The Four Corners Regional Commission is a state-Federal partnership, the purpose of which is to initiate long-range planning, provide data for specific plans, promote private investment, promote legislation, establish plans and program priorities, and initiate and coordinate economic developmental districts in 92 counties in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah. According to the 1969 annual report, planning and activities were conducted in the following areas: agriculture, minerals and fuels, recreation, tourism and retirement, transportation, human resources, water, and industrial development. Graphs and tables show land area and ownership, percent of employment, per capita income, the Four Corners Region job gap, grant awards, and budget. A related document is RC 005 231. (LS)
COMMISSION MEMBERS

State Co-Chairman
DAVID E. CARGO
Governor of New Mexico

Federal Co-Chairman:
L. RALPH MECHAM

JOHN A. LOVE
Governor of Colorado

CALVIN L. RAMPTON
Governor of Utah

JACK WILLIAMS
Governor of Arizona

COMMISSION ALTÉR N A T E S

ELIONIS GUTIERREZ
Alternate, New Mexico

DWIGHT E. NELI
Alternate, Colorado

D. HOWE, MOPAT
Alternate, Utah

STANLEY WOMER
Alternate, Arizona

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
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Dear Mr. Speaker/President:

Pursuant to Section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, this annual report is respectfully submitted to the Congress. Should further information be desired contact the Federal Cochairman's office in Washington, or the Commission's office in Farmington. New Mexico.

Sincerely,

L. Ralph Mecham  
FEDERAL COCHAIRMAN

David F. Cargo  
GOVERNOR, STATE OF NEW MEXICO

STATE COCHAIRMAN
LEADERSHIP CHANGES

L. Ralph Mecham was confirmed as Federal Cochairman by the Senate October 1, and assumed office October 2, 1969.

New Mexico Governor David F. Cargo succeeded Colorado Governor John A. Love as State Cochairman for 1969. Governor Cargo has been re-elected for calendar year 1970.

The first Federal Cochairman, Orren Beaty, Jr., resigned April 9, 1969.

On February 20, 1969, W. D. Brewer was nominated to the Federal Cochairmanship. He was confirmed by the Senate April 3, 1969. He resigned October 1, 1969 to accept another appointment from President Nixon.
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PURPOSE

- Initiate and coordinate the preparation of immediate and long-range overall economic development programs.
- Foster surveys and studies to provide data for use in developing specific plans and programs.
- Promote increased private investment.
- Promote and coordinate public investment through various Federal Programs.
- Promote legislative and executive programs for both short-range and long-range projects involving federal, state and local agencies.
- Establish plans and program priorities with consideration for local, state and federal planning.
- Provide a forum for consideration of problems common to the region and a means of communicating and sharing experience in the various sections of the region.
- Advise and assist the Secretary of Commerce and the states in the initiation and coordination of economic development districts, in order to promote maximum benefits from the expenditure of federal, state and local funds.
The Four Corners Commission represents a unique bipartisan experiment in "New Federalism". It is based upon the premise that the lagging economy of the Region can be aided best by a State-Federal partnership for progress rather than for each to go their separate ways. Some significant progress was made during the year which ended June 30, 1969; but much more can and must be done if the experiment is to realize its potential to aid the Region.

The economy of the Region is not keeping pace with the national growth and prosperity and, in fact, is dropping further behind. Therefore, it is clear that a sense of mission is incumbent upon the Commission.

As a new Federal Cochairman of just a few months, I have been impressed with the careful attention and attitude of cooperation that the Governors and their alternates give to the Commission program.

Important steps have been taken in compliance with the congressional mandate directing the Commission to coordinate the economic development activities of all federal agencies through the Federal Cochairman.

In turn the Governors have done the same with State activities. A comprehensive plan to set priorities and to guide Federal and State projects and programs is proceeding to early completion. It is hoped that through this process there will be genuine coordination to maximize the impact of existing government efforts, while avoiding duplication and waste. As this effort succeeds, it will be made clear that the Commission is not just another spigot to the Federal Treasury. More must and will be done to involve private industry and people at the local level.

Changes and reforms are underway to improve the operations of the Commission in order to assure that Congress and the taxpayers can have confidence in the program. I sincerely hope that the support Congress gave in extending the life and expanding the authority of the Commission in 1969 will be justified and continued.

