

The original documents are located in Box 51, folder “1975/10/01 - Mayors of Small Cities and Towns” of the James M. Cannon Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

PRESIDENTIAL MEETING WITH MAYORS
Chicago
Wednesday, October 1, 1975

NEWS & COMMENT
COMMUNICATIONS CENTER:

Please distribute the News Summary to the following:

The President	James Lynn	William Greener
Donald Rumsfeld	Terry O'Donnell	Jack Hushen
Robert Hartmann	Ron Nessen	Dr. William Lukash
<u>James Cannon</u>	Red Cavanoy	Robert Mead

SPECIAL EDITION:
The Morning Newspapers
October 1, 1975

All major papers ran front page stories on Tuesday's Senate intelligence committee hearings on the Secret Service. The Baltimore Sun, the N.Y. Daily News and the Christian Science Monitor also ran a page one report on the President's trip to Chicago. The New York Times and the Daily News reported the President's request for an additional \$13.5 million for secret service protection. The Times and Sun ran front page stories on the CIA's delivering of secret documents to the House intelligence committee. The Christian Science Monitor ran a major front page story on Secretary Kissinger's "cloaking" of the U.S. role in the 1974 Cyprus crisis.

(The Washington Post was not available due to a strike.)

Ford Speaks In Chicago Amid Tightened Security, by Muriel Dobbin, Baltimore Sun: President Ford flew to Chicago last night under extraordinarily heavy security, and pledged that he would be "prudent and not foolhardy" in his determination to maintain contact with the voters.

The unprecedented use of electronic metal detectors and a small army of about 1,400 policemen, Secret Service agents, FBI men and U.S. marshals indicated the tension surrounding the President's first trip outside Washington since the assassination attempt in San Francisco nine days ago.

A woman found carrying a gun on the street near the hotel where Ford was due to speak was questioned by police. Carmen Teresa Tulido told police she carried the gun for protection because her job involved handling large amounts of money.

Ron Nessen said this episode is judged to have nothing to do with the presidential visit. (10/1/75)



CIA Unit Hopeful on Data, by Thomas Pepper, Baltimore Sun: House intelligence committee chairman Otis G. Pike (D. N.Y.) said Tuesday he has new hopes of reaching agreement with the Ford administration over the committee's access to classified information. But he expressed sharp displeasure with a limitation Secretary Kissinger has placed on the testimony of State Department officials. CIA Director William Colby turned over all but 50 words of subpoenaed documents late Tuesday, according to Pike who said that in his judgment Colby is no longer "in contempt of Congress." (10/1/75)

Kissinger Cloaks U.S. Cyprus Role, by Clayton Jones, Christian Science Monitor: A cloak of secrecy ordered by Secretary Kissinger has been draped over details of U.S. intelligence work surrounding the 1974 Cyprus crisis. The order is another barrier for the House Intelligence Committee to work out with the White House before the committee can begin a full-scale probe of U.S. spy activities, committee spokesmen indicated. (10/1/75)

Zarb Fears Effect If Oil Embargoed, Philadelphia Inquirer: Another Arab oil embargo would bring an allocation program in the US that would "make the last one look like a picnic," Federal Energy Administrator Frank Zarb said Tuesday. "You won't have to worry about long lines at the gas station because there won't be enough gas to have a line," Zarb said at a seminar in New York City. (10/1/75)

Alleged N.M.U. Gift To Ford Splits 2 Agencies, by M.A. Farber, New York Times: The U.S. Attorney for New Jersey and the IRS have become embroiled in an intense dispute over each agency's handling of an allegation that Gerald R. Ford may have received an unusual payment from leaders of the National Maritime Union around 1968. The prosecutor, Jonathan L. Goldstein, is investigating whether the IRS failed to pursue the allegation after it was made, apparently in early 1974, by a former leader of the union. At the same time, the IRS says it acted "appropriately." (10/1/75)

U.S. to Honor Requests of Vietnamese Refugees to Go Home, by Richard Halloran, New York Times: The US has decided to allow 1,600 Vietnamese refugees in Guam to return to their homeland as they have requested despite the new Saigon Government's apparent reluctance to accept them. About 100 others throughout the US are due to be flown here, and all are to sail for South Vietnam in two or three weeks. (10/1/75)

#



CONCLUSION

FRANKLY, THE CONGRESS ISN'T TOO HAPPY ABOUT SUCH LIBERTY ON YOUR PART AND WOULD RATHER TELL YOU HOW THEY WANT IT SPENT. I LEAVE IT TO YOUR GOOD JUDGEMENT TO HELP US CONTINUE THIS PROGRAM FOR ANOTHER FIVE YEARS. I HAVE RECOMMENDED THAT IT BE EXTENDED FOR A FIVE-YEAR PERIOD, AND WITH ADDED MONEY ON AN ANNUAL BASIS.

I SHOULD SAY, AND, IN FACT, WARN YOU, THERE ARE MANY OPPONENTS IN THE CONGRESS WHO DON'T WANT IT EXTENDED AND THE CONSEQUENCE IS THERE IS AN UNFORTUNATE DELAY. AND I DETECT THAT THERE IS A FEELING OF COMPLACENCY ON THE PART OF GOVERNORS, STATE LEGISLATORS, MAYORS AND COUNTY OFFICIALS. I WARN YOU, ALL OF THOSE WHO HAVE RECEIVED THESE FUNDS AND USED THEM EFFECTIVELY -- AND I THINK YOU HAVE -- GET MOVING, BECAUSE THE OPPONENTS ARE WORKING AND I DON'T DETECT THAT THE PROPONENTS ARE REALLY PUSHING.

