

ability to organize effectively so as to achieve these objectives are key requirements for success.

Wheat and feed grain producers present a different situation. Since they produce commodities that move extensively into world trade and are subject to dramatic price fluctuations depending upon the supply-demand balance, some national program to insure a degree of price and income stability remains essential. Moreover, because these crops are produced over large regions and in conjunction with other products, effective price and income policies are likely only at the national level.

In order to achieve effective farm policies at the national level, political representatives from Farm States will need increasingly to trade their support for projects to help nonfarm people.

Broad price and policy issues cannot be effectively addressed at the State and county levels. This does not, however, preclude local help to farmers through effective real estate tax policy, land use zoning, and planning for educational, medical, and other service needs.

In areas of rapid population growth, for example, delaying real estate tax increases until land is sold for higher value uses may effectively aid farmers whose land is in the path of urbanization, industrialization, or other higher-value uses than farming. So may effective land use zoning. At the same time, orderly development of industry, recreational facilities, and housing should be enhanced by such policies.

The political priorities of much of the farm population have shifted materially in recent years and will shift more in the future. Farm families who realize more income from non-farm sources than from farming now have political interests more like those of urban people than like those of their neighbors who operate commercial farms.

They are strongly affected by policies treating wages and worker and consumer benefits (such as mini-

mum wages, unemployment benefits, and consumer safeguards). Thus, their personal well-being stands to be improved much more by policies aimed at strengthening the level of economic activity and employment in sectors outside farming than by policies designed to strengthen and stabilize farm income. Their future attitudes toward restraining those farming activities which cause pollution or environmental damage will be more strongly influenced by their role as consumers and beneficiaries of other amenities of rural living than by their role as farmers.

In conclusion, only one thing is certain. Future changes in agriculture will not affect as many farm families as past adjustments already have. The number of farms and the size of the farm population are down dramatically from their high points in the 1920's and 1930's. Even since 1950, total farm employment has declined by more than 50 percent and a decline of that absolute size in the future is impossible.

Georgia Plans for Growth

E. EVAN BROWN and
HAROLD L. NIX

GEORGIA's greatest asset toward orderly growth and development are her 19 Area Planning and Development Commissions. Generally referred to as APDC's, they represent groups of contiguous counties which have joined together to plan for optimum physical, social, and economic development.

The Commissions came about, in part, as a result of long-time educational efforts by pioneering individuals in both public and private agencies. These pioneers helped point to the APDC's as a mechanism for dealing with such problems as a shrinking tax base, loss of population, and shifting economic bases. Local leaders came to realize the economy of pooling resources and sharing services of adequately trained professional staffs.

The first multi-county planning commission was set up in metropolitan Atlanta in 1947 by a special Act of the General Assembly. In 1959, the first nonmetropolitan multi-county planning commission was formed and named the Coosa Valley Area Planning Commission. In 1960, the 1957 General Planning and Zoning Enabling Act was amended to permit multi-county commissions of not less than five counties to develop throughout the State.

By 1970, a total of 19 APDC's were active in the State—covering 155 out of 159 counties. The smallest commission represents five counties and the largest 14.

Enabling legislation provides for forming area planning commissions and authorizes them to elect officers; hire staff; cooperate with, contract with, or accept funds from Federal, State or local public as well as private agencies; to expend these funds; and to carry out cooperative undertakings and programs.

In most instances, representation on the APDC's in Georgia is limited to two representatives from each member county. One is appointed by the county commissioners and the second by the governing authority of the county seat.

*

E. EVAN BROWN is a Professor in the Agricultural Economics Department at the University of Georgia, Athens.

HAROLD L. NIX is Professor of Sociology and jointly staffed with the Department of Sociology and Anthropology and the Institute of Community and Area Development at the University of Georgia.

Operating funds for APDC's in Georgia are supplied through three major sources. Local contributions are levied at 10 to 25 cents per capita. State matching funds are based on the formula of \$2 for every \$1 of the first \$15,000; and matching dollar for dollar the next \$20,000 collected locally. Federal aid has been in the form of matching grants and loans through such agencies as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Economic Development Administration, Farmers Home Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, and Office of Economic Opportunity.

