**Attitudes and Perceptions of County Legislators Regarding
Their Influence Over the Formulation and Implementation of
Environmental Policy**

By

Danny S. Batts II

An Applied Research Project
(Political Science 5397)
Submitted to the Department of Political Science
Texas State University
In Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Public Administration
Spring 2005

Faculty Approval:

_____
Dr. Patricia M. Shields

_____
Kolette Palacios

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction

Currently there are 3,141 counties or county equivalents in the United States. The fact that almost all share the same title, "county", belies the great diversity of roles, powers, responsibilities, and structures that exist amongst them. Some have developed from the ancient traditions of feudal England, while others were established under the Napoleonic Code. Some are the product of modern governmental theory, being designed by the experts of our leading schools of government, while others were born in the chaos and strife of post-Civil War Reconstruction. Some are largely autonomous, while others are thralls of the state. Despite these diversities, it is generally recognized that across the country, counties have similar interests and common goals, but it is not always known precisely what these "common causes" are.

Purpose

I was originally contacted by the National Association of Counties, Environment, Energy, and Land Use Committee, to help them in drafting an inquiry to aid in the redrafting of their policy platform. It was the purpose of

this inquiry to gauge the attitudes and perceptions of

county legislators (commissioners or their equivalents)

about their influence over the policy process as it

pertains to environmental policy. The National Association

of Counties originally had hoped that this information

would identify environmental policy areas that are of

highest concern to county officials (their members). Up to

this point the NACo Environment, Energy, and Land Use

platform was a burdensome and lengthy collection of policy

statements on a multitude of policy areas, because it was

not known (given US County Govt. diversity) which policy

areas county governments (generally) could influence.   It

was hoped that this inquiry could provide them with the

feedback necessary to determine which policy areas county

commissioners had influence over. This would aid them in

drafting a more coherent and efficient environmental policy

platform, which would increase the efficiency of their

lobbying efforts. To further this goal, I worked with the

committee Vice-Chair, Commissioner Peggy Beltrone of

Cascade County Montana. Unfortunately, the platform

committee *staff* were less than enthusiastic about "starting

over" with the platform drafting process. This lack of

enthusiasm produced repeated delays in the implementation

of the survey, and eventually forced the committee to

abandon their pursuit of the inquiry.[1] Despite this, given

the relative lack of information on the subject, it was

decided that the information to be gathered by the survey

was still useful to the study of county government in

general, and the inquiry was continued independently of

NACo.

Inquiry Structure

As state earlier, it is the purpose of this inquiry to

gauge the attitudes and perceptions of county legislators

(commissioners or their equivalents) about their influence

over the policy process as it pertains to environmental

policy. To accomplish this, both "influence" and

"environmental policy" must be examined in greater detail.

Influence was analyzed at two seminal points in the policy

process, at policy Formulation and at policy

Implementation.[2] The environmental policies themselves were

divided into six broad policy areas, (Water Quality, Air

Quality, Solid Waste Management, Energy

Conservation/Stewardship, Land Use, and Noise Pollution)

which a review of the literature identified as necessary to

---

[1] See the "Issues" section of Chapter IV for a complete discussion of why NACo withdrew their request for the survey.

[2] LeMay, Michael, *Public Administration: Clashing Values in the Administration of Public Policy* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2002) 11.

a comprehensive environmental policy. Hence, it could be said that the project is "framed" using two broad descriptive categories: Influence and Environmental Policy Areas. Accordingly, a survey was developed to poll county officials about their "influence" over certain "environmental policy areas".

PROJECT ORGANIZATION BY CHAPTER

Chapter Two, History, gives an overview of county government and presents a brief history of the development of US counties. Chapter Three, Influence in the Policy Process, presents the literature underpinning the first category of the conceptual framework, Influence. The policy process is discussed at length, with special attention given to the policy formulation and policy implementation stages. Chapter Four, Environmental Policy Areas, lays out the second category in the conceptual framework and presents the literature supporting it. The necessary components of a comprehensive environmental policy are discussed at length. Chapter Five (methodology) operationalizes the Conceptual Framework, presents the methodology used to collect data, and discusses issues with the collection of the data. Additionally, Chapter Five justifies employing the survey used for the study and reviews its strengths and weaknesses. Chapter Six presents

the results of the survey, while Chapter Seven offers

several conclusions drawn from the results.

Chapter II: Settings

"The history of our nation can be seen as a prolonged struggle to define the relative roles and powers of our governments: federal, state, and local. Americans, as well as their leaders, have nursed a preference for government close to the people since the very inception of the republic."[3] This chapter will examine the historical development of county government and provide and up to date picture of the current state of county government in the US.

County Origins: Ancient Roots

U.S. Counties, for most Americans, originated in ancient England. Originally called "Shires", they were districts established for the efficient mustering of troops and collection of taxes. An Earl, appointed by the King, ruled each shire, and was responsible for carrying out these duties and maintained order.[4] Many shires were actually the remains of ancient English kingdoms, and after being subdued, many times the old King and his heirs would become the Earl. To aid him, the Earl appointed an

---

[3] National Association of Counties website:
http://www.naco.org/Content/NavigationMenu/About_Counties/History_of_County_Government/Default983.htm

[4] Porter, Kirk Harold, County and Township Government in the United States ,
(New York: The Macmillian Company, 1922) 47.

official; know as the "Shire-Reeve", who was in charge of the actual "dirty work" of collecting taxes[5], holding court, and carrying out punishments. The Shire-Reeve evolved into our modern day "Sheriff".[6]

After the Norman Conquest of England, the shire became known by its French translation: County [Conte] (since French "Shires" were ruled by Counts and called "Counties"). Additionally, at this time the power of the Earl declined and was distributed to his former subordinate, the Shire-Reeve. Eventually the Earl was stripped of all administrative duties and became a title of nobility only.[7] In the place of the Earl, and in addition to the Shire-Reeve, several new offices, like County Coroner and County Constable began to emerge.[8]

County Origins in America: New England

Many of these traditions were maintained at the dawn of English colonization of America. But as traditions began to collide with conditions, the shape and structure

---

[5] Porter, Kirk Harold, County and Township Government in the United States ,
(New York: The Macmillian Company, 1922) 50.
[6] Fairlie, John, Charles Kneier, County Government and Administration
(New York: The Century Company 1930) 4.
[7] Duncombe, Herbert Sydney, County Government in America,
(Washington, D.C.: NACo Research Foundation, 1966) 18-19.
[8] National Association of Counties website, available at:
http://www.naco.org/Content/NavigationMenu/About_Counties/History_of_County_Government/Default983.htm

of local government in the colonies and in England began to diverge. In New England, where English colonization first became well established, large regions remained uninhabited (by Englishmen) and broad regional governments, such as counties, were unnecessary. The powers and duties of counties were carried out by towns, which acted as the primary unit of government for many decades. Initially, as populations grew, the hostile Indian nations inhabiting the interior compelled the colonist to live in relatively compact settlements, and the development of county government was further delayed.[9]

Eventually, as the frontiers were pushed back and rural areas became safe, settlers began to populate areas farther away from town governments. As the need for county government grew, townships jealously guarded their powers, and resisted the establishment of counties. Initially, this resistance led to the creation of the Township, which basically extended the powers and duties of the towns to the areas surrounding the town limits, similar to the ETJ

[9] Duncombe, Herbert Sydney, Modern County Government (Washington, D.C.: NACo 1977) 21.

(Extra Territorial Jurisdiction) found in some states today.[10]

As settlement continued to extend past the bounds of towns and townships, colonial legislatures realized that some level of government needed to be established for the ever-growing portion of the population outside the large towns and settlements. Finally, county governments were accented to; however, they were a far cry from their English predecessors. The New England County served primarily as a judicial and military district, with no legislative powers. County Courts could be called upon for civil and criminal actions, and the office Sergeant Major (resurrected from English tradition) was responsible for enrolling and mustering all eligible men in the Colonial Militia. Slowly, the need for regulation of these outlying areas became burdensome for Colonial Assemblies, and Boards of Supervisors were established to provide this regulation. But to ensure the primacy of townships, most town officials were made ex-officio members of these boards.[11]

---

[10] Porter, Kirk Harold, County and Township Government in the United States ,
(New York: The Macmillian Company, 1922) 43.
[11] Fairlie, John, Charles Kneier, County Government and Administration
(New York: The Century Company 1930) 17.

This situation, with counties exercising considerably less autonomy and authority than cities, has remained the norm in New England to this day. Of the three US states with no form of county government, three are in New England. Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island all developed but later abolished their counties, and today they only serve as electoral precincts.

County Origins in America: the South

The development of County Government in the South is quite a different story. The primary factor in the development of counties, both in New England and in the Deep South, arose from living conditions. While conditions in New England, such as hostile Indians, harsh climates, and limited agriculture encouraged tightly packed, close nit communities, conditions in the South, such as very few hostile Indians, moderate climates, and plantation agriculture, encouraged diffuse settlement across large areas of land. [12] Very early on settlers in the Southern Colonies began to venture out of their cities and towns and began to engage in extensive farming and ranching enterprises. Hence, the need for broad regional

---

[12] Duncombe, Herbert Sydney, County Government in America, (Washington, D.C.: NACo Research Foundation, 1966) 20.

governments arose much sooner than in the north, before cities and towns could become well established as a political force. Additionally, many of the wealthy and powerful citizens owned large plantations and lived farm from cities and towns, lending political muscle to the impetuous for counties. Early on counties were established and given broad judicial and legislative powers. Instead of the county board and officers being ex-officio, they mostly elected, giving southern counties independence from city and town governments. In a sense, since most of the executive functions were split between several impendent officers, counties could be independent from themselves. While this form of government was less efficient in administration, proponents argued that it was also less efficient in autocracy.[13]

County Origins in America: Manifest Destiny

Of Course, these two movements in the development of counties are broad and general, and there are many exceptions. But they serve as the primary starting points that have heavily influenced the development of counties in other regions of the country. The primary dichotomy

---

[13] Giles, William A.; Gerald T. Gabris; Dale A. Crane *" The Uniqueness of County Government" Public Administration Review,* Vol. 40, No.1 (Jan-Feb, 1980) 24.

existing between the two is that of *diffuse settlement* vs. *compact settlement*. Thus, regions of the country that were relatively diffuse or relatively compact (at least during their developmental stages, as everything is becoming compact nowadays) tended to follow one model or the other.[14] Hence, the West and most of the Mid-West have developed along the Southern model, while the Northeast and the Mid-Atlantic States have followed the New England model. Some states, like Pennsylvania, have had to grapple with both forces at once, and have a county structure that falls somewhere between the thrall-like New England Counties and the semi-sovereign Southern Counties. Additionally, counties have been heavily influenced by uniquely state or regional trends, like the fit of progressivism that hit parts of the West and North East early in the nineteenth century.[15]

Modern County Government

Since most county governments are deeply rooted in state constitutional law, the pace of change over the years has been slow. While most cities and special districts can be altered by simple legislative fiat, fundamental changes

[14] Porter, Kirk Harold, County and Township Government in the United States ,
(New York: The Macmillian Company, 1922) 43.
[15] Duncombe, Herbert Sydney, County Government in America,
(Washington, D.C.: NACo Research Foundation, 1966) 30-31.

to the roles and responsibilities of county governments
usually require a constitutional amendment process, which
is perhaps the most grueling and difficult process under
the American governmental system. Sometimes this process
is required to make even the most minor changes.[16] Even so,
some trends are beginning to have an impact on the shape of
county government.

