2381 <u>Counties</u> : Monroe (Allen, Barren, Butler, Edmonson, Hart, Logan, Metcalfe, Simpson, Warren)		
3E:	Big Sandy Area Development District, Inc. 2nd Floor, Municipal Building Prestonsburg, Kentucky 41653 606/886-2374 <u>Counties</u> : Floyd, Johnson, Magoffin, Martin, Pike	Maryi 4A:	and Tri-County Council for Western Maryland, Inc. Room 228, County Office Building 3 Pershing Street Cumberland, Maryland 21501 301/777:2158		

P.O. Drawer B

Mississippi

5A:

5B:

5C;

5D:

Pontotoc, Mississippi 38863 601/489-2415

Counties: Chickasaw, Itawamba, Lee, Monroe, Pontotoc, Union (Calhoun, Lafayette)

Counties: Allegany, Garrett, Washington

Northeast Mississippi Planning and

Counties: Alcorn, Benton, Marshall, Prentiss, Tippah, Tishomingo

Three Rivers Planning and Development

Development District

Booneville, Mississippi 38829

P.O. Box 6D

601/728-6248

District

Golden Triangle Planning and Development District P.O. Drawer DN Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

601/325-3855

601/683-2007

Counties: Choctaw, Clay, Lowndes, Noxubee, Oktibbeha, Webster, Winston

East Central Mississippi Planning and Development District P.O. Box 499 Newton, Mississippi 39345

<u>Counties:</u> Kemper (Clarke, Jasper, Lauderdale, Leake, Neshoba, Newton, Scott, Smith)

86

Note. Parentheses indicate non-Appalachian counties and independent cities included with the development districts.

•

<sup>85</sup> 

	•				
New 6A:	Southern Tier West Regional Planning and	7C1	<u>Counties:</u> Buncombe, Henderson, Madison, Transylvania Isothermal Planning and Development		Counties: Adams. Brown, Clermont, Gallia, Highland, Jackson, Lawrence, Pike, Ross, Scloto, Vinton
•	Development Board 445 Broad Street Salamanca, New York 14779 716/945-5301 <u>Counties</u> : Allegany, Cattaraugus,		Commission P.O. Box 841 Rutherfordton, North Carolina 28139 704/287-2281	<b>8</b> ₿:	Buckeye Hills Hocking Valley Regional Development District, Inc. 216 Putnam Street St. Clair Bldg., Suite 4 i 0 Marietta, Ohio 45750
	Chautauqua		<u>Counties</u> : McDowell, Polk. Rutherford (Cleveland)		614/374-9436
6B:	Southern Tier Central Regional Planning and Development Board 53½ Bridge Street Corping, New York 14830 607/962-3021 and 962-5092	7D:	Region D Council of Governments P.O. Box 1820 Boone, North Carolina 28607 704/264-5558	8C:	<u>Counties</u> : Athens, Hocking, Meigs, Monroe, Morgan, Noble, Perry, Washington Ohio Mid-Eastern Governments Association
	Counties: Chemung; Schuy!er, Steuben		<u>Counties:</u> Alleghany, Ashe Avery. Mitchell, Watauga, Wilkes, Yancey	• •	P.O. Box 130 Cambridge, Ohio 43725 614/439-4471
6C:	Southern Tier East Regional Planning and Development Board O'Neil Building, 4th Floor State at Court Street Binghamton, New York 13901 607/724-1327	7E:	Western Piedmont Council of Governments 30 Third Street, N.W. Hickory, North Carolina 28601 704/322-9191 Counties: Alexander, Burke, Caldwell		Counties: Belmont, Carroll, Coshocton, Guernsey, Harrison, Holmes, Jefferson, Muskingum, Tusčarawas
•	<u>Counties</u> : Broome, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Schoharie, Tioga, Tompkins	71:	(Catawba) Northwest Economic Development Commission 280 South Liberty Street		Northwest Pennsylvania Regional Planning and Development Commission iery Building, Suite 406
· North	n Carolina	*	Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101 * 919/722-934€		Franklin, Pennsylvánia 16323 814/437-3024
* <del>,</del> 7 <b>A</b> :	Southwestern North Carolina Planning and Economic Development Commission P.O. Drawer 850		<u>Counties</u> : Davie, Forsyth, Stokes, Surry, Yadkin	-	Counties: Clarion, Crawford, Erie, Forest, Lawrence, Mercer, Venango, Warren
	Bryson City, North Carolina 28713 704/488-9211	Ohió	,	9B:	North Central Pennsylvania Regional Planning and Development Commission P.O. Box 488
•	<u>Counties</u> : Cherokee, Clay, Graham, Jackson, Macon, Swain, Haywood	8A:	OhionValley Regional Development Commission		Ridgway, Penrisylvania 15853 814/773-3162
7 <b>B:</b>	Land of Sky Regional Council 25 Heritage Drive Asheville, North Carolina 28806 704/254-8131		Griffin Hall 740 Second Street Portsmouth, Ohio 45662 614/354-7795		Counties: Cameron, Clearfield, Elk, Jeiferson, McKean, Potter
	a 87			• •*	00
EREC THE: Pa	rentheses indicate non-Appalachian counties and independe	ent cities incl	uded with the development districts.		