An executive director heads up each area commission staff. The typical staff includes from 10 to 20 technicians and professionals from such fields as economics, geography, law, public administration, and law enforcement, as well as city, area, and industrial planning. The staffs are frequently aided by State and Federal agencies, the university system, and private consultants.

Generic functions of the Area commissions include research, opportunity identification, goal formulation, project development, program coordination, public education, technical assistance, interagency liaison, citizen participation, and leadership development.

Subject matter areas within which Georgia's APDC's operate currently include economic development, tourism, law enforcement, health, transportation, manpower, recreation, agriculture, water resources, waste disposal. The area commissions are charged with area study, planning, and development as well as with providing local assistance in planning to approximately 200 city, county, and city-county planning units. In addition, each APDC reviews and comments on applications by units of local government within their area to State, Federal, quasi-government, or private agencies for loans or project grants.

Commissions have provided the mechanism through which State and

Federal monies were channeled into local communities resulting in water systems, sewerage systems, airports, roads, recreational facilities, law enforcement facilities, community centers, and other public facilities. Also, they provided a focal point for aiding private investors to secure information and additional sources of credit. In some areas, multi-county industrial parks and waste disposal systems have been established.

Accomplishments cited indicate a tendency on the part of APDC's to go beyond their earlier study and planning functions. There appears to be an increasing trend for them to provide governmental services to their member local governments in such areas as traffic engineering, local planning, and consolidated waste disposal.

Every commission in Georgia has had the problem of developing an area image as well as problems of communicating with local leaders and carrying out plans and programs.

The first decade of APDC's in Georgia has seen the emphasis placed upon local planning and technical assistance. The next decade will probably see emphasis placed upon area-wide planning for use of local member governments and the State, upon area-wide administrative services as requested by member governments, and upon selected administrative functions for State agencies as requested by State governments.

Thus, by providing area planning as a guide to both local and State units and by selective and voluntary consolidation of certain administrative functions and services, local government will be strengthened during the decades to come.

Georgia's APDC's also have served as a mechanism for interstate regional planning and development. Because Georgia was one of the first States in Appalachia with area planning and development units, it was one of the first States to receive funding through the Appalachian Regional Commission Act of 1965.

As a result of early action, many

projects have been completed in the 35 Georgia Appalachian counties which are organized under five APDC's. These projects include 140 miles of highway, water and sewerage projects; access roads to industrial and recreational parks; and construction of vocational schools, hospitals, and housing.

The Coastal Plains Regional Commission was authorized by Congress in 1965 and established in 1967. This interstate commission includes the Coastal Plains counties in Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina.

Six target sectors of the economy selected by this regional commission for acceleration are marine resources, education and manpower, industrial development, agriculture and forestry, tourism and recreation, and transportation.

Since the coastal area and off-shore waters of Georgia offered substantial opportunities for long-range development, marine resources planning has received major attention. Plans made by the commission provided for an accelerated program of research and education in support of coastal marine resource development.

To carry out these plans on a State-wide basis, Georgia established the Ocean Science Center of the Atlantic Commission (OSCA) under sponsorship of the Coastal Plains Regional Commission. This center is the official State agency to receive and administer funds provided by the commission or from State appropriated funds used for matching purposes. OSCA is charged by the State to develop an oceanographic research complex and to establish a marine extension service.

OSCA developed plans for a research center on Skidaway Island as well as extension and service centers at Skidaway, Brunswick, and St. Mary's. The research center at Skidaway was occupied by the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography in 1968. This institute is part of the university system of Georgia. It is designed to conduct research and provide for development in commercial fishing

and aquaculture, marine engineering, mineral exploration, recovery techniques, pollution, and certain fields of basic research.

Marine extension and service programs of OSCA were instituted in 1970 with the employment of several specialists. Their principal functions are to take useful knowledge generated by the research component or other sources and disseminate it to potential users in the coastal area.

The late 1960's has seen development by the university system of two unique centers in Georgia—the Rural Development Center and the Urban Life Center.

The Rural Development Center is at Tifton, Ga. It will complement and expand existing programs of the Coastal Plains Experiment Station, the Extension Service, the College of Agriculture of the University of Georgia, and Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College. A basic purpose will be to coordinate research, instruction, and service functions of these established units so that total resources of the university system will bear significantly on area-wide problems.