The most widespread changes are happening in the area
of county services. Over the last fifty years, counties
have been expanding their services beyond the traditional
road maintenance and judicial functions that preoccupied
U.S. counties for the first 200 or so years of the
republic.[17] Generally these have centered around "Urban
Counties" which have begun to join with or completely take
over efforts traditionally handled by cities. This trend
began when many of the better educated and wealthier
citizens left cities to become suburbanites, while still
working in the city proper. Hence, the wealthier citizens
were still using the city services, nearly the same as
before, but no longer paying city taxes to help support
them, thereby shifting the burden to the city's remaining

---

[16] Texas has repeatedly had to pass constitutional amendments to abolish minor offices in individual counties. See Armando Villafranca, "Amendment Would Let Counties Eliminate Constable Offices," *Houston Chronicle,* 27 October 2002, Voter's Guide Pg. 5.
[17] Duncombe, Herbert Sydney, Modern County Government (Washington, D.C.: NACo 1977) 34.

poor citizens. Since the suburbs were generally able to escape city taxation, officials began to turn services over to the county government, which had the territorial reach to tax all users of a service. Hence, county police departments grew in stature and number, the county jail was expanded, more and more city streets became county roads, and the city airport became the city-county airport.[18] A second area where county governments have begun to participate is regionalization/regional planning, which is an outgrowth of the previous case. Sub-Urban counties have begun to partner with their urban county and city neighbors to help promote and finance regional transportation and infrastructure projects. Federal Community Development Block Grants, once distributed only to major cities, are now being directed to semi-rural and suburban counties.

Efforts to change the structure of county government have been less fruitful. During the 1900's, a handful states were able to amend their constitutions to provide substantial changes to county organization. One, Connecticut, abolished its county governments. The others instituted, to varying degrees, some form of home rule, allowing counties to have a say in the particulars of their

---

[18] Duncombe, Herbert Sydney, Modern County Government (Washington, D.C.: NACo 1977) 132-134.

own structure. In these states, only eleven counties have opted to institute any changes.[19]

Generally, those counties that have adopted these changes have become more professional in nature, either by surrendering control of the county government to technocrats and professionals (similar to the city manager system so prevalent in modern municipal government), or by raising the caliber of its elected officials(necessitated by the increased complexities of the expanded county government). However, most counties cling rather staunchly to their traditional roles, either because of legal constraints, or by an unwillingness to change county structures (and officials) to adapt to new roles.

Conclusion

This Chapter has laid out the historical roots of county government in America, examined county evolution over the centuries, and given a brief synopsis of county government as it stands today. This has all served to underscore the diversity that exists in county government today, both in form and function. The next chapter will present how the inquiry will be structured so as to probe

---

[19] Duncombe, Herbert Sydney, County Government in America, (Washington, D.C.: NACo Research Foundation, 1966) 30-32.

this diversity, and will also present the literature that
supports this structure.

Chapter III: Influence in the Policy Process

Introduction

It is the purpose of this inquiry to gauge the attitudes and perceptions of county legislators (commissioners or their equivalents) concerning their influence over the policy process as it pertains to environmental policy. Hence, the concept of influence, the policy process, as well as specifics about environmental policy, will need to be further examined. This chapter grapples with the concept of influence and the policy process. The next chapter will address environmental policy.

Influence

The concept of influence is at once both obvious and obscure. According to Webster's, Influence is:

> **The power or capacity of causing an effect in *indirect* or *intangible* ways. (emphasis added)**

Influence could also be defined as "leverage points", or points in the policy process where persons can exercise control or determination over the end result.[20] This project concerns the perceptions and attitudes of influence as held by individual county legislators, not adherence to any one academic model or theory about influence. In other words,

---

[20] Kenneth J. Gergen, *Assessing the Leverage Points in the Process of Policy Formation,* The Study of Policy Formulation , ed. Raymond A. Bauer and Kenneth J. Gergen, no. 5
(New York: The Free Press, 1968) 181.

what "matters" is these official's *opinions* about their own influence, not the reality of their *actual* influence, which would be a far more involved and difficult study, perhaps not well suited to survey research. Hence, for the purpose of this inquiry, a very broad definition is assumed to be held in common by the respondents, namely that influence is taken generally to mean the "ability to get others to act, think, or feel as one intends."[21]

After arriving at an acceptable definition for influence, it becomes necessary to determine how and when influence is exercised. As this project pertains to Government Policy, it naturally follows that the policy process should be examined.

The Policy Process

Similar to the concept of influence, the public policy process is difficult to define with certainty. Jones[22] divides the policy process into four general stages which chart the progress of an idea to an action, depending on the relationship of the idea or action to the government. These stages are: 1.Problems to Government, 2.Action In Government, 3.Government to Problems, and 4.Programs to Government. In stage one a problem is defined, in stage two

[21] Banfield, Edward C., Political Influence
(New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Publishers, 2003) 3.
[22] Jones, Charles O. , An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy
(Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1984) 29.

the government formulates a policy to address the problem,

in stage 3 the government's policy is implemented via a

program, and in stage four the program's effectiveness is

evaluated. Building on this, Rushefsky[23] develops a more

precise "flow chart" consisting of eight stages, which

better illustrates the major landmarks of the "policy

roadmap". These landmarks, or stages, are: 1. Problem

Identification, 2. Agenda Building, 3. Policy Formulation,

4. Policy Adoption, 5. Budgeting, 6. Implementation,

7. Evaluation, and 8. Policy Succession.

In stage one, a problem or opportunity arises, and

interests begin to make demands for government action.

This involves two important process, perception and

definition. Perception relates to the awareness of the

problem, and definition to its accepted meaning. At the

end of this stage a problem is recognized as needing a

policy to address it.

In stage two, the government is actually compelled to

place the problem on its "agenda", i.e. set a time and

place to begin step three, policy formulation. According

to Kingdon, this only happens when three streams of

interest, The Problem Stream (those who have the problem),

---

[23] Rushefsky, Mark E. Public Policy in the United States, 3rd ed.
(New York: M.E. Sharp 2002) 5-27, see chart 5.

the Policy Stream (those who know how to fix it), and the

Political Stream (those who have the power to fix it),

coincide with a "window of opportunity"(fortuitous but

often temporary occurrences, such as election results).[24]

Hence, when these three streams converge via a window of

opportunity, there is the Popular will, Knowledge, and

Political Will to get the government's attention.

In stage three, policy formulation, the plan or

strategy meant to address the problem is created. This is

the stage in the process where all of the excitement and

rhetoric of the first two stages is transformed into a

(hopefully)coherent policy, where feelings and ideas form

into rules and regulations. Hence, it is usually the first

stage at which the general public might become aware of the

policy process. In this phase the stakeholders will be

formally designated, resources identified, burdens will be

allocated, and the *formal* policy process begins. [25] This

phase is the first where tangible results will be produced,

and those results will serve as a constraint and guide for

the rest of the policy process. Additionally, the

proceedings of this stage will determine if the "sprit" of

the first two phases will actually be manifested in the

---

[24] Kingdon, John W. Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies, 2ed.
(New York: Longman, 1995) 165.
[25] LeMay, Michael, *Public Administration: Clashing Values in the Administration of Public Policy*
(Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2002) 11.

eventual policy, or if it will be hopelessly altered by the give and take inherent in this phase. Given the visibility and formality of this phase, coupled with the tremendous and decisive influence it will have on those to follow, it was selected as one of the two phases to be addressed in the survey instrument, and thus will merit a more in depth reviewed in its own right.

The fourth step in the policy process is Adoption. Usually the most formal step, it often can be seen as a mere formality. It consists mainly of ascertaining the proper method of enactment. The most common methods are Regulations promulgated by the executive branch, Legislation adopted by the legislative branch, and Judicial Fiats issued by the courts. Usually the method of formulation (i.e. executive commission, legislative committee, trial) will foreshadow the method of adoption.

Step five, budgeting, encompasses the allocation of resources to ensure proper implementation of the policy. While highly important, this phase is constrained by the formation phase to a large extent. However, if budget writers ignore or liberally interpret the results of the formulation phase, they may be able to insert their own policy preferences into the process at this point, leading

some authors to include budgeting in the formulation phase.[26]

In stage six, Implementation, the policy that has been identified, prioritized, formulated, adopted, and funded is instituted as a government program capable of exercising its mandate(hopefully). This stage is just as important, if not more so, than the formation stage, primarily because at this point, the policy is handed off to America's "Fourth Branch" of government, the Bureaucracy.[27] This is the phase of the policy process where policy is carried into action, and the level of control and the level of resources (assigned in the formulation phase) will determine if the spirit of the policy formulation stage will be realized or altered beyond recognition by practical concerns not addressed during that phase.[28] Given the great potential for policy outcomes and results to be determined during this phase, often in ways wholly unforeseen, it was also chosen to be incorporated into the survey instrument, and will also require a more detailed examination.

In the seventh stage, Evaluation, the program that strives to achieve the policy goal is assessed to determine

---

[26] See Jones, above.
[27] Meier, Kenneth J., Politics and the Bureaucracy
(Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers, 1998) 40.
[28] Milakovich, Michael *Public Administration in America*
 (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001) 389.

its efficiency in meeting that goal. The results of that
assessment prompt the eighth and final stage, Policy
Succession. In this stage, the policy process can begin
again anew,(in the event of total program failure) can be
partially restarted (ex. Budget increases/decreases linked
to changing situations), or nothing can happen. (i.e.
program success, program completion, or a lack of political
will to restart the process)

Although all of these stages are certainly important,
it is clear that the Policy Formulation and Policy
Implementation stages stand head and shoulders above the
rest in regards to their impact on the policy process.
Many times we have seen those who have raised issues and
brought them before the government (stages 1&2)
disappointed and even disgusted by the policies that were
formulated. Additionally, we have seen many instances of
policies that have been widely supported through the first
fives stages brought low by the sixth. While stages one,
two, four, five, seven, and eight all have a significant
effect on the policy process, stages three and six are the
ones that receive the most attention, because they are
considered stages at which one has the greatest opportunity
to influence the policy process. Hence, these two phases
were selected as the points at which to query county

officials about their policy influence. It is to the

consideration of these two stages that the rest of the

chapter now turns.