I pledge my full efforts, as the representative of the Federal Government on the Commission, to carry out the directives of Congress and to achieve the desired progress.

Respectfully,

L. Ralph Mecham
Federal Cochairman
President of the Senate
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Lemen:

This second annual report of the Four Corners Commission, you can clearly see that the sphere of cooperation is excellent and that the goals of the Commission are coming closer to reality. Many undertakings in Colorado, Utah, Arizona and Mexico demonstrate progress but at the same time due to increase awareness of the critical conditions in the territories covered by the Commission. Limited federal funds naturally limit the pace of our growth and the states continue their struggle to meet their portion of commitments.

Experience we have gained clearly demonstrates that Commission means progress for historically limited communities and cultures. We know the Commission is working and will continue to do so in the future. Each individual state, combined as the four states and individually, in concert with the federal commitment, we look to 1969 as a milestone, but only in leading up to the fruition of what we know must come.

Respectfully submitted,

F. C. (Francesca) Largo
Governor
Cochairman
THIS IS FOUR CORNERS REGIONAL COMMISSION:

A State-Federal partnership to increase productivity, jobs and income in an economically underdeveloped contiguous area of four states.

A total of 92 counties in the four states make up the area which includes such cities as Colorado Springs and Pueblo, Colorado; Provo, Utah; Santa Fe and Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Flagstaff, Arizona. Most other population centers of Colorado, Utah and Arizona are not included.

Federal Government provided financing for FY 69 and 70. Beginning with FY 71 (July 1, 1970) the states will match the Federal participation for administrative costs. Each state portion is $62,500. The Federal Government will continue to provide the funds for project costs with state and local participation.

Was designated by agreement of the four Governors and the Secretary of Commerce December 19, 1966; Federal Cochairman appointed August, 1967. Executive Director appointed February 20, 1968, and the Farmington Office was established the same date.

Consists of five members; the Governors of the four states plus the Federal Cochairman appointed by the President. Each Commission member designates an alternate.

Population:
1960 Census – 1,508,139
1968 Estimate – 1,765,920

People
Four Corners 92 Counties
1960 Census – 1,508,139
1968 Estimate – 1,765,920

Minorities:
In 1960, Indians comprised 7.9% of the population.
Spanish surnames comprised 5.5%.

Density:

1960 Density was 6.1 people per sq.mi.

Organizations:
Commission offices are located at Farmington, New Mexico, headed by the Federal Cochairman. Commission activities are administered by the Secretary of Commerce; the Commission of Commerce and Economic Development.

Private Sector
Seeks to increase private sector employment in the region.

Population:
1960 Census – 1,508,139
1968 Estimate – 1,765,920

Density:
1960 Density was 6.1 people per sq.mi.

Minorities:
In 1960, Indians comprised 7.9% of the population.
Spanish surnames comprised 5.5%.
Commission offices are in Washington, D.C. and Farmington, New Mexico. The Washington Office is headed by the Federal Cochairman who coordinates Commission activities with that of federal agencies, represents the Commission before Congress, with the Secretary of Commerce and the White House on policy matters. With the State Cochairman he presides over Commission meetings and serves on the Executive Committee which acts for the Commission between meetings.

The Farmington Office is headed by the Executive Director whose office works closely with the four state planning agencies, along with many other local, county, state and federal agencies engaged in economic development.

Seeks to increase private investment in the region and assists in the development of governmental programs that will aid sound, long-range programs.

People

Four Corners 92 County area
1960 Census — 1,757,529
1968 Estimate — 1,850,800

1960 Density was 6.1 per square mile, roughly 1/6 of U.S. Average. Only Montana, Wyoming, Nevada and Alaska are less dense in population.

1969 Density of those areas of the four states not included in the region was 23.7.

Indians comprised 7% of total with 123,313 citizens in 1960.