MY MESSAGE IS SIMPLY DON'T GET CAUGHT NAPPING WHEN THAT EXPIRATION DATE COMES UP MUCH MORE QUICKLY THAN YOU SUSPECT IT MIGHT.

ON THE TABLE IN FRONT OF YOU, YOU WILL FIND A FACT SHEET WHICH OUTLINES THE AMOUNT OF GENERAL REVENUE SHARING MONEY THAT EACH OF YOU HAS RECEIVED IN THE PAST AND WILL RECEIVE IN THE FUTURE UNDER MY PROPOSAL.

(AT THE CONCLUSION OF THESE REMARKS, IT IS SUGGESTED THAT YOU CALL ON ONE OF THE MAYORS TO START THE DISCUSSION)

American



THE WHITE HOUSE



American Airlines Ticket For

AA **American** boarding pass

FLIGHT

CABIN

SEAT NUMBER

GATE

3F

PLEASE DO NOT CHANGE SEATS WITHOUT CONSULTING YOUR FLIGHT ATTENDANT. VACANT SEATS MAY ALREADY BE ASSIGNED FROM THE NEXT CITY.

148 1

Issued By **SOLD SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT ON PASSENGER'S COUPON**

**PASSENGER TICKET
AND BAGGAGE CHECK
PASSENGER'S COUPON**

FROM
TO

CAR-
RIER

FARE
CALCULATION

5823531859

DATE AND PLACE OF ISSUE

AMERICAN AIRLINES INC. AA

If the passenger's journey involves an ultimate destination or stop in a country other than the country of departure, the Warsaw Convention may be applicable and the Convention governs and in most cases limits the liability of carriers for death or personal injury and in respect of loss of or damage to baggage.

DATE OF ISSUE

NAME OF PASSENGER

NOT TRANSFERABLE

ORIGIN

DESTINATION

CANNON/MR. J.

1	2	3	4	ORIGINALLY ISSUED AGAINST BY AGENTS NUMERIC CODE	AT	ON DATE	YR.
1	2	3	4	TICKET DESIGNATOR & TOUR CODE	THIS TICKET ISSUED IN EXCHANGE FOR		

NOT GOOD FOR PASSAGE

FARE BASIS

ALLOW

CARRIER

FLIGHT/CLASS

DATE

TIME

STATUS

Agent

CONJUNCTION TICKET (S)

FORM OF PAYMENT

ENDORSEMENTS (Carbon)

FROM

VOID

TO

VOID

TO

VOID

TO

CHICAGO OHARE

TO

WASHINGTON NATL

BAGGAGE CHECKED UNCK'D

PCS.

UNCK. WT.

PCS.

UNCK. WT.

PCS.

UNCK. WT.

PCS.

UNCK. WT.

PCS.

UNCK. WT.

FARE

CY

ENDORSEMENTS

(Carbon)

FARE CY

TOTAL CY

ROUTE CODE

ENCODE

CPN

AIRLINE CODE

FORM AND SERIAL NUMBER

CK

TAX

EQUIV. FMT. PD.

5823531859 5 □

PRINTED IN U.S.A. BY RAND. MC. NALLY

**THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO
CHICAGO & OMAHA
Tuesday & Wednesday
September 30-October 1, 1975**

Day #1


J. CANNON

- 5:00pm** AF1 dpts AAFB enrte
Chicago, Ill.
[FT: 1+35]
[Time change: -1hr]
Snacks served enrte
- 5:35pm** AF1 arvs O'Hare Field.
Board Guest & Staff Van
in motorcade.
- 5:40pm** Mtrcd dpts enrte Conrad
Hilton Hotel.
[Driving time:35min]
- 6:15pm** Mtrcd arrives.
You may proceed to
Gen. Recept. or staff
lounge.
- 6:20pm** President arvs Gen.
Reception.
- 6:50pm** President greets head

- table guests.
- 6:50pm Proceed to Grand Ballroom to assigned table.
- 7:00pm President arvs Grand Ballroom for GOP Dinner
- 8:20pm Presidential remarks.
- 8:40pm Remarks conclude. Proceed to 3rd floor Beverly Rm for Post Dinner Reception.
- 8:55pm President arvs Beverly room.
- 9:20pm Board mtrcd as on arv. Delete Cong. guests & Les Arends.
- 9:30pm Mtrcd dpts enrte North Shore Hilton, Skokie, Ill
[Driving time:25min]
- 9:55pm Mtrcd arrives. Proceed to assigned rooms.
- 10:00pm President arvs Golf Suite.

RON

- 6:30am Buffet breakfast will be served in Staff Lounge (Rm 925).
- 7:30am Baggage Call outside rooms.
- 8:55 am Proceed to Grand Ballroom for Mayoral meeting.
- 9:30am President arvs Grand Ballroom to meet Mayors.
- 11:00am President dpts enrte Suite.
- 11:30am Board mtrcd as on arv
- 11:38am Mtrcd dpts enrte Office
[Driving time:17min]
- 11:55am Mtrcd arrives. Proceed on your own.