The center's program has four objectives: 1. To increase agricultural and forest production efficiency through continued research findings, 2. To advance development of marketing and utilization of farm and forest commodities, 3. To aid community development and solve problems concerning how and where people will live and relate to each other,

4. To further manpower training and utilization to provide more skilled workers in various types of agribusiness that are needed in the area, and to assist general farm workers to prepare for new forms of employment as farm technology takes over their former jobs.

Complementary to the Rural Development Center is the Urban Life Center at Georgia State University in metropolitan Atlanta.

The private sector is deeply involved in planning and development in Georgia in several ways. Private utility companies, cooperatives, banks, and other private interests have promoted and supported the various public agencies in organizing and assisting the Area Planning and Development Commissions as well as local planning units.

Private planning and development is exemplified by the Cotton Producers Association, which ranked 319th in 1969 in business volume in the United States. The CPA has taken initiative in planning and developing, crop, livestock, and catfish production, processing, and marketing.

Illustrative of this development by CPA was establishment of a \$6.5 million soybean crushing and refining facility at Valdosta, investment of \$200,000 in the largest feedlot facility in the State at Waynesboro, and the building of a large catfish hatchery and processing plant at Quitman.

Another illustration of private planning, with assistance of marine units

Sketch of Rural Development Center at Tifton, Ga. Center was completed in March 1971.



of the Ocean Science Center of the Atlantic Commission, is a private firm's plan for shrimp production. The firm has applied to the Corps of Engineers for a permit to create impoundments totaling 1,200 acres. An estimated 1,000 pounds of shrimp can be produced per acre or a total of 1.2 million pounds with a wholesale value of over \$1 million yearly.

In conclusion, Georgia has staked its future on planning its own destiny. Chief responsibility for this planning is placed in three closely coordinated and supportive levels—State, area, and local.

Capstone for planning is the Georgia Bureau of State Planning and Community Affairs. Second or area level planning is carried on by 19 Area Planning and Development Commissions, each consisting of five to 14 member counties. These commissions have responsibility for area study and planning and assistance in state planning. They are also charged by the Bureau of State Planning and Community Affairs with providing local assistance to approximately 200 planning units of local government.

Georgia, with these coordinated levels of planning strongly supported by the public and private sectors, can look to the future with confidence.

Breakthrough: Looking Back From 2000

ALAN R. BIRD and

MELVIN L. COTNER

We wondered how people would get along in the next 30 years. Where would the next 100 million people live? Would settlement patterns be much different in the year 2000 from what they are today? What will living conditions be like?

Many of you have looked at the same questions, going through this Yearbook. By now, you may have firm conclusions. We must confess that our own conclusions are still very tentative. So we would rather not impose them on you.

To close this volume, we offer an agriculture yearbook article for the year 2000 from a historian looking back upon the last three decades of the 20th century. Perhaps such a "look back" will help in visualizing some of the options available to us. Here it is:

We certainly have come a long way since the moon shots of the sixties. Man had begun to regain mastery of the machine. And it wasn't easy.

We began the seventies with a flurry of concern over population distribution and "balanced growth." Fires in the ghettos, kids blowing their minds on LSD, shootings, traffic congestion, smog, and other happenings had dramatized the problems of urban congestion. And isolated rural poor still lacked the medical, educational, and other services that were generally thought essential to the good life.

The 1970 Census counted more than 200 million Americans for the first time. And people worried about where the next 100 million would live—the 100 million expected by the year 2000 or certainly by 2020 even with widespread and zealous use of the pill and other birth control devices. We needed living space and facilities for 25 million more families.

Why pile up more people in the cities? Why not spread people around and encourage more attractive communities in rural areas that continued to lose people? People voted with their feet and elected life in the cities, even the ghettos, and the suburbs. Nearly 70 percent located in metropolitan areas. Yet most people claimed they preferred to live outside the cities.

*

ALAN R. BIRD is Deputy Director of the Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service (ERS).

MELVIN L. COTNER is Director, Natural Resource Economics Division, ERS.