Spanish surnames comprised 17.5% of total with 308,139 in 1960.
Land Area
- 288,000 square miles (92 Counties)
- Covers over 67% of 4 states
- Nearly 10% of 48 contiguous states
- Largest of the Commission areas: 50% larger than Appalachia's 13 state area
- 70% government owned. Federal, Indian, state and local (see Table II)
  (Government ownership does not exceed 15% in any other area)

Commission Area
- Comparative size of Regions designated for economic development:
  - Four Corners: 288,000
  - Appalachia: 192,000
  - Upper Great Lakes: 416,000
  - Ozarks: 58,000
  - Coastal Plains: 78,500
  - New England: 66,000

1967 Per Capita Personal Income
(As % of United States Average, $3159)
- Less than 70%:
- 70% - 79%:
- 80% - 90%:
- 90%:
The region's counties dropped from 41.6% of their states total population in 1950 to 35.9 in 1960 and to 34.2 in the 1967 estimate.

While many sections of the region depend on the facilities of major cities to survive, Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix and Tucson are not within the regional boundaries.

Culture

The population of the Four Corners Region is culturally diversified; the Anglo-American culture dominant over most of North America is prevalent. Other cultures, which have survived in the area from earlier days, are also represented. Specifically the Region includes most of the Indian population of the four states (86 percent in 1960) and large numbers of Spanish-surnames in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado.

Many factors—some of them accidental—appear to have contributed to the survival of these two cultures in the region. One was the Region's lack of attractiveness to Anglo-Americans in the 19th Century (apart from the Mormon migration to Utah), due to the almost total lack of level land suitable for agriculture without irrigation. Then too, when the region became more attractive to Anglo-Americans, the federal government had begun to regard the Indians as wards to be looked after, rather than as enemy peoples.

Both the Indians and the Spanish-Americans persist as distinct and separate groups. Due to the limited resource base on which these populations are supported—primarily reservations and subsistence farms—there has been little improvement in their standard of living. Per capita incomes are among the lowest in the country. Selective Service during World War II revealed the extent of the lag in educational attainments by Indians and Spanish-Americans.

Economy

The entire states Commission's population in 1965 1/3 of these people.

The entire four sectors Population Employment Personal Income

The counties with sub-par figures.

Employment

In the entire four U.S. industry. Sl

Income

Four Corners Region National norm, 1

Employment and average and the

Nationally, man of employment's income. In the 1 percent of the Region's personal income, manufacturing and 9.8 percent than half the nation below even the
Indians and Spanish surname people. This is particularly true of Indians both on and off the reservations.

Economy

The entire states making up the Four Corners Commission comprised nearly 3% of the national population in 1967; the Region itself includes about 1/4 of these people, or 1% of the nation's population.

The entire four states totaled the following in 1967:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The counties within the region fell well below these sub-par figures.

Employment

In the entire four state area it is proportionate to U.S. industry. Share goes up 1/4 in the Region.

Income

Four Corners Region nearly 6% for agriculture.

Employment and income both range higher than national average and the overall four state average.

Nationally, manufacturing counts for 25.9 percent of employment and 29.6 percent of total personal income. In the Four state area it employs 12.6 percent of the labor force and produces 14.9 percent of total personal income. In the Four Corners Region, manufacturers produce 9.1 percent of the jobs and 9.8 percent of the income. The states are less than half the national norm, with the region well below even the states.
Employment and income are about 35 percent of U.S. average and ½ below entire four states.

*Employment*

Well above the national norm of 15.6 percent, all governmental agencies provide 25.9 percent of employment. This is four points greater than the overall four states.

*Income*

Nearly twice as much income in the region than the national average; much a heavy support, by activity from the private sector.

Of the 92 counties, only 8 approximating the average in the region, percentiles compared to the four states.

---

**Land Ownership in the Four Corners States***

(Acres--in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federal Land</th>
<th>Percent of Land</th>
<th>Indian Trust Lands</th>
<th>Percent of Land</th>
<th>State Local Lands</th>
<th>Percent of Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 1969 Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah State Investment Plans.*
are about 35 percent of entire four states.

orm of 15.6 percent, all wide 25.9 percent of employ-
greater than the overall

Income

Nearly twice as much income comes from government in the region than the national norm, indicating not so much a heavy support, but a drastic lack of other activity from the private sector.

Of the 92 counties, only 8 have a per capita income approximating the average U.S. County. A majority of the counties in the region have a 70 percent or less percentile compared to the average U.S. County.