Pres should visit
Benton Harbor next trip
to Mich

WITHDRAWAL SHEET (PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES)

FORM OF DOCUMENT	CORRESPONDENTS OR TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
Itinerary	Detailed itinerary for President Ford's trip to Illinois and Nebraska, 8 pages (the first page is numbered as page 7)	9/30/1975- 10/1/1975	B

File Location:

James M. Cannon Files, Box 51, "Mayors of Small Cities and Towns, 10/1/1975" SMD - 6/4/2015

RESTRICTION CODES

- (A) Closed by applicable Executive order governing access to national security information.
- (B) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- (C) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 30, 1975

MEETING WITH MAYORS OF SMALL CITIES AND TOWNS

Wednesday, October 1, 1975
North Shore Hilton, Skokie, Illinois
9:00 a.m. (1½ hours)

From: Jim Cannon

I. PURPOSE

This will be an informal meeting which will provide an opportunity to meet with a group of Mayors of small cities and towns from Illinois, Michigan, Indiana and Wisconsin.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS AND PRESS PLAN

A. Background

We have selected a bi-partisan geographically representative group of Mayors of small cities and towns primarily from the greater Chicago area. There will be 34 Mayors including Mayor Patrick Zielke (R) of La Crosse, Wisconsin, whose city just received the award as the number one small city in the Nation based on quality of life offered by the community. Also included are the present President of the Illinois Municipal League, George Bersted (R) of Monmouth, Illinois and the President-elect of the Illinois Municipal League, Fred Dumke (D), of Oak Lawn, Illinois and Lyman Parks (R), of Grand Rapids, Michigan who was recently defeated in a non-partisan primary.

Of those invited, 25 are Republicans, 8 are Democrats and one is an Independent, although most of them are elected in non-partisan elections. A summary including the partisan affiliation, population and further background on the city is included on the participants list.

It is intended that after the opening Presidential remarks that the meeting be conducted as an informal working session with as many Mayors

as possible having an opportunity to be heard. We anticipate that the three top issues will be:

First, support for the reenactment of General Revenue Sharing; Second, opposition to EPA interference coupled with a desire for water and sewer grants and; Third, opposition to a Federal bail-out of New York City.

B. Participants

See Tab A.

C. Press Plan

To be announced. Pictures to be taken at the beginning of the meeting, with 3 or 4 Mayors to be selected to brief at the conclusion of the meeting.

III. TALKING POINTS

See Tab B.

PARTICIPANTS

Arlington Heights, Illinois James T. Ryan (R) 65,000

Mayor Ryan is highly regarded both professionally and politically. He will be very supportive in this meeting and his city is in Congressman Phillip Crane's Congressional district. He feels that it will be most helpful in creating stronger support for you among the conservatives in this district.

Aurora, Illinois Albert D. McCoy (R) 74,000

Like Mayor Ryan, is highly regarded both professionally and politically as one of the more articulate small city Mayors in the Chicago metropolitan area.

Cicero, Illinois John Karner (R) 68,000

This is a very independent and very provincial community. It is different from most other municipalities in the State of Illinois. It is an incorporated town and the population is comprised largely of second and third generation residents.

Deerfield, Illinois Bernard Forrest (R) 19,000

This is a suburban community on the North Shore which is principally a high middle class residential community.

Des Plaines, Illinois Herbert Behrel (R) 57,000

Is a very progressive city which abutts O'Hare field. It has an excellent reputation as a well run municipality with a new municipal complex. The Mayor has been in office several terms and has recently announced that he plans to retire to Arizona in the near future.

Elgin, Illinois Richard L. Verbic (R) 56,000

This is largely a commuter suburban community located some distance from Chicago and was originally a railroad town.

Elmwood Park, Illinois Elmer W. Conti (R) 26,000

The Mayor is a former Republican Legislator and is presently a township committeeman which is the equivalent of a County Chairman. It is largely a community of middle class neighborhoods and is a strong Republican district.

Evanston, Illinois Edgar Vanneman (R) 80,000

Is located on Lake Michigan and is the home of North Western University. Professionals in municipal government regard this as a model city having dealt with racial and growth related problems successfully.

Franklin Park, Illinois Jack B. Williams (D) 20,000

The Mayor is one of the leading Democratic politicians in the State of Illinois and additionally serves in the State Legislature. While he is a part-time Mayor, he has received high marks for good planning and a well run community.

Hoffman Estates, Illinois Virginia Hayter (R) 32,000

This is one of the newer planned communities in the Chicago suburban area. The Mayor, Mrs. Virginia Hayter, can be very out-spoken and loves to talk.

Joliet, Illinois Norman Keck (R) 87,000

This is one of the bigger, older cities around Chicago. It is a working class town with a concentration of heavy industry and is the home of the stockyards.

Lansing, Illinois Jack O. McNary (R) 26,000

This is a very conservative suburb located in the Congressional district of Congressman Derwinsky (R).

Monmouth, Illinois George Bersted (R) 11,000

The Mayor is the incumbent President of the Illinois Municipal League. This is an ultra conservative Republican district.

Mt. Prospect, Illinois Robert Teichert (R) 46,000

This is a prosperous and growing community with no particular problems.

Niles, Illinois Nicholas Blase (D) 31,000

The Mayor is a very partisan Democrat, presently serving his third term and regarded as part of the Daley organization.

Oak Forest, Illinois James Jesk (D) 18,000

This is a small southwestern suburb which is principally a bedroom community.

