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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM NEEDS TO WORK WELL FOR ALL

Hurricane Katrina demonstrated gaping holes in the U.S. governmental system. The numerous failings of all three levels of government in responding to the disaster sounded an alarm about the need to understand the motivations within the intergovernmental system and what practitioners must know and do to perform their jobs better. They also highlighted how intergovernmental mechanisms work, and how and when they do not.

This self-initiated study was performed with the advice of Fellows of the National Academy of Public Administration. The study involved interviews of experts, discussions with practitioners and policy research organizations, a scan of websites and relevant literature, and a survey sent to a number of Fellows and other experts on the intergovernmental system. Overall, these study efforts reinforced the conclusions of a prior Academy committee which felt that the lack of research and data on this subject contributes to misunderstandings among leaders in the three levels of government.

To help provide further guidance on intergovernmental research and priorities, the Academy sponsored a survey of its Fellows with expertise and experience with the intergovernmental system. The respondents to this survey were public officials in federal, state, and local governments, as well as leading academic researchers on federalism and

1 There is a multi-discipline and multi-dimensional nature to the research that can serve the domestic policy concerns at all levels of government. The study was not intended to be a formal evaluation of this field of research, a domain of huge scale that changes all the time. Since a formal evaluation is not practical the Academy designed its efforts to be an iterative scanning process and commentary.
2 In 2004, as part of its "big ideas" initiative, the Academy asked a committee of 25 Fellows to study the intergovernmental system and recommend ways for the Academy to respond to its findings. This committee consisted of Fellows whose backgrounds span the levels of government and who have considerable leadership and policy development experience. This committee reported that trust among the leaders of the three levels of government was breaking down and that there were fundamental misunderstandings. It recommended that the Academy sponsor efforts to improve the data and research.
intergovernmental relations, and others with expertise. This survey provided a strong foundation for the design of the study and for this report.  

It is clear from the tragedies unfolded as a result of Katrina that the intergovernmental system needs to work, and work well for all. However, this study effort uncovered a genuine concern among practitioners and researchers that sufficient time and attention are not being invested to make sure the intergovernmental system works.

STUDY CONCLUSIONS: A GAP IN CAPACITY AND ATTENTION

The following conclusions underscored the need for more and better intergovernmental research:

• Major policy and program problems occur if decision-makers do not pay attention to the intergovernmental system. Policy and implementation can be more successful when intergovernmental research is known, utilized, and heeded.

• There are major trends at work that have intergovernmental dimensions and will cause changes at an accelerating pace:
  • aging of our population
  • advances in technologies, particularly information technology and communications
  • increasing globalization of capital, labor, and exchange marketplaces
  • future instability in the federal budget

• The capacity to perform the studies, polling, and other data collections—is inadequate and insufficient to serve public administration leaders at all levels. It is difficult to find and utilize what data and research are available.  

• The gaps in capacity and attention need to be closed with a sustainable program of intergovernmental research.

*Producing a Research Agenda for IGR, February 2005.
*There are a number of excellent, well-known programs and efforts underway. This report is not intended to provide a compendium. A number of those existing efforts are, however, mentioned within the report and in Part V.
The U.S. system of government is intentionally inter-governmental. For that system to work well, this study suggests that Congress, government agencies at all levels, university systems, and foundations pay far more attention to, and increase funding for, research and data that the public and government leaders can use to improve the system’s functioning.

News stories repeatedly highlight the intergovernmental nature of such issues as health care, public safety, and education. These stories have raised questions about why public policy is often developed without considering the relationships among the different levels of government, how learning opportunities across the governments seem to be ignored or lost, how the practical mechanisms that define day-to-day relationships seem to produce more friction than success, and why we seem to lack basic descriptive data about the intergovernmental system itself.

Public administration leaders seek to be well-informed about these issues so their governments can be better prepared and capable of addressing them. These leaders want to advance useful ideas about the role of government and the relationship of one level of government to the other. Not only must leaders know as much as possible about the problems and concerns and how governments can be involved in crafting solutions. They also need to know more about the “intergovernmental mechanisms” that frame the relationships among the three levels of government.

Looking forward, it is clear that the intergovernmental system will face increasing pressures from a number of major trends affecting society. Now more than ever, public administration leaders need to be better informed and prepared. This report is intended to highlight critical issues affecting the intergovernmental system and bring attention to some of the studies, research, polling, and other information that may be useful.

www.Stateline.org is a good aggregator of news pertaining to state and local governments. It provides a daily compilation, a searchable archive dating back a number of years, and alert services. Governing Magazine is another good source: www.Governing.com.
FOCUS INTERGOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH ON PRIORITY AREAS

In the U.S. form of government, policy and legislative proposals can and do surface at any level of government. Unfortunately, it is not possible to address each of them with the level of intergovernmental research required. An agenda that articulates some research priorities is needed. Based on input from the expert survey and this study's initial scan, research and better data collection should be focused in 2006 on four challenges facing the intergovernmental system:

- emergency management and homeland security
- aging population
- health care
- revenues and fiscal affairs

Intergovernmental research should be designed to help public administration leaders identify and understand such problem areas. It also should help these leaders better comprehend their roles and intergovernmental relations. Here is a brief list of some of the intergovernmental mechanisms and perspectives that need to be considered when designing research intended to serve public administrators at all levels:

- organizational concepts and systems, including network models, administrative approaches, information sharing and brokering, grants and other financial arrangements, and regulatory models
- regional governance
- cooperation models and practices, including interstate compacts

Although the Academy initiated this study effort in early 2005 and ended most of its work before Hurricane Katrina struck the Gulf region, the initial lessons of the disaster response sound an alarm that all public administrators should heed. The publication of this Agenda and future ones is a critical and essential response to that tragedy. The study efforts also highlight how important it is that the nation not again lose
sight of the intergovernmental system and the need for supporting studies, polling, statistics, and research.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations for 2006, if implemented, would help public administration leaders at all levels gain the benefits of intergovernmental research to improve the functioning of the intergovernmental system.

1. Strengthen the capacity to carry out intergovernmental research.

2. Focus this capacity on the following priority challenges:
   • emergency management and homeland security
   • aging population
   • health care
   • revenues and fiscal affairs

3. An institution such as the Academy should take a coordinating role and use its unique position within the intergovernmental community to:
   • periodically convene experts and practitioners to fashion an Intergovernmental Research Agenda
   • hold an annual symposium to focus on intergovernmental research and accomplishments on this Agenda
   • encourage the development of an electronic commons of information related to intergovernmental research, including a compendium of Academy work and other data, studies, and research collections
I. INTRODUCTION: DEFINING THE PROBLEMS

During the drafting of this report, Hurricane Katrina reminded us in stark terms how important it is for the intergovernmental system to work.