Policy Formulation

Once the government has recognized a problem and

decided to do "something" about it, that "something" must

be specified. The decisions arrived at during the

formulation phase will frame the discussion and be the

foundation for all future policy process decisions.

Ascertaining county officials' perception of their

influence at this critical stage will reveal much about how

they see themselves in the policy process as a whole, and

thus will help gauge the relative importance they place on

certain policy issues and related lobbying efforts. For

instance, if it could be said that county officials felt

they had a high level of influence over the formulation of

a specific policy, then it logically follows that they

would be more willing to participate in its implementation

and less likely to support lobbying efforts to change key

aspects of the policy. Conversely, if they felt less

influential or even ignored during the policy formulation

process, then it would logically follow that they would

feel less attached (if not hostile to) said policy,

reluctant to participate in its implementation, and eager

to support lobbying efforts to amend or rescind the policy.

What further conclusions might be drawn from this data,

when coupled with the results of the implementation

section, will be discussed at the end of the chapter.

Steps in the Policy Formulation Process

The first step in the Policy Formulation process is to

identify potential measures that could address the problem

presented. This is called Policy Analysis. During policy

analysis, a model is developed (either formally or

informally) which will emphasize those factors weighing

most heavily on the problem at hand and which will control

or limit the potential pool of choices. Examples of these

factors might be budgetary constraints, scientific or

technological constraints, or legal constraints. Anything

that might reasonably limit the pool of options should be

considered at this stage.[29] In addition to these factors,

potential options will also be evaluated to ensure their

conformance to policy goals. In addition to the obvious

specific goals of an individual policy, options will also

be tested to ensure the conform to, or at least don't

conflict with, four general policy goals that run

---

[29] Rushefsky, Mark E. Public Policy in the United States, 3rd ed.
(New York: M.E. Sharp 2002) 5-27, see chart 12.

throughout government activity, all or none of which may be present in a particular policy, though usually more than one is.   These broad policy goals are: Security, Efficiency, Equity, and Liberty.[30]

Security encompasses the protection of society for internal and external threats, and is most apparent in defense and environmental policy. Efficiency asks the basic question: Is the government using its resources in a way that maximizes return? While this is often a concern of most government policies and programs, this is not always the case. Many government services, such as the Post Office, have objectives and goals that go against the grain of efficiency.[31] Equity dictates that a program be, on balance, fair, as opposed to just. This is the rational behind most affirmative action programs, whereby the most qualified recipient of a service may be denied in favor of one who is less qualified but deemed more deserving. The final general policy goal is Liberty, which attempts to find an acceptable balance between policy goals and individual liberty. An example might be the restriction of

[30] Rushefsky, Mark E. Public Policy in the United States, 3rd ed.
(New York: M.E. Sharp 2002) 5-27, see chart 14.
[31] Meier, Kenneth J., Politics and the Bureaucracy
(Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers, 1998) 6.
Ex. Universal Service to all addresses vs. Efficient Centralized Delivery, Monarchy vs. Democracy

game hunting to seasons, which balances the liberty of
citizens with the needs of nature.

Once the factors that might limit options have been
considered and the general and specific goals identified,
policy formulators must decide the best avenues to pursue
those goals, i.e. they must pick solutions to the problems
they have been studying. These solutions fall into five
broad categories: Inducements, Rules, Facts, Rights, and
Powers.[32] Inducements are the proverbial carrots and sticks.
People can be *induced* to follow a policy by both positive
inducements (carrots, like tax discounts for paying tax
obligations on time) and negative inducements (sticks, like
property foreclosure for not paying tax obligations at all)
Many times the other solutions are paired with inducements
to increase their effectiveness. Rules stipulate that
certain actions must or must not be taken, or that certain
standards must be met. Some rules are more or less
voluntary, like laws against removing mattress tags, while
others are definitely linked to inducements (such as
running red lights). Facts use the power of information,
relying on the human senses of self preservation and common
sense (which are not always reliable), such as the Surgeon

---

[32] Rushefsky, Mark E. Public Policy in the United States, 3rd ed.
(New York: M.E. Sharp 2002) 5-27, see chart 15.

General's Warnings on packs of cigarettes. Rights rely
more on restricting government activity than on restricting
personal behavior, as the First Amendment promotes a policy
of free exchange of ideas by limiting government action.
Finally, powers alter policy by altering those responsible
for decision making with regards to a specific policy. For
instance, if the Federal Government wanted to increase
State Government influence over the Medicaid Program, it
could shift the authority to make spending priorities to
the states from congress.

Policy Implementation

Imagine, if you will, that you are a parent to a young
teenager going off to college. As you get ready to send
them off to fend for themselves in the big world, you hope
that all of the years of hard work you put into raising her
will have instilled solid values and enough common sense to
sustain her through life's challenges. As she pulls out of
the driveway, you come to the realization that you can no
longer exert nearly the influence you once had. She has
moved beyond your grasp, and how she turns out, for better
or worse, is in the hands of the new influences in her
life. Welcome to the sidelines.

In the policy process, the "sidelines" is exactly
where most policy formulators end up when the Policy

Implementation phase arrives. Like the parents in the example above, they must sit back and hope that those charged with implementing their policy will reach the same conclusions and set the same goals as they did when they were formulating it.

Pitfalls of Policy Implementation

If bureaucratic implementation were, as Wilson had envisioned, a "business", whereby bureaucrats neutrally implemented the precise and well thought-out instructions of the policy formulators[33], then perhaps this step in the policy process would be the least controversial. Unfortunately, in our system this is not the case. This is because, in a representative democracy, a policy viewpoint rarely has majority support from its inception. Hence coalitions of support must be formed to push and prod the policy through the process. These coalitions are usually formed and maintained by compromise and ambiguity.[34] Hence, many times the policy formulation stakeholders come away from that stage with different conceptions of what they all agreed on, and with great trepidation drop the policy into the lap of the Bureaucracy, eagerly waiting to see if the bureaucrats will adopt their viewpoint. In so doing, great

---

[33] Wilson, Woodrow, College and State, Ray Baker & William Dodd, Ed.
(New York: Harper Brothers, 1925) 144.
[34] Milakovich, Michael *Public Administration in America*
 (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001) 389.

power and discretion, along with substantial risk, is

passed along to the Bureaucracy. Inevitably, when the

bureaucracy does make a decision which takes into

consideration practical concerns and avoids political

risks, the programs fall short of expectations and the

entire process loses credibility.[35]

Thus, this stage in the policy process is considered

make or break for any potential policy. Assessing the

influence of county legislators at this stage accomplishes

two things: first, it can indicate whether counties carry

the significant burden of implementing a policy, and

second, when paired with the data from the formulation

question, can identify policy areas where counties

influence in making policies is disproportional to their

influence in carrying them out. The implications of these

imbalances will be discussed later in the chapter.

Steps in the Policy Implementation Process

Implementation of a policy involves three activities:

Organization, Interpretation, and Application.[36]

Organization consists of creating or redeploying resources

necessary to launching the program. Examples might be the

levying of a user fee to fund an activity, or the

[35] Ripley, Randal B., Grace A. Franklin, Bureaucracy and Policy Implementation
(Homewood, Il.: The Dorsey Press, 1982) 2-3.
[36] Jones, Charles O. , An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy
(Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1984) 166.

reassignment of employees. Interpretation, the activity
most prone to mischief, involves the "translation" of a
statute, ruling, or rule into "acceptable and feasible"
plans and directives. Given the standard ambiguity of most
legislation, much discretion is left to individual
bureaucrats. An example would be a city administrator
setting bus routes for new buses purchased by the city
council. Application represents the actual commencement of
activities authorized by the policy. The collection of a
new tax, the cordoning off of a nature preserve, or the
condemnation of property would all be examples of this
activity.

Implications of Policy Influence for Counties

The survey instrument will presumably identify four
policy influence situations: 1. a High level of formulation
influence coupled with a high level of Implementation
Influence; Given the large role of the federal government
in setting environmental policy, I speculate that this
situation would be rare for county governments to be in;
2. A low level of policy influence coupled with a low level
of policy implementation; This would essentially represent
a policy that county governments are more or less not
involved in, and given the highly technical and sometimes
macro-geographic nature of some environmental policies, I

would speculate that this situation is likely to be one of the more common ones to be found; 3. A low level of formulation influence and a high level of implementation influence; this would represent a situation in which counties were given responsibility for a program without any consultation by the policy formulators. Since nobody likes to be told what to do, I would speculate that this particular situation might chafe county legislators and be a high lobbying priority; 4. A high level of formulation influence and a low level of implementation influence. Since county governments rarely set policies that other agencies carry out, I expect this would be the least likely situation to be found by the survey.

Depending on which influence situation is found, policies can be evaluated as to their relative importance to county legislators, in as much that county legislators would logically seek to ensure that their responsibility for achieving policy goals is equal to their ability to set those goals. Hence , policies that fall first two situations (High Influence + High influence, Low Influence + Low influence) would not represent an imbalance for county legislators, and they would not have a high priority to lobby for their amendment. Situation 3, (Low formulation influence + High implementation influence)

would represent policies that maximize county

responsibility (liability) while minimizing county liberty.

Conceivably, this situation would also encompass unfunded

mandates. County legislators logically would place a high

priority on lobbying to increase their influence over such

policies, and as such policies identified as falling within

this area should receive higher precedence in platform

construction and lobbying efforts. The last situation,

(High formulation influence + Low implementation influence)

if it indeed exists in any environmental policy area, would

not logically constitute a high lobbying priority.

Therefore, any policies identified by the survey instrument

as falling in the 1st, 2nd, or 4th influence situation should

be dropped from the policy platform and removed from the

lobbying efforts of any group or organization attempting to

alter the current environmental policy arrangement in the

US.

Chapter IV: Environmental Policy Areas

Introduction

The stated goal of this project is to gauge the attitudes and perceptions of county legislators (commissioners or their equivalents) about their influence over the policy process as it pertains to certain environmental policies. This chapter will cast away the crutch-word "certain" and extrapolate the specific environmental policy areas and individual policies upon which evidence is to be gathered. After reviewing the literature, broad areas of environmental policy were identified as needing to be addressed by any comprehensive environmental program. Most, if not all environmental policy, will fall into one of these areas. Further examination of the literature also identified several major policies within each policy area that necessarily must be included so as to make that area comprehensive over its subject. Following each section is a brief speculation about what I expected the survey instrument to indicate in that policy area.