45

Ż

1

ж;

٠,

۰,

.

.

ŝ

9C: "Northern Tier Regional Planning and Development Commission 507 Main Street Towanda, Pennsylvania 18848 717/265-9103

> Counties: Bradford, Sullivan, Susquehanna, Tioga, Wyoming

9D: Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania P.O. Box 777 Avoca, Pennsylvania 18641 717/655-5581

Counties: Carbon, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Monroe, Pike, Schuylkill, Wayne

9E: Southwestern Pennsylvania Economic Development District Park Building, Room 1411 355 Fifth Avenue Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222 412/391-1240

> <u>Counties</u>: Allegheny, Armstrong, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Greene, Indiana, Washington, Westmoreland

9F: Southern Alleghenies Planning and Development Commission 1506 11th Avenue, Suite 100 Altoona, Pennsylvania 16601 814/946 1641

> Counties: Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Fulton, Huntingdón, Somerset

9G: SEDA-COG R.D. No. 1 Lewisburg, Pennsylvania 17837 717/524-4491

> Counties: Centre, Clinton, Columbia, Juniata, Lycoming, Mifflin, Montour, Northumberland, Snyder, Union (Perry)\*

10A:	South Carolina Appalachian Council of Governments P.O. Drawer 6668 Greenville, South Carolina 29606 803/242-9733
·	<u>Counties:</u> Anderson, Cherokee, Greenville, Oconee, Pickens, Spartanburg
Tennes	ssee
11A:	Upper Cumberland Development District 1225 Burgess Falls Road Cookeville, Tennessee 38501 615/432-4111
; ; ; ; ;	<u>Counties</u> : Cannon, Clay, Cumberland, DeKalb, Fentress, Jackson, Macon, 'Overton, Pickett, Putnam, Smith, Van Buren, Warren, White
11'B: *	East Tennessee Development District P.O. Box 19806 Knoxville, Tennessee 37919 615/584-8553
· •	Counties: Anderson, Blount, Campbell, Claiborne, Cocke, Grainger, Hamblen, Jefferson, Knox, Loudon, Monroe, Morgan,

South Carolina

11C: First Tennessee Virginia Development District ~ 207 N. Boone Street, Suite 800 Johnson City. Tennessee 37601 615/928-0224

Roane, Scott, Sevier, Union

Counties: Carter, Greene, Hancock, Hawkins, Johnson, Sullivan, Unicoi, Washington; Washington County, Virginia 11D: South Central Tennessee Development. District P.O. Box 1346 Columbia, Tennessee 38401 615/381-2040

> Counties: Coffee. Franklin (Bedford, Giles. Hickman, Lawrence, Lewis. Lincoln, Marshall. Maury. Moore, Perry, Wayne)

11E: Southeast Tennessee Development District 413 James Building 735 Broad Street Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402 615/266-5781

> <u>Counties</u>: Bledsoe, Bradley, Grundy, Hamilton, McMinn, Marion, Melgs, Polk, Rhea, Sequatchie

#### Virginia

12A: LENOWISCO Planning District Commission P.O. Box 37 Duffield, Virginia 24244 703/431-2206

Counties: Lee, Scott, Wise, City of Norton

12B: Cumberland Plateau Planning District P.O. Box 548 Lebanon, Virginia 24266 703/889-1778

Counties: Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell, Tazewell

-9û

85

 $^{1}$ 

\*Geographically in SEDA-COG, administratively in Capitol Regional Planning and Development Agency in Harrisburg.