This report is focused on the intergovernmental system and ways to improve its functioning at all levels. The conclusions reached as a result of this study and an Academy-sponsored experts' survey reinforce the need for more attention to be paid to how the intergovernmental system works and how to support it with a more coordinated agenda of research, polling, statistics and data. This study involved a number of interviews with experts, discussions with practitioners and policy research organizations, a scan of websites and the literature and the experts' survey. This survey, Producing a Research Agenda for IGR, was done in February 2005. Its responses influenced the design of the study effort and provided a strong basis for the recommendations found in this report.6

Numerous studies and reviews have occurred in the wake of Hurricane Katrina.7 At the time of the event, several descriptive research ideas were raised as part of the study effort: 1) What state and local laws exist to address disasters like Katrina and are they understood and supported by the public?; 2) What preparation and response plans exist and do they properly address intergovernmental relations?; 3) What regional governance approaches can be applied to these situations?; and 4) What roles should the federal government play in addition to its pre-disaster weather notification and technical assistance roles?8

6The summary report from this survey can be found at: http://www.surveymonkey.com/Report.asp?U=8413565160. Appendix B also shows a number of the research, polling or statistical ideas mentioned in the responses.

Intergovernmental research might respond to any of these questions in anticipation of the next Katrina. Such studies and research could produce a catalog of comparable laws and policies within the United States, useful data sets that shed light on public views, descriptions of the mechanisms of intergovernmental relations and civic engagement, and methods and tested practices for use in performance management approaches.

Questions such as these also illustrate why it is important to bring an intergovernmental perspective to the research and studies. Continuing debate about the appropriate roles of the different levels of government, the reality of a system that depends on intergovernmental cooperation in almost all domestic policy areas, and the need for effective and efficient government programs suggest greater attention needs to be directed to understanding when and how the intergovernmental system works—and when it does not.

There is an urgent need to begin work on this research agenda. Looking ahead, this study, an earlier Academy “big idea” committee,1 and other Academy committees have identified the following major trends that have intergovernmental dimensions:

- aging of our population
- advances in technologies, particularly information technology and communications
- increasing globalization of capital, labor, and exchange marketplaces
- instability in the federal fiscal future9

1Improving the functioning of the intergovernmental system was one of the 10 “big ideas” identified by a critical, strategic review of public administration. In 2004, a committee of 25 Fellows held discussions over a six-month period about their experiences and lessons learned from decades of senior public administration leadership. This committee reported that trust among the leaders of the three levels of government was breaking down and that there were fundamental misunderstandings. It concluded that the misunderstandings stemmed from a lack of data and good research, and recommended that the Academy sponsor efforts to respond to these findings. This self-initiated study was a direct result of this “big idea.”

9Ensuring the Future Prosperity of America: Address the Fiscal Future, National Academy of Public Administration, November 2005 was produced by the Fiscal Futures “big idea” committee. http://www.napawash.org/Pubs/12-5-05FiscalFuture.pdf.
The public continues to ask its governments to help, among other things, maintain civil and marketplace order, ensure an educated and productive population, husband and protect critical resources, and support the health care and service needs of all persons, especially the growing elderly population. Policymakers need an informed view about how the intergovernmental system works, how it ought to change, and whether it has the political and fiscal capacity to adapt as called upon. Otherwise, new solutions to problems in these areas may be devised that do not work well, cause further problems, or even have serious unintended consequences.
II. WHAT IS THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM?

Many policymakers, academics, and others refer to the three-level government structure in the United States as an intergovernmental system. This term is used throughout the report with a positive view of how cooperative, competitive, and other aspects of the relationships among the levels of government lead to solutions that work in practice.

The intergovernmental system as a whole is large—around 20 million employees and nearly $4 trillion expended annually for domestic purposes. The U.S. experience is not extraordinarily different from other countries when comparing gross government expenditures relative to a country’s Gross Domestic Product, though the United States expends less than most countries throughout the world.

Figure 1 shows how the role of state and local governments is increasing in the United States.

---

*Figures of government by state and local figure OECD Statistical Tables. Note: Data in the table figures are rounded to the nearest million and may not equivalent to the more detailed figures calculated using the original data sources. Note: Data in the table figures are rounded to the nearest million and may not equivalent to the more detailed figures calculated using the original data sources.
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Table 1. Major Expenditure Components of the U.S. Governments in 2003, shows the very different character of spending by the three levels of government. The federal government, in addition to its expenditures for defense and foreign affairs, makes large-scale income disbursements for individuals. A huge portion of the federal budget, over $1 trillion in 2003, was disbursed directly to individuals or on their behalf (interest on the debt, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and other income supports). Even the majority of its intergovernmental transfers are for the purpose of providing support to individuals (the federal government finances a share of the Medicaid program).

Looking at the expenditures, state and local governments have somewhat “sorted out” the major functions. For the most part, states provide health care financing for the poor (they actually govern and manage Medicaid), higher education, corrections, and state highways and roads. Local governments tend to provide elementary and secondary education, police, public hospitals, and local highways and streets. Public health and other health care efforts often are shared by state and local governments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 - Major Expenditure Components of the U.S. Governments in 2003</th>
<th>(dollars are shown in billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>$470.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>404.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>274.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Supports</td>
<td>196.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid (Federal)</td>
<td>160.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest On Debt</td>
<td>153.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Census of Government for the state and local expenditure figures; Census attributes the function to the government level that is performing the service or activity. Congressional Budget Office (CBO) Historic Data Tables, January 26, 2006, for the federal figures; the federal column reports the federal outlays for that category of spending.

Note: The federal financing amounts for Medicaid are shown in the federal column. These funds are also managed by state governments in addition to their own financing contributions to the overall Medicaid program.
The number of federal civilian employees has remained constant at around 3 million since 1967. In 1982, there were around 13 million state and local government employees. By 1992, that figure had grown to 15.1 million, and by 2002 it was 18.3 million.\(^1\) In one decade the number of state and local employees had grown by more than the entire federal civilian workforce (even counting postal service employees).

The increasing role played by state and local governments is obvious. Yet, it is unclear why this is occurring. Survey data suggest that the public has an "unsettled view of government."\(^2\) Further, numerous polls have shown that the public trusts local governments most, then state governments, and finally the federal government.\(^3\) This may explain why state and local governments continue to grow.

These historic data and trends should indicate to policymakers that state and local governments are critical to effective governance within the United States. However, the findings of the Academy “big idea” committee indicate that such a positive view of the other domestic governments is often misunderstood.

---


\(^2\)By, or For the People?: a Meta-Analysis of Public Opinion of Government, Meg Bostrom for Demos-USA, January 2005; pages 3, Preface, by Michael Lipsky. This report contains an extensive analysis of existing public opinion research in the public domain, encompassing more than 100 surveys conducted primarily within the past five years. This report was produced by FrameWorks’ research partner, Public Knowledge; http://www.demos-usa.org/pubs/ByOrForthePeople20050426.pdf.