Environmental Policy Areas

A review of the literature has identified the following areas as the principal facets of environmental

policy in the United States: Water Quality, Air Quality,

Solid Waste Management, Land Use, Energy Resource

Stewardship/Conservation, and Noise Pollution. These areas

were identified because of their potential to significantly

effect the health and quality of life of the citizens

governments serve.

Water Quality

What is Water Quality?

Defining water quality would seem to be obvious at

first glance. But a closer look reveals that "water

quality" means different things to different people. Is

water quality "acceptable" if it can be consumed safely by

humans? Should factors such as odor, color, taste, softness

or hardness be considered when deciding water quality?

According to Korte,[37] water needs vary so radically

from region to region and person to person, that settling

on one standard is not practical. As an example, he argues

that the water quality needed by a farmer for his crops is

not the same as that needed by a rancher for watering

cattle, and that neither of these is satisfactory for human

consumption. Even for human consumption, professionals

---

[37] Korte, Fiedhelm, *What is Water?,* Water Quality, Proceedings of an International Forum
(New York: Academic Press Inc, 1975) 12.

cannot agree if water should be fluorinated, chlorinated, or just plain left alone.[38] Therefore, some militate against trying to establish a general definition of water quality, advocating definition on a case by case basis.[39] Even though establishing a specific definition for water quality may not be possible, For the purpose of this inquiry, the definition espoused by the environmental protection agency will be used. The EPA defines Water Quality as "the Physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of water and how they relate to it for a particular use."[40]

Threats to Water Quality

A threat to water quality essentially means an impurity that will hamper the water's use for a specified purpose. In general, governments in the US are interested in maintaining water quality sufficient for human, animal, and plant consumption. Hence, anything that can prevent water from being used for this purpose is considered a threat to water quality. A review of the literature has identified the following primary threats to water quality:

---

[38] Korte, Fiedhelm, *What is Water?,* Water Quality, Proceedings of an International Forum
(New York: Academic Press Inc, 1975) 13.
[39] Krenkel, Peter, Vladimir Novotny, Water Quality Management
(New York: Academic Press, 1980) 47.
Chapman, Deborah, Ed., Water Quality Assessment
(New York: Chapman & Hall 1992) 7.
[40] National Water Quality Inventory, 1994 Report to Congress, 3.

Stormwater Management, Wastewater Management, Agricultural

Pesticides, and the Extraction, Treatment, and Distribution

of Safe Drinking water.

Stormwater Management

One emerging factor impacting water quality is storm

water management(SWM).[41] According to Debo and Reese, "In

the past the primary concern with surface water was

draining it from wetlands and flood plains to make way for

agricultural development."[42] Nowadays, storm waters cause

dispersed pollutants (oil from roads, fertilizers from

agriculture, and animal wastes from nature) to become

concentrated in the water supply.[43]   These pollutants have

the potential to foul water and prevent its use for most

activities, thereby making storm water management vital to

ensuring satisfactory water quality.

Additionally, these waters have the potential to cause

great property and environmental damage, mainly through

erosion and small scale flooding. "The Basic underlying

purpose of SWM is to keep people from the water, to keep

---

[41] Chapman, Deborah, Ed., Water Quality Assessment
(New York: Chapman & Hall 1992) 245.
[42] Debo, Thomas, Andrew Reese, Municipal Storm Water Management
(Ann Arbor, Mich.: Lewis Publishers 1995) 1.
[43] Letterman, Raymond, Water Quality and Treatment
(New York: McGraw-Hill 1999) 2.34.

the water from people, and to protect and enhance the environment.[44]

<u>Wastewater Management</u>

Wastewater management is another factor impacting water quality. In times past domestic sewage and agricultural/industrial waste used to be dumped directly into water courses or water tables used for drinking and irrigation purposes. Today, thousands of aging municipal plants[45] and tens of thousands of obsolete and malfunctioning home septics, as well as primitive systems in the developing world, are polluting water bodies and ground water and are posing a grave threat to water quality. These are the number one source for waterborne illness in the world, which is the leading cause of death in the world.[46]

Another serious problem that has developed in recent decades has been the mass utilization of pesticides in agricultural operations. Pesticides have shown an unexpected propensity to seep into ground water, be blown into rivers and lakes, and be absorbed in municipal

---

[44] Debo, Thomas, Andrew Reese, Municipal Storm Water Management
(Ann Arbor, Mich.: Lewis Publishers 1995) 7.
[45] Qasim, Syed, Wastewater Treatment Plants: Planning, Operation, and Design
   (Lancaster: Technomic Publishing Co, Inc. 1999) 1.
[46]Morris, Paul, Basic Waste Water Operations
(College Station, Tx: Texas Engineering and Extension Service, 1997) 1-2 thru 1-5.

wastewater systems not designed to filter them out of the water before being discharged.[47]

Processing of Drinking Water

Finding enough drinking water is also a primary concern for any environmental policy. Extraction, treatment, and distribution of water can have just as severe consequences for the environment as water disposal.[48] Indeed, inadequately extracted, treated, and distributed drinking water is the one of the main reasons behind the number one killer of men, women, and children in the modern age, waterborne illness. (Usually bacteriological or viral)[49] Additionally, over taxing limited resources can eliminate water sources that could have been used for generations if they had only been properly managed.

Aids to Water Quality

While mitigating threats to water quality is important, there are also steps that can be taken to improve the quality of water that has already been polluted. Water conservation and Wastewater Reclamation are two processes that help increase the supply of

---

[47] den Hond, Frank,N. Van Straalen, ed. Questions Around the Persistence of The Pesticide Problem (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State Press 2003) 2.
[48] Brandling-Bennet, David, *The Water Challenge,* from:Providing Safe Drinking Water in Small Systems, Cortuvo,Craun, Hearne, ed. (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Lewis Publishers 1999) 3,5.
[49] Morris, Paul, Basic Waste Water Operations (College Station, Tx: Texas Engineering and Extension Service, 1997) 1-2 thru 1-5.

"quality" water while at the same time reducing the strain on other water production processes.

Water Conservation and Wastewater Reclamation

Water conservation and wastewater reclamation have become an imperative tool in helping to reduce water demand in, and the environmental impact of, existing developments. This would be especially true in areas where it would be uneconomical to replace or upgrade existing water delivery systems. Both of these activities reduce demand on fresh water reserves, thereby reducing the burden of supply on potentially weak (i.e. aging or obsolete) delivery systems. This can extend the life of the systems and reduce operation and maintenance costs.[50]

Water resource stewardship is an area where county and local governments have generally weak regulatory authority. Many are now seeking to expand their responsibilities in an effort to bring attention to an issue that can have a very localized impact but that is oftentimes ignored by the state and federal governments. This includes more power to limit development growth, restrict water use from regulated bodies, and regulate discharges into such bodies. Additionally this power could be used to encourage low

---

[50] Qasim, Syed, Wastewater Treatment Plants: Planning, Operation, and Design (Lancaster: Technomic Publishing Co, Inc. 1999) 2.

impact water conserving construction in and around
regulated bodies of water. Alternatively, watershed
management powers could be increased. This would give
county and local governments the power to do all of the
preceding activities over all areas that contribute water
in any way to a regulated body of water, such as a river,
lake, or reservoir.[51]

Implications for Counties

Water quality is often a regional problem,
encompassing entire rivers, lakes, aquifers, and
watersheds.[52] Hence, since most counties do not encompass
entire watersheds, (like the Lower Colorado River
Watershed, stretching approximately from North Central
Texas (San Saba County) to the Gulf of Mexico (Matagorda
County) I would speculate that some of the broader
policies, such as the definition of what actually
constitutes water quality, would fall increasingly to the
state and national government. Other issues however, like
Sotrmwater and Wastewater Management, closely follow
residential development, which does generally fall under
the purview of counties. I would expect to see a larger
role for counties in these areas.

---

[51] Debo, Thomas, Andrew Reese, Municipal Storm Water Management
(Ann Arbor, Mich.: Lewis Publishers 1995) 103.
[52] Letterman, Raymond, Water Quality and Treatment
(New York: McGraw-Hill 1999) 4.50- 4.53.

Air Quality

Defining Air quality is just as controversial as defining Water Quality, but for different reasons. While the controversy circling around water quality is base on it's use, the controversy swirling around air quality pertains to the causes of pollutants and contaminants.[53] Firstly, this is because the uses of air tend to be quite similar from person to person, and even from animal to animal.(although plants tend to do things in reverse) The controversy in identifying pollutants lies in the fact that most of the time air pollutants are man made,[54] and thus someone can be held liable for the damage they cause. Hence, a chemical plant might object to having its smoke stack discharge labeled as a pollutant. It is this controversial process of "pointing fingers" which constitutes the crux of the Air Quality definition debate.

Threats to Air Quality

As with water quality, a threat to air quality essentially means an impurity that will hamper the air's use for a specified purpose, such as breathing. In general, governments in the US are interested in

---

[53] Griffin, Rodger D., Principles of Air Quality Management
(Boca Raton, Fl.: Lewis Publishers, 1994) 1-2.
[54] As opposed to contaminants (like dust, except when stirred up by man) See previous source.

maintaining air quality sufficient for human, animal, and plant consumption.[55] Hence, anything that can prevent air from being used for this purpose is considered a threat to air quality. A review of the literature has identified Air Pollution as the primary threat to air quality.

What is Air Pollution?

"Air pollution can be defined as the presence in the external atmosphere of one or more contaminants in such quantities and of such duration as may be or may cause injury to human health, plant or animal life, or property, or which may interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life, property, or the conduct of business." [56] Despite it's necessity to life, air quality has been historically variable and frequently to the detriment of human health. Currently, motor vehicle traffic now poses a principal threat to air quality, particularly in urban areas.[57] Despite improvements vehicle control and fuel technology, concerns still persist about the elevated levels of

[55] Godish, Thad, Air Quality, 3rd Ed.
(Boca Raton, Fl.: Lewis Publishing 1997) 179.
[56] Harrop, Owen, Air Quality Assessment and Management,
(New York: Spon Press, Inc. 2002) 1.
[57] Jordan-Bychkov, Terry, Mona Domosh, The Human Mosaic: A Thematic Introduction to Human Geography, (New York: WH Freeman Co. 2003) 313-314, 398.

pollution, including photochemical smogs that often blanket our largest cities.[58]

Implications for Counties

As with water quality, factors that contribute to air quality are often region wide, and policies governing air quality are more likely to be promulgated by governments (State-Federal) with such wide ranging jurisdiction. One notable exception might be on the implementation side, since some air quality policies (such as vehicle emissions monitoring) require extensive interaction with almost all citizens, making it unlikely that the state and federal governments could administer these programs on their own.[59]

<u>Solid Waste Management</u>

No matter what form they take, wastes are generally considered a bad thing, usually because of their propensity to spread disease, attract vermin, and negative aesthetics. Therefore, if health and quality of life are to be maintained, it is imperative that wastes be properly managed. Over the years, solid wastes (domestic garbage) have become an increasing problem, as current disposal

---

[58] Degobert, Paul, Automobiles and Pollution
(Warrendale, Penn.: SAE International 1995) 85.
[59] Of course, vehicle monitoring in Texas, while required based on county residence, is administered by the private sector.

methods begin to become less attractive and new methods
prove inadequate.