Four Corners States*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Land</th>
<th>Percent of Land</th>
<th>Indian Trust Lands</th>
<th>Percent of Land</th>
<th>State Local Lands</th>
<th>Percent of Land</th>
<th>Private Land</th>
<th>Percent of Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>39,100</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mexico and Utah State Investment Plans.
### Percent of Employment by Sector° (1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Four States</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

°Employment was calculated from data provided by:

### Percent of Income by Sectorb (1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Four States</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Four Corners Region Job Gap,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>800</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 1

Note: Marr's projections assume the labor force participation and unemployment rates will remain essentially constant over the projection period.

### Four Corners Regional Job Gap And U.S. Comparisons: 1960-1969

#### 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Four States</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,758,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>633,000</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Four States</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>179,325</td>
<td>64,689</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four Corners Regional Job Gap, 1960-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by: Colorado CBP, 67-7 and City County and the City County Bureau of Economic Research for the Four Corners Regional Commission.

Source: Table 1
Note: Marr's projections assume the labor force participation and unemployment rates will remain essentially stable over the projection period.

Four Corners Regional Job Gap
And U.S. Comparisons: 1960-1975*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Four States</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>137,000</td>
<td>585,000</td>
<td>580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>633,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source materials available by writing
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Regional Federal Council On Economic Development

With every major Federal agency represented by one or more regional Federal Advisory Committees, the Albuquerque, New Mexico office of the Regional Federal Council on Economic Development has a variety of responsibilities:

Actions:

Briefed the committee on Committee structure
Discussed all possible agency programs

Provided nucleus for eight major programs:
  Economic structure
  Transportation
  Manpower
  Minerals and Fuels
  Agriculture
  Tourism and Recreation
  Education
  Early jobs

(These committees have met together and executed their responsibilities...
Regional Federal Council
On Economic Development

With every major Federal agency participating a Regional Federal Advisory Committee was formed in Albuquerque, New Mexico on February 28, 1969.

Actions:

Briefed committee on Commission's planning program

Discussed all possible agency assistance to the planning program

Provided nucleus for eight special advisory committees:
- Economic structure
- Transportation
- Manpower
- Minerals and Fuels
- Agriculture
- Tourism and Recreation
- Education
- Early jobs

(These committees have met as needed to assist in formulation and execution of planning program)
Agriculture

Income is disproportionate to U.S. norms. Employment and income 40% greater than norms; yet agriculture is declining in the region’s economy, due to many marginal operations. Rising costs, technological advances, limited access to markets, unique climate and terrain conditions add to problems.

Committed to support and develop agriculture including areas of agri-business, forestry and forest products. Seeking to improve farm income, create new employment opportunities, assist population stabilization. Striving to improve urban-rural balance. Initiated performance analysis enlisting aid from land grant universities and others to help develop solutions to major processing, and marketing problems.

Minerals & Fuels

Region is presently dependent on mining exports for 1/8 of basic income, but this is declining. In 1967 mining income factor was 5½ times U.S. norms.

Industry performance under Commission study by University of Arizona. Stated study goal: To maximize utilization of resources by participating where feasible in programs to develop new plants, using new technology, cooperating with governmental agencies on all levels to develop facilities best serving regional needs.

Recreation, Tourism and Retirement

The services industries involved are on a par with U.S. norms, but attractions are greatly underdeveloped. Climate, scenic beauty, etc. are abundant, yet year round facilities, adequate transportation, trained manpower are lacking.

Development Research Associates of Los Angeles are under contract to provide a comprehensive analysis of the potential opportunities and outline courses of action. Commission activity aids federal, Indian and state leaders on facility improvement.

Transportation

Low population density, communities and limited to generate an adequate historical east-to-west path complimented with viable ownership of land (70%), a highway must be built to meet the need to develop interest presently inactive.

With the aid of state and completed an inventory assessment of adequacy, second phase of program short and long-range. Further resources to be developed, cost-benefit analysis.

Example: Community 1 may require both safe, p system for moving raw improved highway may construction costs in some due to rugged terrain. If the area may go undeveloped with development sufficient eventually warrant air services.

Human Resources

Inadequate educational does exist, narrow range ability to attract skilled exists. The region falls 1 area and the nation over.

Poor access exists to medical and health manpower, infants, fewer facilities; reach adequate facilities development, regardless.