\(^3\)Publius: The Journal of Federalism and the School of Urban and Public Affairs, University of Texas in Arlington conducted a poll covering Mexico, Canada and the U.S.; the most recent report can be found at the website for the Centre for Research and Information on Canada: http://www.acir.ca/pdf/nationalcomparative_fedcomp_fed_ped_2004.pdf. The U.S.ACRIR’s reports on its polling can be found via this link: http://www.library.unt.edu/gpo/ACIR/browsetitles.htm.
III. GAPS IN INTERGOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH

Public sentiment and employment numbers suggest that research that only considers the federal government's perspective will be too narrow in scope. Major trends will force the intergovernmental system to change and adapt, which will have cascading and compounding effects on the fiscal health of each level of government and place increasing pressure on working arrangements among them. Moreover, there is no doubt that each level of government will be pressed by its residents to deal with problems arising from these trends. Therefore, it is clear that intergovernmental research is essential.

"Intergovernmental Research"

The report uses a broad sense of this term. It encompasses the idea of studies; comparisons, (like international comparisons); concept modeling; experimental designs; quasi- and non-experimental designs; descriptive studies; policy research of all types; evaluations of all types; and data collection efforts such as statistical programs, polling and surveying, and derivations from administrative records.

Intergovernmental research is intended for use by public administration leaders at all levels. Most policy research should be intergovernmental in character. Organizations and persons conducting such research should consider intergovernmental mechanisms in their research designs.
Do we understand the intergovernmental system enough to inform policymakers about how they should adapt structurally, managerially, and fiscally to deal with major trends and an accelerating pace of expected change? Katrina highlights for everyone how serious problems can happen if we do not pay attention to intergovernmental research.

This study suggests that intergovernmental perspectives should be considered in the design of research efforts. Surveys about public service employment predominantly address perceptions and sentiments about federal government employment solely, despite the fact that state and local service employment is much larger. This brief study could not look into the many local polling efforts occurring across the United States (whether ad hoc or longitudinal). A review of a Demos-USA report and comments provided in interviews raised concern about prior polling efforts as they are often federal government-oriented. For instance, surveys of public sentiment toward government only use federal agency examples. For the most part, longitudinal series, like the Pew Center on the Internet and American Life, do not collect survey data at the state or local level. This makes it harder for state and local officials, federal policymakers, researchers, and others to learn from and use such data to evaluate intergovernmental programs and policies. Weaknesses in research efforts like these make it harder for public administration leaders to devise solutions that work well within an intergovernmental system.

The lack of organized attention to intergovernmental research recently affected congressional deliberations on two very important issues. Data on local fiscal capacity and effort were not available for Congress to use in the design of distributional formulae for targeting the 2003 anti-recession fiscal relief measure. Debates about welfare reform can get simple information about the matching-share, financial contributions made by state and local governments. Yet policymakers also needed a clearer understanding about how a broad array of separate state and local programs for low income persons relate to the proposals being considered.

---

15 By, or For, the People?: a Meta-Analysis of Public Opinion of Government, page 33, Table 14.
INTERGOVERNMENTAL MECHANISM CONSIDERATIONS

Public administration leaders need to understand intergovernmental mechanisms, which should be taken into account when designing research efforts and programs. Highlighting this need, one leading expert interviewed felt we needed to understand the conditions that lead to more cooperation.16 As pressures for policy change mount, it is very important to know more about the conditions for, and models of, cooperation among the levels of government. This idea is reflected in the summary of the Academy’s survey results, in which it was suggested that many examples of state-federal cooperation be cataloged.17

Cooperation is a solid example of an “intergovernmental mechanism,” a general term used to refer to any of the public administration models, considerations, and arrangements that frame the way governments work with each other. A focus on these mechanisms is a necessary component of basic research in any policy area. After all, most domestic concerns have intergovernmental dimensions and leaders clearly need to know how to devise solutions that work in this context.

The following intergovernmental mechanisms and perspectives, among others, need to be considered when designing research intended to serve public administrators at all levels:

• organizational concepts and systems, including network models, administrative approaches, information sharing and brokering models, grants and other financial arrangements, and regulatory models
• regional governance
• cooperation models and practices, including interstate compacts

Federal, state, and local governments rarely deal with issues that fit neatly within existing geo-political boundaries. In recent decades, they have cooperated on regional approaches to a range...
of such issues as transportation planning and environmental protection. The importance of regional approaches was reflected in responses to the Academy’s survey. Respondents chose regional governance most often from a list of public management options. Clearly, more needs to be known about the successes and problems associated with existing examples of regional and multi-jurisdictional approaches. Staff from the National Association of Regional Councils indicated that researchers designing statistical series and other data collections must consider how to aggregate and disaggregate geographic elements to serve regional analyses. According to them, some data should focus solely on existing regional governance arrangements, which involve governmental and nongovernmental actors.

A newer analytic model for looking at public administration is referred to as the “network model.”19 This term generally refers to the formal and informal relationships among people and organizations involved in some spontaneous or programmatic effort, with intergovernmental relations being one of the main aspects of public administration. Research related to natural disasters like Katrina show that networks of people and organizations are continuously developing as events unfold.20

The concept of the network was mentioned in pre-Katrina remarks by Dr. Julie Gerberding of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)21 and by Secretary Michael Chertoff of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.22

*Academy Fellow Robert Agranoff’s faculty profile references several works on network models: http://www.indiana.edu/~speaweb/fcltydir/agranoff.html. The Academy has also recently given to Louis Brownlow Book Award to two publications addressing this topic: Governing By Network by Stephen Goldnereth and William Eggers and System Under Stress by Academy Fellow Donald Kettl.*

*Dynamic Networks: Modeling Change in Environments Exposed to Risk; Louise K. Comfort, Milos Hauskrecht, and Jeeun Sheng Lin; University of Pittsburgh, October 2005.*

*Presenting the Public’s Health with Small World Connections: An Address by Julie Gerberding, James E. Webb Lecture, National Academy of Public Administration, November 18, 2004.*


*Networking: The federal government, as you all well know, does not own the transportation system in this country. We don’t own the power grids or the cyber-systems. Most of these are in the hands of the private sector or perhaps, in the hands of local and state agencies. So therefore, protecting this valuable infrastructure cannot be simply a matter of federal government dictating rules and regulations.*

---

19. *Academy Fellow Robert Agranoff’s faculty profile references several works on network models: http://www.indiana.edu/~speaweb/fcltydir/agranoff.html. The Academy has also recently given to Louis Brownlow Book Award to two publications addressing this topic: Governing By Network by Stephen Goldnereth and William Eggers and System Under Stress by Academy Fellow Donald Kettl.*