What is Solid Waste Management?

Solid waste management is the processing of the
garbage produced by the domestic population. Solid waste
management consists of three broad steps: "collection,
transportation, and processing or disposal."[60] Collection
consists of collecting waste from the point of production
(like households, markets, schools, institutions, etc.) and
depositing it in a central location where the waste is then
picked up by the "responsible authority." After the waste
is transported to the disposal site, it is processed.

Processing consists of either resource recovery, waste
recycling (metal/glass/plastic/paper recycling), or
composting (for organic wastes).[61] According to Beukering,
disposal of solid wastes can be broken down in a hierarchy
of methods, ranging from most preferred to least preferred.
This hierarchy is: Prevent, Reuse, Recycle, Incinerate,
Dump, Open Burning.[62] Preventing wastes encourages users to
identify ways in which they can avoid making wastes in the

---

[60] Beukering, Pieter van, Joyeeta Gupta, *Integrated Solid Waste Management in developing Countries*
from: Solid Waste Management, V. Grover, B. Guha, W. Hogland, S. Mcrae ed. (Brookfield, Vt.: A.A.
Balkema 2000)p. 1-2.

[61] Beukering, Pieter van, Joyeeta Gupta, *Integrated Solid Waste Management in developing Countries*
from: Solid Waste Management, V. Grover, B. Guha, W. Hogland, S. Mcrae ed. (Brookfield, Vt.: A.A.
Balkema 2000) 4-5.

[62] Beukering, Pieter van, Joyeeta Gupta, *Integrated Solid Waste Management in developing Countries*
from: Solid Waste Management, V. Grover, B. Guha, W. Hogland, S. Mcrae ed. (Brookfield, Vt.: A.A.
Balkema 2000) 5.

first place. Reusing wastes allows for reclamation of raw

materials with minimal processing. Recycling wastes allows

for the salvage of most of the raw materials that would

have other wise been lost, but takes considerable

processing. Incinerating wastes disposes of most of their

bulk, but results in the loss of the raw materials and in

potential air pollution. Landfills consume significant

space and are a significant risk for pollution. Dumping

alludes to dumping wastes in the ocean, which often times

returns the wastes to our beaches and is a high risk for

pollution. The least desirable method of solid waste

disposal is open burning, where wastes are burned with no

controls on emissions to the air or residue seepage into

ground water.[63]

Implications for Counties

Given the potential for massive environmental

degradation resulting from improper solid waste management,

I would think that states and the federal government would

have a large say in formulating the policy in this area.

However, given the almost universal need for solid waste

disposal services in all sections of the country, it seems

unlikely that the state and federal governments could

---

[63] Landreth, Robert, Paul Rebers, Municipal Solid Waste
(Boca Raton, Fl.: Lewis Publishers 1997) 147.

implement these policies. In my discussions with the NACo

staff they seemed very interested in finding out how many

counties owned and operated solid waste facilities. Hence,

I might expect to find low formulation influence and high

implementation influence for counties on this policy.

Energy Resource Stewardship/Conservation

Energy Resource Stewardship and Conservation are vital

to maintaining the quality of life that most people in

America enjoy. Since almost every activity in the modern

world is heavily influenced by energy, maintaining cost

effective and environmentally sound energy policy is

imperative if we are to sustain those activities.

The fundamental question about energy resources is:

"How fast should we consume our low cost resources?"[64] From

a technological point of view, Nordhaus identifies three

different types of resources: 1. Inexpensive but limited

oil and gas resources- ideal from an economic standpoint.;

2. Abundant, "less alluring" resources that may be used

when the low cost alternatives run thin- coal, high cost

oil and gas, and nuclear fuels. This second group

generally suffers from the shortcoming that it is expensive

and environmentally risky or dirty.; 3. Ultra-abundant

---

[64] Nordhaus, William, The Efficient Use of Energy Resources,
(New have, Conn.: Yale University Press 1979) XV

resources that would provide limitless energy for centuries to come- these are "fusion, fission, solar, and unknown."[65] These share two features: they are unproven for large scale use, and they are relatively expensive. Beyond that, some are thought to be clean (solar energy), while some are thought to be environmentally very risky (nuclear fusion).

Implications for Counties

Given the enormous expense and even extreme danger of most forms of energy production, and considering the moneyed interest involved, I would be surprised to see much if any county influence on either the formulation or implementation of energy policies.

Land Use

Comprehensive land use planning and growth management are the central and most important aspects of our social and economic stability. Land use directly affects the ability to accommodate, develop and protect valuable natural resources. When properly managed, land use planning can minimize pollution, preserve the cultural and historical character of communities, conserve energy, provide community facilities and services, and maintain a

---

[65] Nordhaus, William, The Efficient Use of Energy Resources,
(New have, Conn.: Yale University Press 1979) xvi.

high quality of life for existing and future residents.[66]

The key to sustainable land use is maintaining our current

developments while making them more efficient. To further

this goal, a review of literature has identified two

primary methods: Erosion Control and Use Incentives.

Erosion Control & Use Incentives

Agriculturally suitable land is a declining resource

in the United States.[67] This trend necessitates that

efforts be made to conserve what undeveloped land remains,

while at the same time making better and more efficient use

of the land that has "already been surrendered to

development." To further this goal, several initiatives

have been proposed: Erosion Control: The erosive impact

that new and existing construction has on undeveloped land

is high. This impact could be lessened by improving storm

water and wastewater management.[68]

Additionally, incentives could be introduced to

encourage currently developed (but abandoned) land to be

reused, and such initiatives should encourage the most

efficient use of the land possible. Such incentives could

include: Economic Recovery Districts, which can provide

---

[66] NACo Platform 23-25.
[67] Cullingworth, J. Barry, The Political Culture of Planning
(New York: Routledge 1993) 128.
[68] Saunderson, Mont, *Western Rangeland Use and Conservation Problems*
Journal of Farm Economics, Vol. 31, No 4, Part 2:Proceedings Number(Nov., 1949), 985.

capital for improvements to depressed areas; tax breaks to businesses willing to locate into economically depressed areas; and infrastructure improvements designed to make such areas or attractive to commercial or residential development.

Implications for Counties

Residential development control and regulation is a process that is too involved to handle on a state or federal level beyond the most general terms. And often times cities do not encompass a large enough jurisdiction to meaningfully control the development around them. Traditionally this role has fallen to counties. Increasingly, as wildland conservation and park creation and maintenance have been elevated to new prominence, counties have used their leverage over developers to pry concession out of the development interest, asking for green space set asides, runoff control, and the like in return for subdivision plat approval. Given these trends, coupled with the countless new developments needing regulation across the nation, I would expect to see a high level of county influence in both the formulation and implementation of these policies.

Noise Pollution

What is noise pollution?

Noise Pollution has rapidly grown to be a major environmental problem.[69] According to Hildebrand, "Noise is one of the scourges of the modern world. It is an unwanted byproduct of our technological civilization, and is becoming an increasingly dangerous and disturbing environmental pollutant." Despite growing public awareness and advances other environmental fronts, what Hildebrand calls a "third jeopardy"-noise pollution- has only recently begun to gain attention. Since the industrial revolution the daily lives of people, particularly in urban environments, have been invaded by unwanted and disruptive sounds. Hildebrand argues that the antagonism evoked by aircraft noise has stimulated a more critical public attitude toward noise in general and has drawn attention to other sources of "unwanted sound".[70] He complains that, although "Noise has always been with us,... it has never been so obvious, so intense, so varied, and as pervasive as it is today." He points out that "background noise has increased at a rate of one decibel a year on the A scale (a

---

[69] Bragdon, Clifford, Noise Pollution: The Unquiet Crisis (Philadelphia, Pa: University of Pennsylvania Press 1970) xvii.
[70] Hildebrand, James, Noise Pollution: An introduction to the Problem and an Outline for Future Legal Research, Columbia Law Review. Vol. 70, No 4(Apr., 1970) 652.

scale devised to give greater weight to high pitched

sounds, which are more annoying to the human ear than low

pitched sounds). Since the intensity of sound doubles with

every six decibels, it will take only six years to double

the loudness of city noise." Noise effects people's health

in subtle ways- both physiological and psychologically.

"Unexpected or unwanted noise causes the pupils to dilate,

skin to pale, and mucous membranes dry up. Noise also

causes a loss of nervous energy to the detriment of the

health and well being of the individual."[71]

Implications for counties

Noise pollution is generally linked to hustle and

bustle of city life.   Heavy traffic, road construction,

air ports, universities with lots of academics, all of

these irritations are generally concentrated in

metropolitan areas. Noisy industrial facilities, while

they may be located in rural areas, usually have their

noise levels capped by state environmental agencies.

Hence, while a few large urban counties may have cause to

be concerned about noise pollution, I would not anticipate

a large number of counties clamoring for policy control on

this issue.

---

[71] Hildebrand, James, Noise Pollution: An introduction to the Problem and an Outline for Future Legal Research, Columbia Law Review. Vol. 70, No 4(Apr., 1970) 652.

Conceptual Framework

Descriptive categories will be the tool utilized to facilitate this inquiry. A review of the literature has identified two descriptive categories for study: Influence Over the Policy Process and Environmental Policy Areas. Two general sub-categories of the Policy Process were identified because influence exercised at these two points had the greatest potential to determine policy outcomes. These two points in the policy process were Policy Formulation and Policy Implementation. A further review of the literature identified six general sub-categories of Environmental Policy for study, primarily because of their ability to impact the environment and affect the quality of life of county citizens. These were Water Quality, Air Quality, Solid Waste Management, Energy Stewardship/Conservation, Land Use, and Noise Pollution. Table 3.1 below links the various framework elements to their supporting literature.