	12C:	Mount Rogers Planning. District		<u>Counties:</u> McDowell, Mercer, Monroe, Raleigh, Summers, Wyoming
		1021 Terrace Drive Marion, Virginia 24354 703/783-5103	13B:	Region 2 Planning and Development Council
		Counties: Bland, Carroll, Grayson, Smyth, Washington, Wythe, Cities of Bristol and Galax		1221 6th Avenue Huntington, West Virginia 25712 304/529-3357
•	12D;	New River Valley Planning District		<u>Counties</u> ; Cabell, Lincoln, Logan, Mason. Mingo, Wayne: Boyd County, Kentucky, and Lawrence County, Ohio
•	•	P.O. Box 3726 Radford, Virginia 24143 703/639 9313	13C:	BCKP Regional Intergovernmental Council—Region 3 1223 Leone Lane
		<u>Counties:</u> Floyd, Giles, Pulaski (Mont- gomery and City of Radford)		Dunbar, West Virginia 25064 304/768-8191
	12E:	Fifth Planning District Commission		<u>Counties:</u> Boone, Clay, Kanawha, Putnam
•		P.O. Drawer 2569 Roanoke, Virginia 24010 703/243-4417	13D:	Region 4 Planning and Development Council (Gauley) 500B Main Street
		Counties: Alleghany, Botetourt, Craig and		Summersville, West Virginia 2665 304/872-4970
	-	Cities of Clifton Forge and Covington (Roanoke County and Cities of Roanoke and Salem)	•	<u>Counties</u> : Fayette, Greenbrier, Nicholas, Pocahontas, Webster
	12F:	Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission	13E:	Mid-Ohio Valley Regional Council— Region 5 P.O. Box 247
I	;	P.O. Box 1337 Staunton, Virginia 24401 703/885-5174		Parkersburg: West Virginia 26101 304/485-3801
		Counties: Bath, Highland (Augusta,	•	<u>Counties</u> : Calhoun, Jackson, Pleasants. Ritchie. Roane, Tyler, Wirt, Wood
		Rockbridge, Rockingham and Cities of Buena Vista, Harrisonburg, Lexington, Staunton and Waynesboro)	13F:	Region 6 Planning and Development Council 200 Adams Street
	West	, Jiú-sinto		Fairmont, West Virginia 26554 304/366-5693
		Virginia		<u>Counties:</u> Doddfidge, Harrison, Marion,
	13A:	Region 1 Planning and Development		Monongalia, Preston. Taylor
	· ·,	P.O. Box 1442 Princeton, West Virginia 24740 304/425 9508		/
	4.			

le: Parentheses indicate non-Appalactian counties and independent cities included with the development districts.

9

Region 7 Planning and Development Council Upshur County Court House Buckhannon, West Virginia 26201 304/472-6564 <u>Counties</u>: Barbour, Braxton, Gilmer, Lewis, Randolph, Tucker, Upshur

13G:

13H: Region 8 Planning and Development Council P.O. Box 887 Petersburg, West Virginia 26847 304/257-1221

> <u>Counties</u>: Grant, Hampshire, Hardy, Mineral, Pendleton

 13I: Eastern Panhandle Regional Planning and Development Council—Region 9
 121 W. King Street Martinsburg, West Virginia 25401
 304/263 1743

Counties: Berkeley, Jefferson, Morgan

13J: Bel-O-Mar Regional Council and Planning Commission—Region 10
.O. Box 2086
Wheeling, West Virginia 26003
304/242-1800

> <u>Counties</u>: Marshall, Ohio, Wetzel: Belmont County, Ohio

13K: B-H-J Planning Commission—Region 1.1 814 Adams Street Steubenville, Ohio 43952 614/282-3685

> <u>Counties</u>: Brooke, Hancock: Jefferson County, Ohio

> > **9**2

#### Editorial Staff

. Elise F. Kendrick, editor Diane Bowker, technical editor



. 93

\$

## Appalachian Regional Commission

March 31, 1983

FEDERAL COCHAIRMAN . Winifred A. Pizzano STATES' COCHAIRMAN Governor William F. Winter

ALTERNATE FEDERAL COCHAIRMAN Jacqueline L. Phillips STATES' WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE Michael R. Wenger

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR Francis E. Moravitz

Governors and State Alternates

ALABAMA Governor George C. Wallace Ned N. Butler

GEORGIA Governor Joe Frank Harris Steve Rieck

KENTUCKY Governor John Y. Brown, Jr. Rush Dozier, Jr.

MARYLAND Governor Harry R. Hughes Hans F. Mayer

MISSISSIPPI Governor William F. Winter George W. Parsons NEW YORK Governor Mario M. Cuomo Gail S. Shaffer

NORTH CAROLINA Governor James B. Hunt, Jr. J. Paul Essex, Jr.

OHIO Governor Richard F. Celeste Mamie Shaul

PENN3YLVANIA' Governor Dick Thornburgh James O. Pickard SOUTH CAROLINA Governor Richard W. Riley Donald Hinson

TENNESSEE Governor Lamar Alexander Michael McCuire

VIRGINIA Governor Charles S. Robb O. Gene Dishner

WEST VIRGINIA Governor John D. Rockefeller, IV Daniel S. Green

Appalachian Regional Commission 1666 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20235