*Networking: The federal government, as you all well know, does not own the transportation system in this country. We don’t own the power grids or the cyber-systems. Most of these are in the hands of the private sector or perhaps, in the hands of local and state agencies. So therefore, protecting this valuable infrastructure cannot be simply a matter of federal government dictating rules and regulations.*
Much more research needs to be applied to the “network model” to help leaders at all levels of government understand how to act successfully within networks.23

The federal government has begun to reach for new models of collaboration and cooperation for areas shared with state and local governments. For instance, the federal government often finds itself in the position of persuading state and local officials to undertake activities and adopt processes, often in the interest of establishing more uniformity in commerce. Governments at all levels can adopt the role of being an information broker that proactively supplies information and data to inform decision-making and guide behaviors for all involved, including other levels of government, commercial entities, not-for-profits, and consumers. This intergovernmental mechanism can produce results but uses a more salutary approach and transparency in contrast to the more coercive intergovernmental mechanisms like unfunded mandates and preemptions.

CDC and the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) use this approach within an intergovernmental system. These federal agencies aggregate numerous data reports from state governments and make them available to the public. Each state government would be unable to accomplish this nationwide aggregation on its own, at least without significant and costly recurring expenses. CDC also provides supporting information about best practices and invites public health entities to utilize the CDC for support and collaboration. This mechanism may be increasingly useful due to the growing acceptance of the Internet and technological advances. The U.S. Department of Education is moving forward with plans to erect a web-based information service that would permit government officials and the public to access a repository of No Child Left Behind data, analytical tools, other research findings, and related news. Research might look at how this information broker approach compares with the more regulatory aspects of federal policy in this area.

23At the time of publication of this research agenda, the staff of the Academy’s Center for Intergovernmental Relations had begun a survey of the literature on networked governance with the intent on authoring a paper to improve understandings about this model within an intergovernmental system.
Overall, these intergovernmental mechanisms must be cataloged and studied so we understand more about successes and promising practices, and the way they influence intergovernmental relations, outcomes, and results.

CAPACITY ISSUES

This study indicates that more investment is needed to strengthen the capacity to perform intergovernmental research. At this time, there is no compendium that draws together the efforts of all government agencies, research institutions, advocacy organizations, and academia. Doing so would make it possible to formally identify gaps in the research. Nevertheless, the study reached its conclusions based on literature reviews, interviews with some of the top research and practitioner organizations, the expert survey, and the many years of experience of the Fellows, staff, and advisors involved in the project.

The capacity for intergovernmental research was diminished by the loss of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR). ACIR provided an overarching intergovernmental viewpoint on domestic matters and exerted a positive, convening influence on many communities of interest, including those involved in research designed to serve the intergovernmental system. During its decades-long history, ACIR performed some of its own research following its own research agenda, conducted a public polling series, and provided a venue for discussing research findings. ACIR provided a useful institutional setting that is needed today.

ACIR produced a regular publication of basic descriptive data about the fiscal interrelationships of the three levels of government, Significant Features of Fiscal Federalism. This publication came up frequently in the interviews and discussions. In particular, interviewees singled out “Table 10,” which dealt with federal grants-in-aid and gross domestic product figures. Significant Features of Fiscal Federalism is an excellent example of research work intended to serve the intergovernmental system.

---

24Interview with Academy Fellow Carl Stenberg, who was former assistant director and acting executive director of ACIR.
This ACIR publication and many other research projects depend on statistics from the Census of Governments, which is produced by the U.S. Census Bureau from voluntary submissions by state and local governments (there are frequent, recurring efforts and a larger census every five years). The study uncovered a number of concerns about this Census program, including how frequently it is collected, the difficulty of accessing it, the tail-off in voluntary compliance, its cost and efficiency (the use of more interactive submission techniques was pointed out as a solution in the Academy’s survey), and the need for updating its classifications to modern times. The Census Bureau plans to conduct a study and demonstration of a redesigned Census of Governments. The sooner a modern Census of Governments can be established, the sooner we can be prepared for the accelerating pace of change expected within the intergovernmental system.

The Academy or a similar entity can resume the organizing role that ACIR long played. This entity could provide an institutional setting for discussing implications of intergovernmental research and encouraging connections between public administration leaders and the study and research community. Information and communications technologies offer more advantages now than ever before. Support for effective intergovernmental research can be improved only if new and better attention is paid to it, more investments are made in the infrastructure that serves the research, as well as the research itself.

25The U.S. Census Bureau maintains a Census of Governments (beginning in 1957) that provides data and reports that can be accessed at http://www.census.gov.
IV. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH FOR 2006

PRIORITY AREAS

It is not possible to close the gaps in intergovernmental research all at once. It is such a broad and multidimensional field. At the same time, this study and the Academy survey point to four areas where increased attention and effort should be directed:

- emergency management and homeland security
- aging population
- health care
- revenues and fiscal affairs

Each area deserves immediate attention and continuing research efforts to ensure that mounting pressures for change can be addressed properly by public administration leaders at all levels.

Intergovernmental research must follow sound methods and techniques. It should be focused so that it serves public administration leaders, and hypotheses should begin with neutral positions about which level of government ought to have the primary role, avoid presumptions that government is the problem to be addressed, and not presume that government-based efforts are the answer to every concern.

Intergovernmental research should be focused on policy outcomes as much as the mechanisms that help make solutions work well. Intergovernmental leaders are not fundamentally concerned about the survival of the status quo, increasing grant funds, or amounts received by state and local governments. Rather, they are concerned about better outcomes for society.
PRIORITY AREA COMMENTARY

The following commentary is offered to stimulate a discussion about the intergovernmental research that should support public administration leaders as they address the 2006 priority areas highlighted below.


Hurricane Katrina highlighted mounting concerns about the ability of the intergovernmental system to deal well with large-scale disasters.

The questions raised by this episode during the study period give rise to an agenda of descriptive research and study that might subsequently serve leaders at all levels of government in advance of the next widespread disaster:

- What state laws and local laws and interstate arrangements exist to address disasters like Katrina or a pandemic? Are they understood and supported by the public?
- What preparation and response plans exist for these purposes? Do they properly consider intergovernmental aspects?
- What regional governance approaches can be applied to these situations?
- What roles should the federal government play in addition to its pre-disaster weather notification and other technical assistance roles?

Such research and study can draw on the experiences to date and the continuing lessons being learned through the recovery, stabilization, and rebuilding of the Gulf region.