Oak Lawn, Illinois Fred Dumke (D) 60,000

Mayor Dumke will be the next President of the Illinois Municipal League. He is presently the first Vice President. He is a parapalegic and will be in a wheelchair or on crutches. He has been the subject of some controversy and recent civil litigation. He is the only Democrat in municipal office in his community.

Palatine, Illinois Wendall E. Jones (R) 30,000

Is primarily a residential community with little or no industry and no particular problems.

Park Forest, Illinois Mayer Singerman (D) 31,000

Is a fast growing, middle class, planned community which was the setting for the widely read novel, "The Organization Man."

Park Ridge, Illinois Martin J. Butler (R) 42,000

This is a very older suburban, wealthy suburb.

Robbins, Illinois Marion L. Smith (D) 10,000

The community is all black with a lot of problems relating to welfare, child care, and food stamps.

South Holland, Illinois Harold J. Gouwens (R) 27,000

A very traditional Dutch community with a strong ethnic population.

Skokie, Illinois Albert J. Smith (D) 69,000

This is an upper middle class community which has recently been through a very disruptive fire and police strike. The Mayor took a very hard-nosed attitude and discharged over 40% of the police force. He is credited with having handled the situation well and having brought the strike to a rapid conclusion.

Waukegan, Illinois Robert Sabonjian (R) 65,000

The Mayor is a real character who regularly jumps back and forth from Republican to Democrat registration. The community is regarded as the principal liberty port for the Great Lakes Naval Training Center and experiences constant problems with sailors and Marines.

Western Springs, Illinois Robert Lavidge (I) 12,000

This is an older residential suburb on the edge of Cook County. There is no industry at all in the community.

Wheaton, Illinois Ralph H. Barger (R) 36,000

Is an older suburb which has experienced some fairly severe problems as a result of flooding in past years.

Elmhurst, Illinois Ray W. Fick (R) 51,000

Is like Wheaton, an older suburb having experienced some flooding problems.

Blue Island, Illinois Richard Withers (R) 22,000

Located south of Chicago, a middle class community which principally began as a railroad town.

Grand Rapids, Michigan Lyman Parks (R) 198,000

Mayor Parks was defeated in a recent primary by a Mr. Decker and a Mr. Dreisen. There will be an election in November between those two candidates. Mayor Parks has been a strong supporter of yours and one of the few black Republican Mayors in the Nation.

Benton Harbor, Michigan Charles Joseph (R) 16,000

The Mayor is black and a Republican, strong supporter. The Federal Regional Council in Chicago has been working with him on some local problems and we are advised that good progress is being made.

Michigan City, Indiana Randall C. Miller (R) 40,000

Is an industrial city on the Southern tip of Lake Michigan and is the site of the Indiana State Penitentiary. A prime issue indicated is prison reform.

Crown Point, Indiana Richard C. Collins (R) 14,000

This is the site of Inland Steel and EPA apparently is trying to close the Gary plan of Inland which is just across the line from Crown Point. A relaxation of pollution regulation and enforcement seems to be a matter of prime concern.

La Crosse, Wisconsin Patrick Zielke (R) 51,000

A recent "Quality of Life Study" done through funding provided by EPA, ranked La Crosse as the number one smaller city in the Nation. This award was based on economic, political, environmental, health and education, and social qualities.

Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin

Donald F. Penza (D)

19,000

This is a "paper" city and a question uppermost in the minds of local officials is pollution regulation. They apparently would like to see EPA hold off a little on pollution regulation and enforcement.

TALKING POINTS

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- . Upon entering the Grand Ballroom you will be photographed upon meeting each Mayor.
- . General Press Photographs.

POINTS OF DISCUSSION

- . I have met with all 50 of our State's Governors in working sessions not just social settings.
- . I have met with well over 100 of our leading Mayors.
- . I have addressed 5 State Legislatures, Louisiana and Michigan as Vice President, and New Hampshire, Kansas and California as President.
- . I know that the work of Government is largely the work of State and local elected officials and I wanted to meet with you today as representatives of some of our smaller cities and towns.
- . The importance of small cities and towns is pointed up by the fact that there are only 3 cities of over 100,000 population in the State of Illinois. Therefore, it is clear that the people of Illinois have a vital stake in what you do as local officials.
- . One of the problems I would like to discuss with you today of particular importance to your communities is General Revenue Sharing.
- . General Revenue Sharing has been a highly successful and effective program. Since enactment, \$20.4 billion in direct, flexible aid has been returned to 39,000 State and local governments through an equitable distribution formula. Shortly, additional payments of approximately \$1.6 billion will be distributed.
- . I support General Revenue Sharing and want to see it continue. For that reason, I have proposed legislation to renew and improve this vital program. Under my proposal, \$39.8 billion would be distributed between January, 1977 and September, 1982 to all eligible units of general government, regardless of their size, without any change in the existing distribution formula.

As you know, there has been some discussion in Congress about changing the distribution formula to provide more funds to large urban areas. Such proposals would adversely affect the local governmental jurisdictions which you represent. I have and will continue to reject any proposal to deprive smaller communities, which also have a legitimate need for assistance, of Federal revenue sharing funds.

General Revenue Sharing expires in December, 1976, and I have called upon the Congress to extend and revise the program this year. Congressional action during 1975 is essential in order to enable States and units of local government to deal with their severe fiscal problems and meet increasing demands for public services.