Problems:

Action Plan:
norms. Employment is yet agriculture is due to many marginal advances, limited terrain conditions agriculture including forest products. Create new employment bilization. Striving toward a major needs.

**Transportation**

Low population density, rugged terrain, widely separated communities and limited facilities have not been able to generate an adequate transportation network. The historical east-to-west patterns are slowly being complimented with viable north-south ties. Government ownership of land (70%) is a major constraint. Usually a highway is built to meet known demand. Here roads must be built to develop demand to known points of interest presently inaccessible.

With the aid of state and federal agencies, have completed an inventory of facilities: received expert assessment of adequacy of overall system. Launched second phase of program, an intermodal study of needs, short and long-range. Future determinations based on resources to be developed, type of commodities to be transported, cost-benefit ratio of various modes.

Example: Community growth from developing industry may require both safe, practical commuter service and a system for moving raw or processed materials; an improved highway may be the answer. Conversely, road construction costs in some areas may exceed benefits due to rugged terrain. If air service is not the answer, the area may go undeveloped. If air service is feasible, with development sufficient traffic may be generated to eventually warrant air service and highway.

**Human Resources**

Inadequate educational facilities, limited access to what does exist, narrow range and quality of services all limit ability to attract skilled people even where opportunity exists. The region falls below remainder of four state area and the nation overall.

Poor access exists to medical and health facilities. Lower health manpower rates, higher death rates for infants, fewer facilities per capita, great distances to reach adequate facilities combine to discourage development, regardless of opportunity.
Education

Intensive efforts are underway to assist state vocational technical education offices to expand their services. Sterling Institute has been under contract to provide a regional Vocational Education Plan. The states have contributed additional consulting work. The completed report, which will be submitted to the Commission in early 1970, will make recommendations on:

1. Expansion of existing and construction of new facilities.
2. Creation of a bonus training program to assist new industry locating in the Region.
3. Coordination of training with employment and manpower services and with industrial users.
4. Special programs to aid the disadvantaged.

Health

Committed to improvement of health levels, the Commission is seeking to establish diagnostic and health centers, treatment centers, etc. This program now is in the design stage.

Water

Agriculture uses 90% of available water; needs more to grow, yet is faced with uneconomical marginal size farms. Water is also key to development of recreation, mining, manufacturing.

The commission endorses the competent programs of various state and federal agencies charged with development and allocation of water resources and is committed to the earliest possible implementation of water programs.

Industrial Development

Both manufacturing and regional income growth are significantly below the U.S. norms.
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The region's market is now $5 billion in personal income.
By 1975 it is anticipated to be at least $8 billion. This is
one of the least industrialized areas in U.S. Growth lag
accentuates as overall U.S. grows, falling further behind.
A change in defense-oriented industry could cut deeper,
requiring major adjustments.

Comprehensive Analysis underway by Battelle Institute
of Columbus, Ohio; subcontracts to the four state
universities. Goals of the study: (1) determine relative
contribution of industries in region; (2) feasibility for
new industry and (3) establish a guide for the Commis-
ion in the use of industrial development funds.

The Early Job Development program has been
implemented. Through a contract with Thiokol
orporation and subcontracts with the four state
universities, a survey and analysis of new job sources
for the next year has been completed. Commission
presently working closely with various resource
agencies to service requests for assistance to
expanding industries.

Comprehensive Regional Plan

The Commission has completed a preliminary
Comprehensive Plan and will formulate the final
program when the various studies are completed. Any
plan is subject to the approval of the many state, and
Federal agencies who must share the combined costs
of its implementation.

We seek not to compete with the agencies charged with
the various responsibilities, but to assist in coordinating
and focusing the needs of the Four Corners Region.
We have sought, and will continue to seek an atmosphere
of cooperation aimed at implementing at the earliest
possible time programs to aid this highly restricted
region to reach beyond sub-standard levels of
opportunity and performance.
Our plan, coordinated with the various state and federal programs must be flexible to meet changing conditions. It is anticipated that revising and updating will be an ongoing process to meet the challenges.

**Supplemental Grants**

The Supplemental Grant Fund provided an opportunity during the year to add to federal programs with an additional grant to the basic assistance from a federal agency. The combined federal participation could not exceed 80% of the total cost.