The Academy’s research agenda survey was conducted months prior to Katrina, but it indicated a strong concern about homeland security. Respondents highlighted the need to understand the circumstances and considerations that inform government leaders about when they should employ...
an all-hazards view, or a local civil order viewpoint, or a focus on terrorism alone. These balancing questions deserve attention. The events of 9/11 illuminated the importance of state and local governments working as first responders. Survey responses prompted several other related questions. Are local priorities and support being crowded out by federal demands for preventing and responding to terrorism? Are the all-important levels of public awareness being confused or aided? How does the disruption to traditional law enforcement and disaster preparation debates affect public support when it is time to act? One respondent suggested that a performance index be established for border security using state and regional perspectives.

As more and more research is conducted on emergency management and homeland security, it should address all three levels of government, not just one,26 consider intergovernmental mechanism questions, and focus on serving public administration leaders.

2. Commentary about Aging of the Population

The aging U.S. population will affect the mix of services and levels and distribution of demand for services and goods within the economy affecting housing, transportation, recreation, and health care.27 This has great implications for the intergovernmental system.

Each level of government will face constituent demands related to changing service needs arising from the aging population. Some local governments will need to adapt their approaches to community-based services. In fact, governments may soon face high retirement rates due to its aging workforce, especially in law enforcement, education, and social and human services.

The fiscal effects of escalating medical care costs on the federal government are well known. Health care already is a cause of

27White House Conference on Aging, 2005. The Listening Sessions section of this website contains a wide range of submitted testimony and reports; http://www.whoa.gov/.
fiscal stress at the state and local levels, as well. Long-term care financing was one of two forced-choice ideas for research selected by the greatest number of respondents to the Academy survey. Because its costs are tied so much to the care of the aging, the state government-supported Medicaid program is now the largest and fastest growing governmental expenditure program. Local governments also face the rising health care costs for their retirees and rising support costs for public hospitals.

Little research has been conducted on the effect that an older population will have on local governments. William Frey’s work from 1999 was one of the few resources found in the literature review that employs an intergovernmental perspective.

Surveys continue to indicate that the elderly choose to age in place. Local governments with a high proportion of the elderly will see changes in their tax revenues as more people retire and shift their spending patterns. The elderly population also is known to be a strong voting bloc that can become less tied or interested in local economies and civic engagement, and possibly more federalized in their outlook (social security and Medicare are federally managed and financed programs).

With an increasingly older population, communities also will face rising demand for personal support services, accessible transportation, different housing arrangements, and new recreational options. However, local governments may be hard pressed to make new investments if their revenues decrease. Public administrators must know much more about how demand for services will change as more people enter their retirement years. In addition, they must know more about the elderly population’s mobility and sentiments toward taxation and government services.

Interviews identified several other issues related to an increasingly older population. These include nursing shortages,
the formation of newly established non-incorporated retirement communities outside the boundaries of local jurisdictions, and the affordability and supply of facilities that provide increasing levels of care, both medical and personal.

The lens provided by current government programs may not be adequate to help create a full understanding about the aging population's influence on the intergovernmental system. Much care and support for persons with chronic conditions are supplied by family members, not government programs or commercial insurers. Almost all family-provided work resides outside the scope of basic government programs.

What will happen when family caregivers themselves age and become less capable of providing support? Governments may need to assume or expand some roles. Consumer-protection roles may need to expand as new commercial suppliers try to serve the growing demands. Governments also may need to serve those who do not have the economic means to take advantage of commercial suppliers. Governments may be the only recourse in some economically-weak areas that will not attract such suppliers. Unfortunatly, these will be the same governments whose fiscal capacities are weak, making intergovernmental solutions one possible response.

With a growing population of older persons, certain paradoxes are emerging:

• Local governments most often raise tax revenues from non-mobile sources, but they likely will face increased opposition from a growing bloc of non-mobile citizens.
• Demands for services will arise in the very places where the governments do not have the fiscal capacity to respond.

The National Family Caregivers Association is a source of some estimates about the costs of care supported by families. Its website offers this citation: “The value of the services family caregivers provide for ‘free’ is estimated to be $257 billion a year. That is twice as much as is actually spent on homecare and nursing home services.” Source: Peter S. Arno, “Economic Value of Informal Caregiving,” presented at the American Association of Geriatric Psychiatry, February 24, 2002.

“Tax sources often are categorized according to whether they are mobile or non-mobile. Internet sales are an example of a highly mobile transaction as the exchange can be done globally. Purchases at a local retail store, on the other hand, are seen to be non-mobile because the transaction is physically attached to the jurisdiction. Residential property, a person’s wages, purchases of energy for the home, groceries, and other consumables, are all examples of non-mobile sources. Tax sources that are highly mobile cannot easily be taxed as the economic activity can move to avoid tax burdens.”
The United States must understand more about these emerging paradoxes if it is to adapt wisely. Which governments will have the greatest difficulty providing these services? How should public education and communications efforts change? What intergovernmental and non-governmental solutions are being devised? How are they performing?

One useful project would be to continually track how the growing population of older persons influences the intergovernmental system by locality, covering demographics, fiscal health factors, service-delivery changes, and public sentiment.

3. Commentary about Health Care

Federal, state, and local governments are involved directly in approximately half of all health care expenditures (via Medicare, Medicaid, military-health services, Veterans health benefits, and coverage for government retirees and employees). The industry is further subsidized by taxation policies at all levels of government. State and local health care spending has overtaken expenditures related to elementary and secondary education.

Medical advancements, changes in the health care industry, and demographic pressures will affect health care policies and services at all levels of government. Demand for medical services is increasing as newer devices and therapies are available. At the same time, the older population will require more medical care. It should be no surprise that such rising demand would cause health care "inflation" to outpace other sectors. For example, the share of gross domestic product attributable to health care expenditures has more than doubled since 1970, according to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.  

Federal income tax laws permit employers to provide health and benefit plans for employees that they write-off as a cost of doing business, while the employees escape income taxes on the benefit. State governments that couple themselves to federal income tax definitions provide a further tax subsidy. The President's Advisory Panel on Federal Tax Reform recommended in November 2005 that a certain portion of the health care plan expenditures by employers become taxable. Prescription drugs often are given favored sales tax treatments, while most doctor services are excluded from sales taxes.

Combined, this makes for a real fiscal problem for all levels of government as costs rise due to such programs as Medicaid and Medicare, health care financing obligations made to an aging workforce and government retiree pool, and the uninsured. There undoubtedly will be continued pressure to change the health care delivery system throughout the nation.