Unfortunately, the renewal legislation faces an uncertain future in the Congress. The question is not only when, but if, the Congress will re-enact this vital program. There is much indifference to General Revenue Sharing and considerable opposition to its continuation.

I tell you, candidly, General Revenue Sharing is in jeopardy and the efforts to gain re-enactment will not succeed without your active involvement and support. General Revenue Sharing is more than a sound concept of Federalism. You know the devastating impact Congressional failure to extend this program would have on State and local governments. I hope you will begin to share that knowledge with Members of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 30, 1975

MEETING WITH MAYORS OF SMALL CITIES AND TOWNS

Wednesday, October 1, 1975
North Shore Hilton, Skokie, Illinois
9:00 a.m. (1½ hours)

From: Jim Cannon

I. PURPOSE

This will be an informal meeting which will provide an opportunity to meet with a group of Mayors of small cities and towns from Illinois, Michigan, Indiana and Wisconsin.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS AND PRESS PLAN

A. Background

We have selected a bi-partisan geographically representative group of Mayors of small cities and towns primarily from the greater Chicago area. There will be 34 Mayors including Mayor Patrick Zielke (R) of La Crosse, Wisconsin, whose city just received the award as the number one small city in the Nation based on quality of life offered by the community. Also included are the present President of the Illinois Municipal League, George Bersted (R) of Monmouth, Illinois and the President-elect of the Illinois Municipal League, Fred Dumke (D), of Oak Lawn, Illinois and Lyman Parks (R), of Grand Rapids, Michigan who was recently defeated in a non-partisan primary.

Of those invited, 25 are Republicans, 8 are Democrats and one is an Independent, although most of them are elected in non-partisan elections. A summary including the partisan affiliation, population and further background on the city is included on the participants list.

It is intended that after the opening Presidential remarks that the meeting be conducted as an informal working session with as many Mayors

as possible having an opportunity to be heard. We anticipate that the three top issues will be:

First, support for the reenactment of General Revenue Sharing; Second, opposition to EPA interference coupled with a desire for water and sewer grants and; Third, opposition to a Federal bail-out of New York City.

B. Participants

See Tab A.

C. Press Plan

To be announced. Pictures to be taken at the beginning of the meeting, with 3 or 4 Mayors to be selected to brief at the conclusion of the meeting.

III. TALKING POINTS

See Tab B.

PARTICIPANTS

Arlington Heights, Illinois James T. Ryan (R) 65,000

Mayor Ryan is highly regarded both professionally and politically. He will be very supportive in this meeting and his city is in Congressman Phillip Crane's Congressional district. He feels that it will be most helpful in creating stronger support for you among the conservatives in this district.

Aurora, Illinois Albert D. McCoy (R) 74,000

Like Mayor Ryan, is highly regarded both professionally and politically as one of the more articulate small city Mayors in the Chicago metropolitan area.

Cicero, Illinois John Karner (R) 68,000

This is a very independent and very provincial community. It is different from most other municipalities in the State of Illinois. It is an incorporated town and the population is comprised largely of second and third generation residents.

Deerfield, Illinois Bernard Forrest (R) 19,000

This is a suburban community on the North Shore which is principally a high middle class residential community.

Des Plaines, Illinois Herbert Behrel (R) 57,000

Is a very progressive city which abutts O'Hare field. It has an excellent reputation as a well run municipality with a new municipal complex. The Mayor has been in office several terms and has recently announced that he plans to retire to Arizona in the near future.

Elgin, Illinois Richard L. Verbic (R) 56,000

This is largely a commuter suburban community located some distance from Chicago and was originally a railroad town.

Elmwood Park, Illinois Elmer W. Conti (R) 26,000

The Mayor is a former Republican Legislator and is presently a township committeeman which is the equivalent of a County Chairman. It is largely a community of middle class neighborhoods and is a strong Republican district.

Evanston, Illinois Edgar Vanneman (R) 80,000

Is located on Lake Michigan and is the home of North Western University. Professionals in municipal government regard this as a model city having dealt with racial and growth related problems successfully.

Franklin Park, Illinois Jack B. Williams (D) 20,000

The Mayor is one of the leading Democratic politicians in the State of Illinois and additionally serves in the State Legislature. While he is a part-time Mayor, he has received high marks for good planning and a well run community.

Hoffman Estates, Illinois Virginia Hayter (R) 32,000

This is one of the newer planned communities in the Chicago suburban area. The Mayor, Mrs. Virginia Hayter, can be very out-spoken and loves to talk.

Joliet, Illinois Norman Keck (R) 87,000

This is one of the bigger, older cities around Chicago. It is a working class town with a concentration of heavy industry and is the home of the stockyards.

Lansing, Illinois Jack O. McNary (R) 26,000

This is a very conservative suburb located in the Congressional district of Congressman Derwinsky (R).

Monmouth, Illinois George Bersted (R) 11,000

The Mayor is the incumbent President of the Illinois Municipal League. This is an ultra conservative Republican district.

Mt. Prospect, Illinois Robert Teichert (R) 46,000

This is a prosperous and growing community with no particular problems.

Niles, Illinois Nicholas Blase (D) 31,000

The Mayor is a very partisan Democrat, presently serving his third term and regarded as part of the Daley organization.

Oak Forest, Illinois James Jesk (D) 18,000

This is a small southwestern suburb which is principally a bedroom community.