Table 3.1: Conceptual Framework Link to Literature

Descriptive Categories:	Source:
Policy Influence	
Policy Formulation	Banfield (2003) LeMay(2002), Rushefsky (2002),Milakovich (2001), Meier (1998), Jones (1984), Kingdon (1984), LeMay(2002),Milakovich (2001)
Policy Implementation	Jones (1984), Ripley (1982), Wilson (1925)
Environmental Policies	
Water Quality	
Water Quality(defined)	Letterman(1999), EPA (1994), Krenkel (1980), Korte (1975)
Storm Water Management	Letterman(1999),Debo (1995), Chapman(1992)
Wastewater Management	Qasim (1999), Morris (1997)
Pesticides	Den Hond (2003)
Safe Drinking Water	Brandling-Bennet (1998), Morris (1997)
Water Conservation/Reclamation	Qasim (1999), Debo (1995)
Air Quality	
Air Pollution(defined)	Jordan-Bychkov (2003), Harrop (2002), Godish (1997) Deogbert (1995), Griffin (1994)
Solid Waste Management	
Solid Waste Management (defined)	Beukering (2000)
Disposal	Landreth, (1997)
Energy Stewardship/Conservation	
Energy Types	Nordhaus (1978)
Land Use	
Wildland Conservation	Saunderson (1949)
Erosion Prevention/Development Control	Cullingworth (1993), Saunderson (1949)
Noise Pollution	
Noise Pollution(defined)	Bragdon (1970), Hildebrand (1970)

Table 3.1 links the various framework elements to their supporting literature

Chapter V: Methodology

Introduction

   As stated earlier, the goal of this inquiry is to
gather evidence which will identify the attitudes and
perceptions of county legislators as to their influence
over certain environmental policy areas. Chapter V examines
the method by which this evidence is gathered and the
research question is addressed. Hence, the survey
instrument is discussed, along with a general discussion of
the strengths and weaknesses of survey research, as well as
issues and complications encountered during the course of
the survey.

Survey Research

   According to Babbie, survey research is particularly
useful in describing the characteristics of a large
population.[72] Though is not definitively known how many
county legislators there are, there are probably at least
10,000 scattered across forty seven states in our
Republic.[73] Since even a representative sample would
constitute a large number of respondents, survey research
would be conducive to observing the characteristics of this

---

[72] Babbie, Earl, The Practice of Social Research, 9th ed.
(Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001) 268.
[73] Given 3000+ counties w/ between 3 and 5 (average) "legislators".

population. Additionally, this inquiry is in its nature descriptive, and survey research is also well suited to descriptive research.[74] Given these considerations, a survey was deemed to be the most useful method to address the research question.

Primarily, the greatest strength of survey research is its ability to allow the observation of the characteristics of a population too large to be physically observed, thus allowing for broad generalizations to be draw about that population. But to take advantage of this benefit sacrifices must be made, namely precision. For a survey instrument to be useful it must be uniform or standardized so as to produce results that can be compared.[75] Unfortunately, this often forces respondents to choose between extremes, thus eliminating shades of grey amongst respondent views. While this can be ameliorated in some studies by the inclusion of a range of options, the precise views of a respondent can not be ascertained as easily (or at all) as they might could in other types of research. Additionally, unlike some direct observation studies, once commenced a survey cannot be changed without restarting the process, injecting an element of inflexibility into the

[74] Babbie, Earl, The Practice of Social Research, 9th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001) 238.
[75] Babbie, Earl, The Practice of Social Research, 9th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001) 268.

study. Finally, surveys, when conducted amongst persons,
can only represent personal opinions, and those only at one
point in time.[76] Hence, if your survey population is fluid
in its views or biased as to its perception of reality,
then it is possible that a survey completed in good faith
by the respondents will produce responses either of short
term value or of no value as they relate to reality.
Hence, moving beyond broad statements and observations
about a population's characteristics is not generally
supported by survey research.

Development of the Survey

The focus of this inquiry is to determine the level of
influence that county legislators *think* they exercise over
the formulation and implementation of certain environmental
policies. The following evidence relating to county
official's attitudes and perceptions about environmental
policy formulation and implementation was collected:

-Perceptions of influence in policy formation
-Perceptions of influence in policy implementation

---

[76] Babbie, Earl, The Practice of Social Research, 9th ed.
(Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001) 268.

Since evidence was needed about specific policies at these two general points in the policy process, the survey questions were grouped into two categories reflecting this. (FORMULATION and IMPLEMENTATION) Two questions were developed for each of the 17 individual environmental policies, one concerning influence for each stage. Thus, each individual environmental policy had one question asking about formulation influence, and another asking about implementation influence. Except for the words Formulation and Implementation, the each policy question was verbally identical. Table 4.1 shows the link between the survey questions and the conceptual framework. Hence, there are 17 questions for Policy Formulation, and 17 questions for Policy Implementation, for a total of 34 questions.

Because influence is itself an imprecise term, it logically follows that the perception of would be imprecise. Therefore, to ascertain policy influence a Likert type scale was employed.[77] Respondents were asked to rate their perceived influence using a range, from None (Not Involved) to Autonomous (County has total responsibility). Low, Medium, and High were used as

---

[77] Likert Type scales allow for the honing of imprecise concepts. See Babbie, Earl, The Practice of Social Research, 9th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001) 167.

intermediary options. County officials with knowledge of

these areas completed the survey. The internet surveying

company SurveyMonkey.com administered the survey, and

Table 4.1: Operationalization of Conceptual Framework (see appendix for actual survey questions and survey instrument)			
	Descriptive Category #1: Influence Over The Policy Process		
Survey Page 1 Policy Formulation		**Survey Page 2 Policy Implementation**	**Survey Questions**
	Descriptive Category #2: Environmental Policy Areas		
Water Quality		**Water Quality**	
Water Quality(defined)		Water Quality(defined)	1,18
Wastewater Management		Wastewater Management	2,19
Pesticides		Pesticides	3,20
Safe Drinking Water		Safe Drinking Water	4,21
Water Conservation/Reclamation		Water Conservation/Reclamation	5,22
Air Quality		**Air Quality**	
Air Pollution(defined)		Air Pollution(defined)	6,23
County and Local Government Resources		County and Local Government Resources	7,24
Solid Waste Management		**Solid Waste Management**	
Solid Waste Management (defined)		Solid Waste Management (defined)	8,25
Disposal		Disposal	9,26
Energy Stewardship/Conservation		**Energy Stewardship/Conservation**	
Energy Types		Energy Types	10,11,12,27,28,29
County and Local Government Resources		County and Local Government Resources	
Land Use		**Land Use**	13,30
Rangeland Conservation		Rangeland Conservation	14,31
Development Control		Development Control	15,32
Erosion Prevention		Erosion Prevention	16,33
Noise Pollution		**Noise Pollution**	
Noise Pollution(defined)		Noise Pollution(defined)	17,34

responses were solicited through e-mail.

Issues

Given the time and difficulty associated with obtaining e-mail addresses for county officials across the country,[78] the process would be divided into four phases, whereby the officials in five hundred counties (approximately ten from each state) would be contacted via e-mail and asked to participate in the survey. By e-mailing all of the policy officials in a county, it was hoped that at least one would respond. This process, if carried out to its conclusion, might have resulted in results from all 47 states that have county governments, and also might have resulted in results from a majority of US counties. The first phase was begun in early February, when the e-mail addresses were gathered for 1,564 county officials in 500 counties, divided relatively equally amongst the 47 states. Unfortunately, the response rate for this phase was very poor and a determination was made that pursuing further

---

[78] The difficulty would have been much less if NACo had remained a partner. Initially, this inquiry was to be a joint effort between myself and the National Association of Counties Environment, Energy, and Land Use Steering Committee. I worked with Peggy Beltrone, a County Commissioner for Cascade County, Montana, and Vice Chair of the committee, to develop a survey that would poll members of NACo about their county's influence over Environment, Energy, and Land Use policy formulation and implementation. The results would then be used to help draft a more relevant policy platform from which NACO could conduct lobbying efforts. To these ends, the current survey was developed. Unfortunately, near the end of the process, immediately before the survey was to be administered, the committee staff decided that they no longer wanted to conduct a survey about policy influence, but rather about county ownership of municipal landfills, and asked that the survey be altered. This constituted a radical departure from my and Commissioner Beltrone's previous efforts, and would have essentially required us to start the process over. This option was not feasible, given time restraints and the extremely limited applicability of the proposed survey. It was decided that the current survey would still be administered, but without the backing or affiliation of NACo.

responses would not be productive. Of the 1,564 officials

contacted, 187 responded with survey responses. When

duplicate responses (i.e. more than one person from the

same county) were removed, responses from 148 counties were

acquired, which represents a twenty nine percent response

rate for counties and an eleven percent response rate for

individuals. Neither of these response rates is considered

high enough to be conclusive in social research.[79]

I can not be definitively state why the response rate

for this survey was so low, but several potential causes

were encountered:

1. Authenticity: This is the issue that received the

   greatest amount of attention from survey respondents.

   35 survey respondents contacted either the university

   or myself to confirm my enrollment as a graduate

   student. Although the survey was sent out under a

   Texas State e-mail address, a significant number of

   respondents felt compelled to verify the authenticity

   of the survey. Fifty two people responded to the

   survey solicitation with various forms of " remove me

   from your mailing list", which suggest they suspected

---

[79]Babbie, Earl, The Practice of Social Research, 9th ed.
(Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001) 256.

that the survey solicitation was a promotional or commercial e-mail.

2. Survey Difficulty: The survey was divided into two sections, and had 34 questions. However, ninety percent of respondents who started the survey completed it, and the time used to complete the survey averaged 3-5 minutes.

3. Apathy: Several respondents wrote e-mails stating that they did not have the time necessary to complete the survey. Ironically, given the average survey time, they probably could have done the survey instead of writing the e-mail.

Regardless of the cause, the poor response rate limited the representativeness of the sample. Hence, all conclusions drawn from the data are necessarily speculative. In any event, the next chapter (Results) presents the responses that were obtained.

Chapter V: Results

Introduction

As stated earlier, it is the propose of this inquiry to gauge the attitudes and perceptions of county legislators (commissioners or their equivalents) about their influence over the policy process as it pertains to environmental policy. Chapters III and IV introduced and laid out the basic elements of the conceptual framework, which consisted of the manifestations of six broad environmental policy areas at two points in the policy process, policy formulation and policy implementation. Therefore, this chapter is divided into six sections, and each section is divided into two parts, representing how the policy area was found to manifest itself at each point in the policy process.

Each part presents the several questions promulgated in the survey to determine county influence in that given policy area. Questions that present an imbalance[80] between the responses on the formulation and implementation might represent policies that are a burden to county government, and are discussed in the next chapter.

---

[80] An Imbalance would represent a situation where a county government had a role in one phase that was disproportionate to its role in the other phase(Implementation vs. Formulation. For example, and unfunded mandate might represent an imbalance where a county's role in formulation (low) was disproportionate to its role in implementation (high).

Water Quality

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Water Quality?