Twenty-three projects were funded under this program. Page 16 itemizes the range of effectiveness.

The following summary focuses the highlights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commission Help</th>
<th>Total Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission participation</td>
<td>$2,095,000</td>
<td>$8,378,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Federal Grant</td>
<td>5,879,000</td>
<td>2,144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Local Funds</td>
<td>8,813,157</td>
<td>4,426,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Activity</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,787,430</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,787,430</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following participation breakdown indicates improvements within each of the Four Corners states:

- **Arizona**: $694,150, $8,378,635
- **Colorado**: 488,850, 2,144,000
- **New Mexico**: 511,250, 4,426,189
- **Utah**: 400,750, 1,838,206
- **Totals**: $2,095,000, $16,787,430

**Criteria for Project Selection**

1. Seek projects that bring additional permanent employment to the most distressed areas.
2. Seek projects which establish vocational training qualifying the work force in the most distressed areas.
3. Seek projects having high potential for other industrial development.
4. Seek to advance project employment to public and private sectors.
5. Seek projects critically valuable to the development of social facilities or may also absorb unmet needs.
6. Seek projects where local participation is already available.

**Technical Assistance**

Funds for technical assistance planning activities, state projects, and special projects and development.

In FY 1969 the major portion of the Commission funds were used to support the design of the Regional Analysis. In FY 1970 the work will continue in FY completion at the end of the year. Preliminary State Developments by each of the state plans continue with more comprehensive regional analyses for FY 17 valuable to the Commission.

**Special Assistance and Indirect**

A small portion of the funds used were for vocational education and agricultural and industrial development. (See Page 17 of concepts that can be utilized in the region.)
3. Seek projects having high potential for tourism and other industrial development.

4. Seek to advance projects having a high ratio of employment to public investment, particularly where they generate the need for supporting trade services.

5. Seek projects critically needed for improving health and social facilities or services, especially where these may also absorb unemployed labor.

6. Seek projects where local supporting funds are already available.

**Technical Assistance Programs**

Funds for technical assistance support regional planning activities, state planning units, demonstration projects and special projects related to economic development.

In FY 1969 the major portion of funds was committed to the design of the Regional Planning Program. This work will continue in FY 1970 and should near completion at the end of calendar year 1970.

**Preliminary State Development Plans** were produced by each of the state planning offices under contract with the Commission during FY 1969. The work continues with more emphasis being placed on sub-regional analysis for FY 70. These state plans have been valuable to the Commission in meshing its planning and project priorities with the states' goals and development objectives.