Oak Lawn, Illinois Fred Dumke (D) 60,000

Mayor Dumke will be the next President of the Illinois Municipal League. He is presently the first Vice President. He is a parapalegic and will be in a wheel-chair or on crutches. He has been the subject of some controversy and recent civil litigation. He is the only Democrat in municipal office in his community.

Palatine, Illinois Wendall E. Jones (R) 30,000

Is primarily a residential community with little or no industry and no particular problems.

Park Forest, Illinois Mayer Singerman (D) 31,000

Is a fast growing, middle class, planned community which was the setting for the widely read novel, "The Organization Man."

Park Ridge, Illinois Martin J. Butler (R) 42,000

This is a very older suburban, wealthy suburb.

Robbins, Illinois Marion L. Smith (D) 10,000

The community is all black with a lot of problems relating to welfare, child care, and food stamps.

South Holland, Illinois Harold J. Gouwens (R) 27,000

A very traditional Dutch community with a strong ethnic population.

Skokie, Illinois Albert J. Smith (D) 69,000

This is an upper middle class community which has recently been through a very disruptive fire and police strike. The Mayor took a very hard-nosed attitude and discharged over 40% of the police force. He is credited with having handled the situation well and having brought the strike to a rapid conclusion.

Waukegan, Illinois Robert Sabonjian (R) 65,000

The Mayor is a real character who regularly jumps back and forth from Republican to Democrat registration. The community is regarded as the principal liberty port for the Great Lakes Naval Training Center and experiences constant problems with sailors and Marines.

Western Springs, Illinois Robert Lavidge (I) 12,000

This is an older residential suburb on the edge of Cook County. There is no industry at all in the community.

Wheaton, Illinois Ralph H. Barger (R) 36,000

Is an older suburb which has experienced some fairly severe problems as a result of flooding in past years.

Elmhurst, Illinois Ray W. Fick (R) 51,000

Is like Wheaton, an older suburb having experienced some flooding problems.

Blue Island, Illinois Richard Withers (R) 22,000

Located south of Chicago, a middle class community which principally began as a railroad town.

Grand Rapids, Michigan Lyman Parks (R) 198,000

Mayor Parks was defeated in a recent primary by a Mr. Decker and a Mr. Dreisen. There will be an election in November between those two candidates. Mayor Parks has been a strong supporter of yours and one of the few black Republican Mayors in the Nation.

Benton Harbor, Michigan Charles Joseph (R) 16,000

The Mayor is black and a Republican, strong supporter. The Federal Regional Council in Chicago has been working with him on some local problems and we are advised that good progress is being made.

Michigan City, Indiana Randall C. Miller (R) 40,000

Is an industrial city on the Southern tip of Lake Michigan and is the site of the Indiana State Penitentiary. A prime issue indicated is prison reform.

Crown Point, Indiana Richard C. Collins (R) 14,000

This is the site of Inland Steel and EPA apparently is trying to close the Gary plan of Inland which is just across the line from Crown Point. A relaxation of pollution regulation and enforcement seems to be a matter of prime concern.

La Crosse, Wisconsin Patrick Zielke (R) 51,000

A recent "Quality of Life Study" done through funding provided by EPA, ranked La Crosse as the number one smaller city in the Nation. This award was based on economic, political, environmental, health and education, and social qualities.

Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin

Donald F. Penza (D)

19,000

This is a "paper" city and a question uppermost in the minds of local officials is pollution regulation. They apparently would like to see EPA hold off a little on pollution regulation and enforcement.

TALKING POINTS

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- . Upon entering the Grand Ballroom you will be photographed upon meeting each Mayor.
- . General Press Photographs.

POINTS OF DISCUSSION

- . I have met with all 50 of our State's Governors in working sessions not just social settings.
- . I have met with well over 100 of our leading Mayors.
- . I have addressed 5 State Legislatures, Louisiana and Michigan as Vice President, and New Hampshire, Kansas and California as President.
- . I know that the work of Government is largely the work of State and local elected officials and I wanted to meet with you today as representatives of some of our smaller cities and towns.
- . The importance of small cities and towns is pointed up by the fact that there are only 3 cities of over 100,000 population in the State of Illinois. Therefore, it is clear that the people of Illinois have a vital stake in what you do as local officials.
- . One of the problems I would like to discuss with you today of particular importance to your communities is General Revenue Sharing.
- . General Revenue Sharing has been a highly successful and effective program. Since enactment, \$20.4 billion in direct, flexible aid has been returned to 39,000 State and local governments through an equitable distribution formula. Shortly, additional payments of approximately \$1.6 billion will be distributed.
- . I support General Revenue Sharing and want to see it continue. For that reason, I have proposed legislation to renew and improve this vital program. Under my proposal, \$39.8 billion would be distributed between January, 1977 and September, 1982 to all eligible units of general government, regardless of their size, without any change in the existing distribution formula.

150, 46

As you know, there has been some discussion in Congress about changing the distribution formula to provide more funds to large urban areas. Such proposals would adversely affect the local governmental jurisdictions which you represent. I have and will continue to reject any proposal to deprive smaller communities, which also have a legitimate need for assistance, of Federal revenue sharing funds.


General Revenue Sharing expires in December, 1976, and I have called upon the Congress to extend and revise the program this year. Congressional action during 1975 is essential in order to enable States and units of local government to deal with their severe fiscal problems and meet increasing demands for public services.