It is no surprise that health care was frequently mentioned in interviews and represented well in the responses to the Academy survey.34

Increased attention must be paid to the role that governments and intergovernmental relations play in the health care debate. Because it is as a factor in better medical service practice and therapy-compliance and a driver toward healthier lifestyles, consumerism has the potential to control short- and long-term costs.35 An intergovernmental perspective might consider the role of each level of government related to consumerism. Governments may want to know more about how to use information broker roles, contracting abilities, reimbursement policies, and collaborative efforts to speed up developments in these areas. The changes needed in federal-state relations to permit such practices to ensue also should be explored.36 Public polling programs should supply insights to public administration leaders about the role each level of government should play, including consumer protection issues, financing, and other roles.37

The rising numbers of people without health insurance or underinsured may result in more appeals for government intervention. Of course, governments already are involved. Local governments own hospitals and other public health organizations and they often manage networks of grantees established, at least in part, to mediate matters for the poor and uninsured. State governments also sponsor service providers, Medicaid being the largest financing program for

---

35 Healthy America: Wellness Where We Live, Work, and Learn, National Governors Association, Governor Huckabee’s initiative, 2006; http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/05HUCKABEEBROCHURE.pdf.
37 The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation (www.kff.org) sponsors a polling program, including an employer survey and other policy research efforts related to Medicaid, Medicare, and health care. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation is a well-known funder of research studies and projects exploring health care delivery issues and practices.
health care services. Charitably-provided medical services are costs often financed inter-governmentally via the Medicaid program. The federal government is expanding its community health clinic program.

Understanding how these delivery systems work in concert with the normal commercial delivery system, including looking at comparative performance data, would interest policy makers at all levels. There should be a continuing stream of data and reports about the uninsured covering geographic distribution and migration patterns, ethnographies of their situations and its influence on health care and related services demand, public polling data on the role of governments related to the uninsured, and cost projections to help policymakers decide whether to fashion interventions and what kind.

4. Commentary about Revenues and Fiscal Affairs

The Academy survey indicated that taxation was the number one topic of concern among respondents. The research topic chosen most often was a description of overlaps in taxation and fiscal relationship among the three levels of government. The third most popular choice dealt with the need for economic models that describe how the public values government and its relationship to taxation. In addition, respondents provided responses of their own, including many tax-related ideas (some are listed in a chart included in the Appendix).

The study being conducted as part of the Intergovernmental Forum on Revenue Systems indicates that there simply is not a good set of data and research explaining taxation from an intergovernmental perspective.

*Research Agenda Survey, February 2003. The third most-chosen offering was: “Taxation—Economic models that value government, considering the ‘price of services’ AND the value of such matter as public safety, maintenance of civility norms and market exchange mechanisms.”


*The Intergovernmental Forum on Revenue Systems was sponsored by the Academy and a consortium made up of organizations whose constituents represent public administration leaders from state and local governments. This study Forum conducted interviews, a literature review, worked with an Experts Group and a working group of staff and held a public discussion meeting of this Forum’s principals. This study on intergovernmental research was able to draw upon this work as part of its own efforts. The work of this Intergovernmental Forum ended in January 2006 and a summary is expected to be published in 2006.
Of course, the federal government is much larger than any single state government and its taxation policies clearly have greater influence on economic matters as a whole. Many interviewees said the federal government is not considering how its revenue system policies impact state and local governments' fiscal health. The Experts Group associated with the Intergovernmental Forum felt that local government officials seem to have comparatively more involvement in state policymaking, though they have similar criticisms of state government.41

It is clear that we need more research, polling, and data characterizing all fiscal interrelationships, especially in the tax area. For example, we need to catalog the fiscal constraints established by law and policy and investigate their consequences, adaptive responses taken within the intergovernmental system, and their successes or failures. Inter-jurisdictional competition, for instance, influences taxation policy within the United States.

The literature review conducted by project staff did not identify a comprehensive research understanding explaining how the public values governments, though some tax economists now relate simple budget or expenditure figures to the concept of a value proposition;42 still others offer contrasting theories.43 The Academy survey and other study efforts indicate that much more needs to be known about changing public sentiment about the value of government and how it relates to taxation and government spending.

If the nation is undergoing an accelerated pace of change, then tax systems must change along with it, at all levels of government but especially the state and local levels. There, the last recession demonstrated vulnerabilities. Public surveys can help track changes in sentiment and understanding accompanying tax law

41Notes from the Experts Group meetings are in an unpublished briefing book for the Principals of this Intergovernmental Forum. A summary report of this Forum’s study is forthcoming.
42Budgetary amounts do not reflect a measure of economic value. Commentators who equate these amounts to a tax-price usually ignore the productive value of prior year’s law and policy (like the setting of standards), the economic returns of prior year investments, and such highly valuable intangibles as stability in exchange marketplaces and public safety. These may explain a good portion of the real marketable value for the property and assets within any jurisdiction.
changes. Researchers can use these data to inform governments about the implications for tax policy and administration.

Many questions come to mind. Can governments cooperate to keep the levels of taxation at responsible levels and still contribute to other goals, such as improving employment levels, increasing retirement savings for low and moderate income persons, and fostering a stable and growing economy? Do we know whether inter-jurisdictional competition within the United States is dynamic enough, or whether it goes too far? Do we understand the positive role that state and local governments play in the economy? How does globalization affect each level of government? How should this be taken into account when changing tax policy?

International comparisons that focus on the United States as the “unit of analysis” may be very valuable as the nation responds to accelerating change. Currently, the literature on fiscal decentralization is almost exclusively focused on other countries, particularly those emerging from political histories unitary in character.44

The previous section on health care referred to mobile and non-mobile sources of taxation. Non-mobile tax sources are physical items or transactions that are so locally “captive” that they can be taxed in a practical manner. Examples include governments levying property taxes on people’s homes, wages and salaries tied to the person’s place of work, the consumption of food stuffs and eating in restaurants, and energy for the home and vehicles. All of these non-mobile sources are potentially taxable. If the expenditure levels of the elderly decline, or travel and migration increase, sales tax revenues will decline for some localities. Property tax revenues will be affected as well given that more economically mobile elderly sell properties, sometimes regardless of declining home values, and move to new areas that appeal to them more.

Mobility itself is a consideration. The Internet is making more things mobile; many goods purchased only in local stores now reside on the “net” outside tax jurisdictions (legally and in fact). Services can be intermediated on the Internet as well, moving

another set of transactions that might easily have been taxed when non-mobile. The Internet also makes possible the movement of service jobs. Economically advantaged persons can move easily by taking their assets, wages or salaries, and even their businesses with them. Tax bases can shrink as mobility increases.

Mobility in the United States is another adaptive mechanism, making for a dynamic economy and society. Mobility in tax sources, however, makes tax policy and administration more difficult. When designing tax systems to keep up with changes and new demands, governments must consider what to do as tax sources become increasingly mobile. This needs to be studied from an intergovernmental perspective.