**Special Assistance and Demonstration Projects** have used a small portion of the funds. Water Conservation, industrial development, transportation, health, vocational education, agriculture, tourism and recreation are included. (See Page 17) The projects seek feasibility of concepts that can be applied to various sections of the region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Basic Grant Amount</th>
<th>FCRC Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Yavapi College</td>
<td>$5,167,000</td>
<td>$363,693</td>
<td>$156,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Chinle Nursing Home</td>
<td>$1,203,313</td>
<td>459,313</td>
<td>105,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Parker Dam Road</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Flagstaff Airport</td>
<td>$208,722</td>
<td>126,868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,378,635</td>
<td>$1,849,874</td>
<td>$691,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Dolores Road</td>
<td>$438,212</td>
<td>$250,570</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Monte Vista School</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Penrose Sewage</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>99,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Antonito Sewage</td>
<td>1,66,700</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Cucharas Pass Road</td>
<td>1,40,744</td>
<td>305,449</td>
<td>121,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>LaJara Sewage</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>42,150</td>
<td>36,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Manassa Sewage</td>
<td>78,744</td>
<td>29,572</td>
<td>39,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,144,099</td>
<td>$971,241</td>
<td>488,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Eagle Nest Water</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$164,800</td>
<td>54,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Eagle Nest Sewage</td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>61,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Navajo Airport</td>
<td>86,500</td>
<td>48,700</td>
<td>28,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Hogback Irrigation</td>
<td>30,280</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>9,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Ponderosa Ditch Irrigation</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Chama Road</td>
<td>1,168,583</td>
<td>754,670</td>
<td>180,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Red River Sewage</td>
<td>211,909</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>14,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Zuui Sewage</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Santa Fe School</td>
<td>1,981,000</td>
<td>990,500</td>
<td>152,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Mora County Road</td>
<td>450,417</td>
<td>290,479</td>
<td>37,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,426,189</td>
<td>$2,429,089</td>
<td>511,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Price River Sewage</td>
<td>$1,381,930</td>
<td>$439,230</td>
<td>345,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Gunnison Hospital</td>
<td>456,676</td>
<td>189,839</td>
<td>55,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,838,606</td>
<td>$629,069</td>
<td>400,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,787,430</td>
<td>$3,879,273</td>
<td>2,095,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Basic Grant Amount</td>
<td>FCRC Grant</td>
<td>State-Local Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,167,000</td>
<td>$363,693</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
<td>$4,647,307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,203,313</td>
<td>459,313</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>639,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208,322</td>
<td>126,868</td>
<td>33,150</td>
<td>4,8304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,378,635</td>
<td>$1,849,874</td>
<td>$694,150</td>
<td>$5,834,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$438,212</td>
<td>$250,370</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$87,642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166,600</td>
<td>99,600</td>
<td>33,200</td>
<td>33,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166,700</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>38,150</td>
<td>78,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534,014</td>
<td>305,349</td>
<td>121,862</td>
<td>106,803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140,500</td>
<td>42,150</td>
<td>36,350</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78,574</td>
<td>21,572</td>
<td>39,288</td>
<td>15,714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,144,000</td>
<td>$97,241</td>
<td>$488,850</td>
<td>$683,909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$163,800</td>
<td>$54,600</td>
<td>$54,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>61,500</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66,500</td>
<td>48,700</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,280</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>9,099</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,168,583</td>
<td>754,670</td>
<td>180,196</td>
<td>233,717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211,909</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>54,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,981,000</td>
<td>990,500</td>
<td>152,705</td>
<td>837,795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450,417</td>
<td>290,879</td>
<td>37,359</td>
<td>'12,179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,426,189</td>
<td>$2,429,089</td>
<td>$511,250</td>
<td>$1,485,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,381,930</td>
<td>$439,230</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$397,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456,676</td>
<td>189,839</td>
<td>55,750</td>
<td>211,087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,838,606</td>
<td>$629,069</td>
<td>$400,750</td>
<td>$808,787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,787,430</td>
<td>$5,879,273</td>
<td>$677,000</td>
<td>$8,813,157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Technical Assistance Program 1968-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Area Covered</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Development District</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Resources</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Economics</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$25,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Valley Water</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Marketing I</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Marketing II</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meating Packing/Feedlot</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad D&amp;RGW</td>
<td>Colorado-New Mexico</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Title</td>
<td>Colorado-New Mexico</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower (Phase I)</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$42,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational-Technical Education</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$59,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology Conference</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$459,506</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas Covered in 1968-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>State Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>25,852</td>
<td>45,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado-New Mexico</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado-New Mexico</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>89,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>42,726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>59,428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>113,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$459,506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Financial Report

### SUPPLEMENTAL GRANT PROGRAM 1968-9
- Funds Available
- Obligations
- Balance

### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS 1967-8 & 1968-9
- FY 1967-8 Unobligated Balance
- FY 1968-9 Fund
  - Obligations
  - Balance July 1, 1969

### STATE INVESTMENT PLAN FUNDS 1968-9
- Funds Available
- Obligations
- Balance

### COMMISSION ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES 1968-9
- Personnel Costs
- Travel
- Other Services
- Total

### FEDERAL COCHAIRMAN'S OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES 1968-9
- Personnel Costs
- Travel
- Other Services
- Total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1968-9</th>
<th>1967-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES &amp; 1968-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>$2,095,000.00</td>
<td>- 0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSES</td>
<td>$ 547,500.00</td>
<td>797,826.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,345,326.70</td>
<td>459,506.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 885,820.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 288,000.00</td>
<td>144,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 144,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSES 1968-9</td>
<td>$ 244,407.53</td>
<td>46,307.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96,540.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 387,255.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES 1968-9</td>
<td>$ 135,699.00</td>
<td>22,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31,268.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 189,842.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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