Unfortunately, the renewal legislation faces an uncertain future in the Congress. The question is not only when, but if, the Congress will re-enact this vital program. There is much indifference to General Revenue Sharing and considerable opposition to its continuation.

I tell you, candidly, General Revenue Sharing is in jeopardy and the efforts to gain re-enactment will not succeed without your active involvement and support. General Revenue Sharing is more than a sound concept of Federalism. You know the devastating impact Congressional failure to extend this program would have on State and local governments. I hope you will begin to share that knowledge with Members of Congress.

SEATING DIAGRAM
MAYORAL MEETING
OCTOBER 1, 1975

CONTI Elmwood Park	SMITH Robbins	KARNER Cicero	FALK	LAVIDGE Western Springs	GOUWENS South Holland	BLASE Niles	O'NEILL	WILLIAMS Franklin Park	BUTLER Park Ridge
WITHERS Blue Island									JESK Oak Forest
SABONJIAN Waukegan									TEICHERT Mt. Prospect
JOSEPH Benton Harbor									NESSEN
CANNON									MRS. HAYTOR Hoffman Estates
PENZA Wisconsin Rapids									? McNARY Lansing
COLLINS Crown Point									VERBIC Elgin
BEHREL Des Plaines									FORREST Deerfield
HARTMANN									RUMSFELD
VENNEMAN Franklin Park									BARGER Wheaton
JONES Palatine									SINGERMAN Park Forest
FICK Elmhurst	DUMKE Oak Lawn	McCOY Aurora	PARKS Grank Rapids	PRESIDENT	RYAN Arlington Heights	BERSTED Monmouth	ZIELKE La Cross	SMITH Skokie	KECK Joliet



General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Arlington Heights
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 402
FY-1974	391
FY-1975	386
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>1,179</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	390
Final Payment (Est.)	206
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>1,175</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>2,468</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Aurora
 (In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 1,317
FY-1974	1,020
FY-1975	959
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$ 3,296</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	1,084
Final Payment (Est.)	573
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$ 4,953</u>
 Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	 <u>\$ 6,854</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Town of Cicero
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Town</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 834
FY-1974	549
FY-1975	619
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>2,002</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	565
Final Payment (Est.)	299
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>2,866</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>3,579</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Township of Deerfield
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Township</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$106
FY-1974	95
FY-1975	51
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>252</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	88
Final Payment (Est.)	44
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>384</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>504</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Deerfield
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 95
FY-1974	71
FY-1975	71
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>237</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	82
Final Payment (Est.)	43
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>362</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>515</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Des Plaines
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 617
FY-1974	412
FY-1975	485
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>1,514</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	506
Final Payment (Est.)	267
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>2,287</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>3,201</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Elgin
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 913
FY-1974	687
FY-1975	598
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$2,198</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 646
Final Payment (Est.)	341
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$3,185</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$4,086</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary Fy-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Elmwood Park
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 165
FY-1974	129
FY-1975	145
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>439</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	173
Final Payment (Est.)	91
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u><u>703</u></u>
 Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	 <u><u>1,091</u></u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Evanston
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 723
FY-1974	567
FY-1975	626
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>1,916</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	701
Final Payment (Est.)	371
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u><u>2,988</u></u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u><u>4,434</u></u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Franklin Park
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 296
FY-1974	190
FY-1975	200
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$ 686</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 297
Final Payment (Est.)	156
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$1,139</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$1,873</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Hoffman Estates
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$178
FY-1974	129
FY-1975	125
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>432</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	128
Final Payment (Est.)	68
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>628</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>812</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Joliet
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$1,331
FY-1974	877
FY-1975	946
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>3,154</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	1,095
Final Payment (Est.)	578
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>4,827</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>6,920</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Lansing
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$150
FY-1974	119
FY-1975	153
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>422</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	161
Final Payment (Est.)	80
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>663</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>954</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Monmouth
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 186
FY-1974	184
FY-1975	173
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>543</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	167
Final Payment (Est.)	88
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>798</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>1,059</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Mount Prospect
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 251
FY-1974	229
FY-1975	218
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	\$ <u>698</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 271
Final Payment (Est.)	143
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$1,112</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$1,711</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

X

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Niles
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 432
FY-1974	312
FY-1975	301
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$1,045</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 341
Final Payment (Est.)	180
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$1,566</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$2,157</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Oak Forest
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 133
FY-1974	106
FY-1975	101
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$ 340</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 100
Final Payment (Est.)	53
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$ 493</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$ 632</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Oak Lawn
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 573
FY-1974	439
FY-1975	482
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$1,494</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 478
Final Payment (Est.)	253
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$2,225</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$3,025</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