Table 5.1	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Definition of Water Quality for your region/state	21%	**32%**	30%	17%	0%	**148**
Wastewater Management	12%	25%	**30%**	28%	5%	**148**
Pesticide Use	30%	**36%**	19%	14%	1%	**148**
Safe Drinking Water	20%	**26%**	**26%**	**26%**	1%	**148**
Water Conservation/ Reclamation	18%	26%	**30%**	26%	1%	**148**

Table 5.1 presents survey responses on the Formulation of Water Quality Policy

The evidence in table 5.1 indicates that a majority of respondents have a medium or higher level of influence over the formulation of most water quality policies. Notable exceptions include regulation of pesticide use and definition of water quality for an individual's region or state. The slim majorities for Drinking Water and the Definition of Water Quality are of note.

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Water Quality?

Table 5.2	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Definition of Water Quality for your region/state	23%	**28%**	27%	21%	0%	**132**
Wastewater Management	13%	27%	24%	**32%**	4%	**132**
Pesticide Use	30%	**35%**	23%	11%	2%	**132**
Safe Drinking Water	20%	27%	23%	**30%**	2%	**132**
Water Conservation/ Reclamation	17%	29%	**31%**	23%	1%	**132**

Table 5.2 presents survey responses on the Implementation of Water Quality Policy

The evidence in table 5.2 indicates that a majority of respondents have a medium or higher level of influence over the implementation of most water quality policies. As with the formulation section, pesticide use and definition of water quality for an individuals region or state had a majority of respondents indicating low or no influence.

The results of the Formulation and Implementation sections were similar for each question, i.e. no major discrepancy between policy formation influence and policy implementation influence was evident it the responses. Respondents apparently felt they had the same level of influence at both points in the policy process.

Air Quality

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Water Quality?

Table 5.3	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Definition of Air Quality for your region/state	38%	31%	20%	11%	1%	148
Monitoring of Air Quality	39%	30%	15%	15%	1%	148

Table 5.3 presents survey responses on the Formulation of the Definition of Air Quality for a Region/State.

Table 5.3 indicates that a large majority of respondents had low or no influence over the formulation of air quality policies.

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Water Quality?

Table 5.4	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Definition of Air Quality for your region/state	30%	**41%**	20%	7%	2%	**132**
Monitoring of Air Quality	**39%**	30%	16%	12%	3%	**132**

Table 5.4 presents survey responses on the Implementation of the Definition of Air Quality for a Region/State.

Table 5.4 indicates that a large majority of respondents also had low or no influence of the implementation of air quality policies. The margins are almost identical to the formulation responses.

As with water quality, the responses do not indicate an imbalance between influence during policy formulation and implementation processes.

Solid Waste Management

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Solid Waste Management?

Table 5.5	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Disposal of Solid Waste	8%	18%	17%	**42%**	14%	**148**
Recycling	8%	20%	22%	**40%**	10%	**148**

Table 5.5 presents survey responses on the Formulation of Solid Waste Management policy.

Table 5.5 shows that substantial majorities of respondents had a medium or higher level of influence over formulating Solid Waste Management Policy.

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Solid Waste Management?

Table 5.6	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Disposal of Solid Waste	6%	18%	19%	**44%**	13%	**132**
Recycling	8%	17%	23%	**41%**	11%	**132**

Table 5.6 presents survey responses on the Implementation of Solid Waste Management policy.

Table 5.6 six upholds the precedent of table 5.5, showing considerable majorities of respondents had a medium or higher level of influence over the implementation of Solid Waste Management policy.

The results show a consistent 3% increase in influence from the formulation to the implementation stages. Otherwise the results for both stages do not seem to indicate a substantial imbalance in influence. This was the only Policy Area where a majority of respondents indicated a High or Autonomous level of influence. (Parks and Recreation was the only other individual policy)

Energy Resource Stewardship/Conservation

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Energy Stewardship/Conservation?

Table 5.7	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Oil and Gas Resources	**56%**	34%	9%	2%	0%	**148**
Nuclear Power	**78%**	17%	3%	2%	0%	**148**
Solar, Wind, Alternative Power	**46%**	36%	11%	7%	1%	**148**

Table 5.7 presents survey responses on the Formulation of Energy Resource Stewardship/Conservation Policy.

Table 5.7 indicates that an overwhelming majority of respondents and Low or No influence over formulating energy

policy. Oil & Gas and Nuclear Power represent the only

instance in the survey where a majority of respondents fell

within single influence category. (No Influence)

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Energy Stewardship/Conservation?

Table 5.8	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Oil and Gas Resources	**57%**	32%	9%	2%	0%	**132**
Nuclear Power	**76%**	19%	4%	1%	0%	**132**
Solar, Wind, Alternative Power	**44%**	39%	12%	5%	1%	**132**

Table 5.8 presents survey responses on the Implementation of Energy Resource Stewardship/Conservation Policy.

Table 5.8 indicates that overwhelming majorities of

respondents also had no influence at the policy

implementation stage.

The similarity in the margins of responses for both

stages indicates that no significant influence disparity

exists between the two.

Land Use

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Land Use?

Table 5.9	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Wildland Conservation	11%	29%	26%	**33%**	1%	**148**
Parks and Recreation	7%	11%	26%	**46%**	11%	**148**
Erosion Prevention	6%	17%	34%	**38%**	5%	**148**

Table 5.9 presents survey responses on the Formulation of Energy Resource Stewardship/Conservation Policy.

Table 5.9 represents the large majority of respondents

who indicated they had a medium or higher level of

influence over the policy formulation process. Parks and

recreation is one of only three policies in which a
majority of respondents indicated a High or Autonomous
level of influence.

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Land Use?

<u>Table 5.10</u>	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Wildland Conservation	15%	24%	**34%**	26%	2%	**132**
Parks and Recreation	7%	15%	25%	**42%**	11%	**132**
Erosion Prevention	5%	20%	31%	**37%**	7%	**132**

Table 5.10 presents survey responses on the Formulation of Energy Resource Stewardship/Conservation Policy.

Table 5.10 shows a large majority of respondents who
indicated they had a medium or higher level of influence
over the policy implementation process. Again, Parks and
recreation is one of only three policies in which a
majority of respondents indicated a High or Autonomous
level of influence.

The similarity in the margins for both stages
indicates that no significant influence disparity exists
between the two in this Policy Area.

Noise Pollution

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Noise Pollution?

Table 5.11	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Noise Pollution Remediation	25%	**36%**	25%	9%	5%	**148**

Table 5.11 presents survey responses on the Formulation of Noise Pollution Policy.

Table 5.11 indicates a majority of respondents had Low or No influence over the Formulation of Noise Pollution Policy.

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Noise Pollution?

Table 5.12	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)	Response Total
Noise Pollution Remediation	26%	**35%**	24%	8%	6%	**132**

Table 5.12 presents survey responses on the Formulation of Noise Pollution Policy.

Table 5.11 indicates a majority of respondents had Low or No influence over the Formulation of Noise Pollution Policy.

The similarity in the margins of responses for both stages indicates that no significant influence disparity exists between the two.

Chapter VI: Conclusion

When I first read the NACo Environment, Energy, and Land Use policy platform, I was shocked to say the least. I could not fathom why an organization like NACo would use valuable resources advocating for positions that conceivably had absolutely nothing to do with county government, or would never be adopted by any legislature anywhere. A case in point would be their advocacy promoting "safe" nuclear energy. They offered no reason why county officials would have any more insight or interest on this issue than the average citizen on the street, probably because they don't. The same position advocated by an organization involved with nuclear energy, (like "The National Association of Highly Respected Nuclear Scientists"), might actually carry some weight with lawmakers. I could not think of any reason why a congressman or state legislator would consider NACo credible on this subject.

Several members of the NACo Environment, Energy, and land Use Committee agreed. They felt that individual dues paying counties would rather have NACo fighting to improve policy areas that could potentially affect county government. Thus the current inquiry was undertaken, in an attempt to find out which policies individual county

legislators were concerned about. Now, of course, almost

everyone is concerned about almost every environmental

issue. And some folks, for ideological reasons, would have

NACo advocate every position under the sun, from

environmental to foreign policy, irregardless of the damage

it might do to the organizations credibility. Therefore,

assuming near universal *concern*, it was decided to find out

which areas county legislators were both *concerned* with and

had *influence* over. So, as the most used line in this

project says, "It was the purpose of this inquiry to gauge

the attitudes and perceptions of county legislators

(commissioners or their equivalents) about their influence

over the policy process as it pertains to environmental

policy."

I was surprised by the results. Given the near fever

pitch of the NACo platform,(In politically correct pundit-

speak, of course) one might think that county government in

the US was in serious danger of being crushed by unfunded

mandates and irksome programs they were forced to

administer (without being consulted) by states. And since

this is the typical chorus of all sub-federal governments,

from states to property owner's associations, I accepted

most of it as fact. I suspect that if there was such a

thing as a Rural Barbeque Conservation District, we would

get an earful from its board about interference from the EPA (all that smoke, you know), state agriculture departments, and county health districts.

Contrary to my assumptions, the survey showed that on average, at least in environmental policy areas, counties do not suffer from an imbalance of influence. Generally speaking, areas where counties are not asked to participate in policy formation, they are also not asked to participate in implementation, and vice versa. While they may be miffed at being left out, they cannot legitimately claim that they are being railroaded into carrying out policies they had no voice in formulating. Far from it, the results suggest that counties are only charged with implementing their own policies pertaining to the environment, while city, state, and federal governments do their own thing. The state and federal government seem to run on a track largely divorced form the track county governments are on. Generally, the survey suggests that the higher governments regulate Energy and Air Quality, while Counties regulate Land Use and Solid Waste Management. They both appear to divvy up Water Quality , with counties assuming control of development oriented water issues, and the state and federal government setting policy for use standards and commercial pollutants. I suspect Noise Pollution is a

concern primarily of city governments. (Especially college
towns)

Given the limits and issues already discussed, the
following conclusions are drawn from the results about the
individual policies themselves.

Water Quality

Definition of Water Quality for your Region/Sate
The responses to this question did not seem to
indicate an imbalance between county roles in the
formulation and implementation of this policy.
Additionally, the results indicate that a majority of
respondents do not play a significant role with this policy
and thus would not benefit from lobbying efforts.(i.e.
pleas for increased funding, less regulation, etc. etc.)

Wastewater Management
The responses to this question suggest a slight
imbalance between county roles in the formulation of this
policy versus its implementation. However, lobbying
efforts aimed specifically at remedying this imbalance
would not benefit a significant percentage of respondents,
and therefore would probably not be profitable.

Pesticide Use

The responses here did not seem to indicate an imbalance between county roles in the formulation and implementation of this policy. Additionally, the results indicate that a majority of respondents do not play a significant role with this policy and thus would not benefit significantly from lobbying efforts.