Many study participants expressed concern about the fiscal plight of local governments, which have smaller economic footprints and are vulnerable to rising demands for public goods, services, and infrastructure investments that test the natural constraints of their fiscal capacity. Local governments face additional constraints and claims in the form of federal and state laws. Claims made by "unfunded mandates" and legal constraints on taxing jurisdictions and authorities place local leaders in difficult positions. Unfortunately, local economies not always are able to grow adequately to surmount the constraints or cover the claims.

This picture deserves careful monitoring. We need to collect more data and statistics on rising service demands, fiscal capacities, unfunded mandates arising from other levels of government, intergovernmental fund flows, and fiscal constraints in order to quickly identify those local governments most at risk fiscally. We also need to collect reports about how these governments are adapting and what the implications are for social equity, disaster preparedness, educational performance, and other important matters.

*Federal and state governments enact changes in law that have the effect of creating new costs for local governments. If these costs are unfunded by state or federally collected revenues, they fall upon local governments. Unfunded mandates, as these are often called, can limit the amount of discretionary budgeting even as the local economy grows. Local economies that are stagnant or declining exacerbate matters. Public support can erode as governments are unable to meet demands for new roads and improvements, improved school capacities, expanded recreational services, and more. State governments voice the same concerns about federal unfunded mandates.

46In addition to unfunded mandates and problems transcending their boundaries, state and local governments face growing costs from an aging workforce, globalization, other inter-jurisdictional competitive pressures, and diminshing federal fiscal support.
We also need to study how these local governments are adapting in structural ways. One option for fiscally weak local governments is to merge with adjacent jurisdictions. Local governments are looking more at the consolidation of costly functions as a cost-savings measure. Some are even looking toward more regional mechanisms as a way to balance demands with capacities. The abandonment of services and jurisdictional coverage is another possible response that can place those living in marginal areas into even more uncertainty. Not all of these changes may be wise intergovernmental policy.

Arguably, policymakers should be concerned about the weakening of the fiscal adaptive capacity of the intergovernmental system. Economic downturns of a more general nature, like those seen in 2002-2003 and reflected in the state and local government fiscal crisis at that time, can cause situations to worsen rather than improve.47 Clearly, public administration leaders at all levels need more and better intergovernmental research about the revenue systems and fiscal affairs in the United States.

V. HIGHLIGHTING SOME INTERGOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH

This section highlights a selected group of data or research efforts underway. They are examples of programs that take an intergovernmental research approach or address basic capacity gaps.

This short list only reflects some of the efforts identified during the brief study. Undoubtedly, there are many other fine efforts that can help public administration leaders improve the functioning of the intergovernmental system. The Academy encourages the sponsors of these other efforts to contact the Center for Intergovernmental Relations so their efforts can be reflected in next year’s version of the Agenda.

This study did not review the research design protocols and cannot offer commentary about the quality management, experimental or non-experimental designs being employed, or statistical validity for the following efforts:

- National Academy of Public Administration—Corrections Research and Data—The Academy’s prisons “big idea” committee recognized the need to connect public administration leaders at all levels with current news, information, and research regarding the correctional system. The Academy’s research program depends on finding external financial support.

- ICMA, The Maturing of America: Getting Communities on Track for an Aging Population—Local government officials will be regularly polled by the International City/County Management Association to gauge their perceptions and knowledge about the aging population and the role of government in serving this population. Five organizations are collaborating in the survey effort, including the National League of Cities and National Association of Counties. Funding support is provided by the MetLife Foundation.
George Washington University Institute of Public Policy and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy—Significant Features of Fiscal Federalism—This is a collaborative effort among individuals and organizations to reproduce the former ACIR’s descriptive resource of data tables covering fiscal interrelationships among governments. This publication had been compiled previously by ACIR staff using Census, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and other data sources.

Heritage Foundation’s Program on Military Realignment—The Department of Defense has focused on a major realignment of the military services that will significantly influence industries and communities across the United States. The Heritage Foundation is establishing a study program to look at these influences and report on their implications for state and local governments.

National Association of Regional Councils (NARC)—Regional Information Clearinghouse—Regional views of the United States lack consistency with existing geopolitical boundaries, making it difficult to have data-driven views of regions. NARC has established a common data profile, benchmarks for comparisons about governance, and an indicator series for 600 regions within the United States. This is an example of an applied data-collection process that is intended to serve the intergovernmental system by providing a regional perspective.

Rockefeller Institute of Government, Fiscal Studies—Rockefeller’s Fiscal Studies* frequently gathers and reports data and information on state governments’ fiscal activities, including spending and revenues (quarterly reports) and employment numbers. These data and informed analyses help to explain state fiscal activities as part of the intergovernmental system.

*Academy Fellow Richard Nathan directs the overall Institute. The Fiscal Studies website is http://rfs.rockinst.org/
The Brookings Institution, National Infrastructure for Community Statistics (NICS) — NICS is a data and information sharing model that provides researchers and data users with access to data, research, and tools needed to perform additional research. State, federal, and local governments are seen as both users and suppliers of important data sets. NICS is to be implemented as a new web-based service. It is in an early stage of development, with some piloting scheduled for 2006. The full launch of this “infrastructure” depends on financing. Academy staff contributed to the operations planning for NICS.

Publius: The Journal of Federalism — Publius was founded in 1973 by the late Daniel Elazar. It continues “to publish the latest research from around the world on federalism theory and practice; the dynamics of federal systems; intergovernmental relations and administration; regional, state and provincial governance; and comparative federalism.” Offering a variety of research reports and articles, the journal is sponsored by the Section on Federalism of the American Political Science Association and published by Oxford Journals on behalf of CSF/Publius, Inc. which is housed at the Robert B. and Helen S. Meyner Center for the Study of State and Local Government at Lafayette College.

*A website has been established to provide more information about NICS: http://www.brookings.edu/metro/umi/nics.htm.*
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERVIEW OF THIS FIRST AGENDA

This Agenda recommends actions designed to bolster the nation’s research and data so that the public and government leaders become much better informed and able to devise intergovernmental solutions that work. Overall, there is a need to strengthen the capacity and attention to such studies and research, focus this growing capacity on several priority areas, and ensure that there is a continuing, organized approach to intergovernmental research.

Given the dynamic nature of self-government and complex nature of the huge intergovernmental system, the Academy expects that updates to the Agenda will be needed. Indeed, the National Agenda for the Support of Intergovernmental Research, 2006 should be viewed as the first, not last, attempt to coordinate such a national view. Each subsequent Academy effort to focus upon an agenda for the support of intergovernmental research can improve upon this previous effort.

CONCLUSIONS

The Academy’s survey and study efforts for 2006 support the following conclusions:

• Major policy and program problems occur if decision-makers do not pay attention to the intergovernmental system. Policy and implementation can be more successful when intergovernmental research is utilized and heeded.