X

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Palatine
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 142
FY-1974	169
FY-1975	156
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$ 467</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 157
Final Payment (Est.)	83
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$ 707</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$ 991</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Park Forest
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 276
FY-1974	204
FY-1975	187
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$ 667</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 197
Final Payment (Est.)	104
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$ 968</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$1,247</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Park Ridge
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 270
FY-1974	207
FY-1975	193
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$ 670</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 204
Final Payment (Est.)	108
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$ 982</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$1,292</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Robbins
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 136
FY-1974	118
FY-1975	109
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$ 363</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 132
Final Payment (Est.)	70
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$ 565</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$ 835</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of South Hollands
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 155
FY-1974	134
FY-1975	128
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$ 417</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 136
Final Payment (Est.)	72
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u><u>\$ 625</u></u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u><u>\$ 860</u></u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Skokie
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Village</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 554
FY-1974	434
FY-1975	402
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$1,390</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 414
Final Payment (Est.)	219
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u><u>\$2,023</u></u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u><u>\$2,619</u></u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Waukegan
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$1,153
FY-1974	858
FY-1975	898
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>2,909</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	918
Final Payment (Est.)	486
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>4,313</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>5,809</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the Village of Western Springs
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 65
FY-1974	49
FY-1975	49
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>163</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	57
Final Payment (Est.)	28
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>248</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>334</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Wheaton
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 281
FY-1974	230
FY-1975	236
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>747</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	313
Final Payment (Est.)	148
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>1,208</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>1,773</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Elmhurst
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 519
FY-1974	373
FY-1975	364
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>1,256</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	372
Final Payment (Est.)	197
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>1,825</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>2,352</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Blue Island
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 190
FY-1974	142
FY-1975	128
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>460</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	166
Final Payment (Est.)	88
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>714</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>1,047</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Grand Rapids
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 4,735
FY-1974	3,601
FY-1975	3,447
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>11,783</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	3,903
Final Payment (Est.)	2,043
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>17,729</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>22,250</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Benton Harbor
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 618
FY-1974	467
FY-1975	469
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>1,554</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	453
Final Payment (Est.)	237
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>2,244</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>3,252</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.



General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Michigan
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$1,274
FY-1974	957
FY-1975	764
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>2,995</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	836
Final Payment (Est.)	442
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>4,273</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>5,202</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Crown Point
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$102
FY-1974	75
FY-1975	70
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>247</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	82
Final Payment (Est.)	44
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>373</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>584</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of La Crosse
(In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 804
FY-1974	569
FY-1975	993
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>2,366</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	904
Final Payment (Est.)	477
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>3,747</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>5,693</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.
2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.



September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the City of Wisconsin Rapids
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>City</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 654
FY-1974	388
FY-1975	371
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$1,413</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 515
Final Payment (Est.)	271
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$2,199</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$3,231</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary Fy-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 30, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the State of Illinois
 (In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>State Government</u>	<u>Local Government</u>	<u>Total for State Area</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 139,351	\$ 220,804	\$ 360,155
FY-1974	104,285	208,250	312,535
FY-1975	103,805	208,195	312,000
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	\$ <u>347,441</u>	\$ <u>637,249</u>	\$ <u>984,690</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 107,246	\$ 214,488	\$ 321,734
Final Payment (Est.)	56,274	112,505	168,779
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	\$ <u>510,961</u>	\$ <u>964,242</u>	\$ <u>1,475,203</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>673,177</u>	<u>\$1,346,397</u>	<u>\$2,019,574</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the State of Indiana
 (In thousands)

Date: September 29, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>State Government</u>	<u>Local Governments</u>	<u>Total for State Area</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 57,998	\$116,172	\$174,170
FY-1974	43,531	86,537	130,068
FY-1975	42,533	85,350	127,883
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>144,062</u>	<u>288,059</u>	<u>432,121</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	42,940	85,930	128,870
Final Payment (Est.)	22,528	44,924	67,452
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$209,530</u>	<u>\$418,913</u>	<u>\$628,443</u>
TOTAL Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$269,576</u>	<u>\$539,283</u>	<u>\$808,859</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under existing program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

General Revenue Sharing
 Payments & Estimated Allocations to the State of Michigan
 (In thousands)

Date: September 30, 1975

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>State Government</u>	<u>Local Governments</u>	<u>Total for State Area</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$114,810	\$ 229,069	\$ 343,879
FY-1974	86,765	173,261	260,026
FY-1975	87,151	175,392	262,543
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$288,726</u>	<u>\$577,722</u>	<u>\$866,448</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	88,990	178,109	267,099
Final Payment (Est.)	46,565	93,017	139,582
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$424,281</u>	<u>\$848,848</u>	<u>\$1,273,129</u>
TOTAL Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>\$557,024</u>	<u>\$1,114,161</u>	<u>\$1,671,185</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under existing program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.

September 29, 1975

General Revenue Sharing
Payments & Estimated Allocations to the State of Wisconsin
(In thousands)

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>State Government</u>	<u>Local Government</u>	<u>Total for State Area</u>
FY-1973 ¹	\$ 68,036	\$ 135,512	\$ 203,548
FY-1974	51,208	103,668	154,876
FY-1975	51,727	103,194	154,921
Total Payments Thru July 7, 1975	<u>\$ 170,971</u>	<u>\$ 342,374</u>	<u>\$ 513,345</u>
FY-1976 (Est.)	\$ 53,517	\$ 107,033	\$ 160,550
Final Payment (Est.)	28,201	56,374	84,575
TOTAL Est. Payments under Existing Program	<u>\$ 252,689</u>	<u>\$ 505,781</u>	<u>\$ 758,470</u>
Total Est. Added Allo- cations Under Proposed Bill ²	<u>337,347</u>	<u>\$ 674,719</u>	<u>\$1,012,066</u>

1. Includes payments retroactive to January 1, 1972.

2. Does not include Estimated Final Payment shown above under Existing Program.

NOTE: All estimates for FY-1976 and later are based on preliminary FY-1976 data elements (population, per capita income, tax effort, etc.) used in the revenue sharing formula to compute allocations. As new data becomes available and is used in future years, it will cause actual allocations to differ to some degree from current estimates.