Safe Drinking Water

The responses to this question did not indicate a disparity between county roles in the formulation and implementation of this policy. Since a majority of respondents do have a significant role in this policy area, lobbying efforts would benefit most respondents.

Water Conservation/Reclamation

The responses to these questions did not point to an inequity between county roles in the formulation and implementation of this policy. Since a majority of respondents do have a significant role in this policy area, lobbying efforts would benefit most respondents.

Air Quality

Definition of Air Quality

The responses to this question suggest a slight imbalance between county roles in the formulation of this policy versus its implementation. As with Question 2,

lobbying efforts aimed specifically at remedying this
imbalance would not benefit a significant percentage of
respondents, and therefore would probably not be
profitable. Additionally, since a majority of respondents
do not have a significant role in this policy area,
lobbying efforts would not benefit most respondents anyway.

Monitoring of Air Quality

The responses to this question also did not indicate
an imbalance between county roles in the formulation and
implementation of this policy. The results indicate that a
majority of respondents do not play a significant role with
this policy and thus would not benefit significantly from
lobbying efforts.

Solid Waste Management

Disposal of Solid Waste

The responses to this question did not seem to
indicate an imbalance between county roles in the
formulation and implementation of this policy. Since a
large majority of respondents do have a significant role in
this policy area, lobbying efforts might benefit most
respondents.

Recycling

The responses to this question did not indicate an
imbalance between county roles in the formulation and

implementation of this policy. Also, since a large
majority of respondents do have a significant role in this
policy area, lobbying efforts would benefit most
respondents.

Energy Resource Stewardship/Conservation

Oil and Gas Resources

Nuclear Power

Solar, Wind, and Alternative Power

The responses to these questions did not signify an
imbalance between county roles in the formulation and
implementation of this policy. Additionally, the results
indicate that a majority of respondents do not play a
significant role with this policy and thus would not
benefit significantly from lobbying efforts.

Land Use

Wildland Conservation

Parks and Recreation

Development Control

Erosion Prevention

The responses to this question did not seem to
indicate an imbalance between county roles in the
formulation and implementation of this policy. Also, since

a majority of respondents do have a significant role in
this policy area, lobbying efforts would benefit most
respondents.

Noise Pollution Remediation

Noise Pollution Remediation

The responses to this question did not seem to
indicate an imbalance between county roles in the
formulation and implementation of this policy.
Additionally, the results indicate that a majority of
respondents do not play a significant role with this policy
and thus would not benefit significantly from lobbying
efforts.

Suggestions for Further Research

For more meaningful results to be obtained, this
research would have to be conducted again, and solutions
to the issues raised in Chapter IV (Methodology) would
have to be formulated. To address those issues, one
primary suggestion presents itself, being that this type
of study should not be attempted unless it could be
conducted under the auspices of a well established and
respected organization in this field, such as the
National Association of Counties or a similar group.
This could help eliminate the obstacles encountered by

this inquiry. Namely, the questions pertaining to

authenticity and apathy might be avoided by such a move.

1.Babbie, Earl, The Practice of Social Research, 9th ed.
(Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001)

2.Banfield, Edward C., Political Influence
(New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Publishers, 2003)

3.Beukering, Pieter van, Joyeeta Gupta, *Integrated Solid Waste Management in developing Countries* from: Solid Waste Management, V. Grover, B. Guha, W. Hogland, S. Mcrae ed.
(Brookfield, Vt.: A.A. Balkema 2000)

4.Brandling-Bennet, David, *The Water Challenge,* from: Providing Safe Drinking Water in Small Systems, Cortuvo, Craun, Hearne, ed. (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Lewis Publishers 1999)

5.Bragdon, Clifford, Noise Pollution: The Unquiet Crisis
(Philadelphia, Pa: University of Pennsylvania Press 1970)

6.Chapman, Deborah, Ed., Water Quality Assessment
(New York: Chapman & Hall 1992)

7.Cullingworth, J. Barry, The Political Culture of Planning
(New York: Routledge 1993)

8.Debo, Thomas, Andrew Reese, Municipal Storm Water Management
(Ann Arbor, Mich.: Lewis Publishers 1995)

9.Deogbert, Paul, Automobiles and Pollution
(Warrendale, Penn.: SAE International 1995)

10.den Hond, Frank, N. Van Straalen, ed. Questions Around the Persistence of The Pesticide Problem
(Ames, Iowa: Iowa State Press 2003)

13.Duncombe, Herbert Sydney, County Government in America,
(Washington, D.C.: NACo Research Foundation, 1966)

14.Duncombe, Herbert Sydney, Modern County Government
(Washington, D.C.: NACo 1977)

15.Fairlie, John, Charles Kneier, County Government and Administration
(New York: The Century Company 1930)

16.Jones, Charles O. , An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy
(Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1984)

17.Jordan-Bychkov, Terry, Mona Domosh, The Human Mosaic: A Thematic Introduction to Human Geography, (New York: WH Freeman Co. 2003

18.Kenneth J. Gergen, *Assessing the Leverage Points in the Process of Policy Formation,* The Study of Policy Formulation ,
eds. Raymond A. Bauer and Kenneth J. Gergen, no. 5
(New York: The Free Press, 1968)

19. Kingdon, John W. Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies, 2ed.
(New York: Longman, 1995) pg. 165

20. Giles, William A.; Gerald T. Gabris; Dale A. Crane " *The Uniqueness of County Government" Public Administration Review,* Vol. 40, No.1 (Jan-Feb, 1980)

21. Godish, Thad, Air Quality, 3rd Ed.
(Boca Raton, Fl.: Lewis Publishing 1997)

22. Griffin, Rodger D., Principles of Air Quality Management
(Boca Raton, Fl.: Lewis Publishers, 1994)

23. Harrop, Owen, Air Quality Assessment and Management,
(New York: Spon Press, Inc. 2002)

24. Hildebrand, James, *Noise Pollution: An introduction to the Problem and an Outline for Future Legal Research, Columbia Law Review.* Vol. 70, No 4(Apr., 1970) 652-692

25. Korte, Fiedhelm, *What is Water?,* from: Water Quality, Proceedings of an International Forum, F.Coulston, E. Mrak, ed. (New York: Academic Press Inc, 1975) pg. 11-20

26. Krenkel, Peter, Vladimir Novotny, Water Quality Management
(New York: Academic Press, 1980)

27. Landreth, Robert, Paul Rebers, Municipal Solid Waste
(Boca Raton, Fl.: Lewis Publishers 1997)

29. LeMay, Michael, *Public Administration: Clashing Values in the Administration of Public Policy*
(Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2002)

30. Letterman, Raymond, Water Quality and Treatment
(New York: McGraw-Hill 1999)

31. Meier, Kenneth J., Politics and the Bureaucracy
(Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers, 1998)

32. Milakovich, Michael *Public Administration in America*
(Belmont, CA: Wadsworth 2001) pg389

33. National Association of Counties website:
http://www.naco.org/Content/NavigationMenu/About_Counties/History_of_County_Government/Default983.htm

34. Nordhaus, William, The Efficient Use of Energy Resources,
(New have, Conn.: Yale University Press 1979)

35. Porter, Kirk Harold, County and Township Government in the United States,
(New York: The Macmillian Company, 1922)

(College Station, Tx: Texas Engineering and Extension Service, 1997)

37.Ripley, Randal B., Grace A. Franklin, Bureaucracy and Policy Implementation (Homewood, Il.: The Dorsey Press, 1982)

38.Rushefsky, Mark E. Public Policy in the United States, 3rd ed. (New York: M.E. Sharp 2002)

39.Saunderson, Mont, *Western Rangeland Use and Conservation Problems Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. 31, No 4, Part 2: Proceedings Number (Nov., 1949), *985-994*

40.Qasim, Syed, Wastewater Treatment Plants: Planning, Operation, and Design (Lancaster: Technomic Publishing Co, Inc. 1999)

41.Wilson, Woodrow, College and State, Ray Baker & William Dodd, Ed. (New York: Harper Brothers, 1925) pg. 144

Table 0.1: Policy Formulation Survey

	Levels of Influence				

Water Quality

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Water Quality?	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)
1.Definition of Water Quality for your region/state.	–	–	–	–	–
2.Wastewater Management	–	–	–	–	–
3.Pesticides	–	–	–	–	–
4.Safe Drinking Water	–	–	–	–	–
5.Water Conservation/Reclamation	–	–	–	–	–

Air Quality

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Air Quality?					
6.Definition of Air Quality for your region/state.	–	–	–	–	–
7. Monitoring of Air Quality	–	–	–	–	–

Solid Waste Management

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Solid Waste Management?					
8. Disposal of Solid Waste	–	–	–	–	–
9. Recycling	–	–	–	–	–

Energy Stewardship/Conservation

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Energy Stewardship/Conservation?					
10.Oil and Gas Resources	–	–	–	–	–
11. Nuclear Power	–	–	–	–	–
12. Solar, Wind, Alternative Power	–	–	–	–	–

Land Use

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Land Use?					
13.Wildland Conservation	–	–	–	–	–
14. Parks and Recreation	–	–	–	–	–
15. Development Control	–	–	–	–	–
16. Erosion Prevention	–	–	–	–	–

Noise Pollution

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the formulation of the following policies concerning Noise Pollution?					
17. Noise Pollution Remediation	–	–	–	–	–

Water Quality

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Water Quality?

	None (Not involved whatsoever)	Low	Medium	High	Autonomous (County has total responsibility)
					Levels of Influence
18. Definition of Water Quality for your region/state.	–	–	–	–	–
19. Wastewater Management	–	–	–	–	–
20. Pesticides	–	–	–	–	–
21. Safe Drinking Water	–	–	–	–	–
22. Water Conservation/Reclamation	–	–	–	–	–

Air Quality

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Air Quality?

23. Definition of Air Quality for your region/state.	–	–	–	–	–
24. Monitoring of Air Quality	–	–	–	–	–

Solid Waste Management

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Solid Waste Management?

25. Disposal of Solid Waste	–	–	–	–	–
26. Recycling	–	–	–	–	–

Energy Stewardship/Conservation

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Energy Stewardship/Conservation?

27. Oil and Gas Resources	–	–	–	–	–
28. Nuclear Power	–	–	–	–	–
29. Solar, Wind, Alternative Power	–	–	–	–	–

Land Use

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Land Use?

30. Wildland Conservation	–	–	–	–	–
31. Parks and Recreation	–	–	–	–	–
32. Development Control	–	–	–	–	–
33. Erosion Prevention	–	–	–	–	–

Noise Pollution

In your opinion, what is your county's level of influence in the implementation of the following policies concerning Noise Pollution?

34. Noise Pollution Remediation	–	–	–	–	–