• There are major trends that have intergovernmental dimensions and will cause changes at an accelerating pace:
  • aging of our population
• advances in technologies, particularly information technology and communications
• increasing globalization of capital, labor, and exchange marketplaces
• future instability in the federal budget

The capacity to perform studies, polling, and other data collection is inadequate and insufficient to serve public administration leaders at all levels. It is difficult to find and utilize what data and research are available.

There is a gap in capacity and attention that needs to be closed with a sustainable program of intergovernmental research.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations respond to these conclusions. If implemented, they will help public administration leaders at all levels improve the functioning of the intergovernmental system:

• Strengthen the capacity to provide public administration leaders at all levels with the following:
  • more data describing the characteristics of the intergovernmental system
  • more research, additional statistics, and polling data exploring the intergovernmental perspectives of proposed policies
  • more data that tracks changes in the intergovernmental system and its relationship to societal outcomes
  • more research on intergovernmental mechanisms and how well they work
  • more international comparisons that apply to the United States
  • better research and more syntheses employing intergovernmental perspectives in their design
  • data and analyses that key audiences can easily access and use

• Focus this capacity on the following priority challenges:
  • emergency management and homeland security
  • aging population
• health care
• revenues and fiscal affairs

• An institution such as the Academy should take a coordinating role and use its unique position within the intergovernmental community to:
  • periodically convene experts and practitioners to fashion an Intergovernmental Research Agenda
  • hold an annual symposium to focus on intergovernmental research and accomplishments of this Agenda
  • encourage the development of an electronic commons of information related to intergovernmental research, including a compendium of Academy work and other data, studies, and research collections
APPENDIX A

METHODS AND APPROACH, POINT OF CONTACT

The Academy formed a small group of its Fellows to provide advice to this effort. This study applied traditional Academy research methods, including literature and website reviews, individual interviews, and discussions with experts and institutions involved in the intergovernmental system or its study. Using the Internet, other research agendas were reviewed.

The overall study period was bound by practical judgments about the time needed to produce a responsible review and a report useful to the communities affected. The study’s design did not entail a formal evaluation because the multidimensional and multidisciplinary character of research on domestic matters created too broad a scope. The Academy undertook an iterative, study and comment approach to this huge, dynamic area. Subsequent iterations can lead to updated versions of the Agenda. This initial publication is being published now to begin the process of expansion as soon as practicable.

In addition to traditional methods, the Academy also conducted a survey of selected Academy Fellows and others with intergovernmental experience. This survey provided a main source of insight and direction for the study and report. A capsule summary, “Academy Survey, Producing a Research Agenda for IGR,” is included in Appendix C. Other survey findings are highlighted in the body of the report. In addition, readers are invited to look at the overall aggregate results from this survey, which include responses to the open-ended questions. However, there is no personal attribution in this summary, located at http://www.surveymonkey.com/Report.asp?U=84133565160.

Three meetings with Fellow advisors were held as part of the study effort. Drafts of the report were reviewed in these meetings and there were frequent e-mail exchanges during the drafting process. A draft was shared with a select number of
individuals for review as well. The final report reflects feedback and recommendations received through this process.

The Academy welcomes comments and suggestions for use in any subsequent study. The primary author of this report is Jim Frech, director of the Center for Intergovernmental Relations (jfrech@napawash.org). Interested persons may also contact the Academy’s communications office.
APPENDIX B
SUMMARY OF THE ACADEMY SURVEY
PRODUCING A RESEARCH AGENDA FOR IGR

In February and March 2005, a small online questionnaire, Producing a Research Agenda for IGR, was sent to selected Academy Fellows and other experts and practitioners. Forty-six responses were received from the 120 persons included in the group.

Overall, the survey responses identified three main areas of concern from the choices. These lists were derived from a related but separate survey on the topics of concern within intergovernmental relations (and through the use of a small test of the survey instrument). In policy areas, respondents expressed concern about taxation and long-term care (an aging issue). With regard to intergovernmental mechanisms, survey respondents were most concerned about the need for research and data related to regional governance and fiscal conditions. Many fiscal-related ideas were offered, indicating the degree to which this area of intergovernmental relations dominates perceptions. Fiscal concerns also underpin research interests related to health care and the aging population.

The survey also asked a number of open-ended questions that prompted respondents to offer a number of interesting research or study ideas. More than 100 ideas were offered. A selected set are highlighted in the following chart. Readers are invited to review overall aggregate results of this survey at http://www.surveymonkey.com/Report.asp?U=84133565160. This summary also allows a person to look at the responses to the open-ended questions.
**Selected Ideas, Academy Survey, Producing a Research Agenda for IGR**

**February 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Note</th>
<th>Research, Polling or Statistics/Data-Collection Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Local plight, Fiscal</td>
<td>Do a credible job of tracking the fiscal health of cities and counties. They are going to be under tremendous pressure, with “double whammy” from the feds and then their own states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Taxation</td>
<td>Need more economists working to value government from other than a tax-price of services perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mobility</td>
<td>Examine demographic factors (mobility, stability, foreign-born, etc.) with respect to inter-jurisdictional and inter-sectoral affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fiscal, unfunded costs</td>
<td>We should look at the level of unfunded mandates from Federal and state governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Intergovernmental mechanisms</td>
<td>Dealing with third parties both public and nonprofit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Social Equity</td>
<td>Building Social Equity into Intergovernmental Agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Education, Human Services</td>
<td>We should study the impact of programs integrating social services into public schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Regional governance</td>
<td>Management Tools for Negotiating Regional Equitable Growth Compacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Homeland security</td>
<td>There is a need to define the realities of homeland security needs in local communities from a domestic terrorism perspective — communities are not safe because of gang violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Homeland security</td>
<td>Border patrol security - comparative indices across states and regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Intergovernmental mechanisms</td>
<td>State collaborative policy models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Polling Intergovernmental Mechanisms</td>
<td>Taxpayers role in sorting out priorities for federal/state/local expenditures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Polling – Intergovernmental Mechanisms</td>
<td>Public Attitudes on Various Forms of Regional Cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Polling – Homeland Security</td>
<td>What are the public’s priorities for safety, security, and protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Polling – Education</td>
<td>What attributes would public schools have to have to cause more parents to use public education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Polling – Intergovernmental Mechanisms</td>
<td>Need more support for strategic communications efforts by governments; how do you build loyalty to government programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Data and Statistics – Social equity</td>
<td>Collecting data to determine the variations in access to government services among various ethnic groups and income levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Data and Statistics Fiscal Local plight</td>
<td>Fiscal disparities data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Data and Statistics – Taxation</td>
<td>Distribution of Wealth in U.S.-States can consider and plan for a net worth tax like Switzerland if these data existed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Data and Statistics – Fiscal</td>
<td>Distribution of State Spending, Tracking state and local spending that matches or supplements federal programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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