

members of the federal government, protecting the health and safety of the nation; the next day they are handed a slip of paper and sent home with no idea when they will be paid. That is no way to motivate a work force, let alone demonstrate respect for it.

The daily payroll cost for the furlough of employees is no small matter—even if employees are paid retroactively for their days out of work. But there are consequences of the cavalier treatment of the federal work force that will be felt long after the government is back in business.

A government that is in gridlock—worse yet, shuttered—does little to bolster a political system already losing the public's confidence. It downright debilitates its own work force. As a furloughed federal economist said during the last interruption, "Can you imagine a Fortune 500 company operating like this? If they had a dispute between their board of directors and their president, and they sent everybody home?" And in addition to the effect on morale, can such interruption be supposed to be a help to the work they do?

In an open letter to federal employees, President Clinton and Vice President Gore signaled their recognition of the shabby treatment afforded the federal work force: "you remain good people caught in what Churchill called the 'worst system of government devised by the wit of man, except for all the others,'" they wrote. Good people—and they are—should not be made to pay for the failures of their leaders. Getting federal employees out of the middle and back on the job is the way to respect them.●

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR STEVE HETTINGER

● Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Huntsville, AL, Mayor Steve Hettinger, announced in October that he would not seek reelection in 1996. He has been in Huntsville's top administrative post since 1988. Prior to becoming mayor, he was in the State legislature for 6 years, served for 4 years as an aide to former Congressman Ronnie Flipppo, and worked as an engineer.

Huntsville has witnessed dramatic growth and progress under the dynamic leadership of Mayor Hettinger. It has continued its long-range capital improvements program. He and other city leaders took an active role in persuading the Base Realignment and Closure Commission to move 2,600 Army jobs to Huntsville. Early in his tenure, he was instrumental in the passage of slope-development controls. Many urged him to mount a race for the Senate next year, but he declined.

Other accomplishments include the city's community plan "Vision 2000," road construction, the establishment of community facilities and long-term investments, and improvements in public safety, public works, and government efficiency. In 1989, the city council passed a half-cent sales tax increase, the revenue from which was used to improve city schools. No other general tax increase has been enacted. Mayor Hettinger has represented the city of Huntsville well. He is on good terms with corporate executives and is close to key State legislators.

In a highly unusual development, Mayor Hettinger and the city council

were able to balance the 1995 city budget and carry over nearly \$8 million to the 1996 budget year. He made a promise to do everything in his power to hold down spending while at the same time retain the quality and level of service to which residents had come accustomed. The fiscal austerity that resulted from this wise promise was difficult, as is always the case when government programs are affected. The efforts of the mayor and city council paid off in a big way, however, as the books were balanced and a surplus resulted. In these times, this is truly an incredible feat. The citizens of Huntsville are now mulling over what to do with the extra money. We can only dream of such success at the Federal level. Mayor Hettinger should be commended for this budgetary success—success from which we could learn a thing or two.

Steve Hettinger moved to Huntsville in 1967 after graduating from Mississippi State University with a degree in engineering. He attended the University of Alabama in Huntsville and worked in the space program. He earned a master's degree in industrial and systems engineering from UAH in 1974. He is currently the president of the Alabama League of Municipalities.

I know that Mayor Hettinger still has a great deal he wants to accomplish before he leaves office, and I am sure that he will accomplish much over the next year. He is really the first mayor of modern Huntsville, coming as he does from the ranks of the technocrats, and I mean that in the best sense of the term. He has improved efficiency dramatically, and Huntsville is a much better city because of his leadership and contributions. I wish him all the best for the future.●

UTAH WILDERNESS BILL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as you know, I have joined with other members of the Utah delegation and Governor Leavitt in introducing S. 884, the Utah Public Lands Management Act, also known as the Utah wilderness bill. Since we introduced this bill earlier this summer, we have been criticized up and down by opponents of S. 884 that the extensive process we engaged in to study and eventually recommend over 1.8 million acres in 49 wilderness areas was not extensive enough. Since January, over 22,000 public comments have been submitted, over 45 public hearings were held and 600 personal testimonies were accepted. However, our critics choose to overlook this fact as well as the fact that it is time to bring to closure this 20-year-old debate.

Mr. President, I ask that the following document be printed in the RECORD at the proper place as proof that the public comment process has indeed been extensive. This is an excerpt from a publication by the Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000. It details the extensive process which the coalition, joined by members of Utah's

environmental community and county commissioners and citizens of Emery County, undertook to discuss and resolve the issue of wilderness. Unfortunately, cost and space limitations will prohibit the inclusion of the entire text. I would encourage those who are interested in the full report to contact the coalition at the address following the excerpt. I commend these folks for their tremendous efforts to reach consensus on one of the most difficult and contentious public lands issues in our State. I believe this report illustrates just how extensive the process has been. I wish to express my thanks to the Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000 for the time and effort they have spent in conceiving and implementing this pilot project.

The material follows:

A PROJECT OF THE COALITION FOR UTAH'S FUTURE/PROJECT 2000

INTRODUCTION

In twelve short months, a traditional rural community in Utah moved from what appeared to be a deeply seated, anti-environmental sentiment to a protection oriented public lands agenda. Involved Emery County leaders and citizens alike, are now publicly espousing the desire to work with disparate parties and land managers to solve problems and seek mutually beneficial land protection mechanisms. How did this rather dramatic transformation in the county's approach to public lands issues occur? The answer involves the willingness of several visionary county and environmental leaders to be the "guinea pig" in a cooperatively designed Community and Wild Lands Futures Pilot Project sponsored by the Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000 (CUF), a non-profit, multi-issue organization comprised of diverse community leaders interested in a quality future for all Utah citizens. It also involves the surfacing of values, long held within the county but unacknowledged, due to the acrimonious nature of environmental disputes throughout Utah and the West over the past fifteen years.

The pilot was conceived in the summer of 1993 when CUF's conflict resolution consultant, Susan Carpenter, put a hypothetical question before a group of some 25 disparate stakeholders interested in resolving the conflict over Utah's BLM wilderness designation issue. She asked participants to assume the year is 1999, and that a Utah BLM wilderness bill, which everyone could support, had just been signed into law. "What", she asked, "are the steps beginning in 1999 and then working backwards to 1993, that led to the passage of this bill?" The group's response to this question became the basis for the conceptualization of the Community and Wild Lands Futures Pilot Project (CWFP). CWFP, they hoped, could become a model for other rural Utah communities and interested parties in the West.

The word future is key here. Conservationists in the design group reasoned that helping communities articulate their values, visions, and goals for an "ideal" future, would enable citizens to move beyond current problems and contentious issues toward a more pro-active plan based on commonly shared community values and "sense of place". This, they also theorized would lay a more productive foundation for subsequent discussions regarding environmentally sensitive, adjacent public lands. Rural leaders in the design group supported this community-based, grassroots approach. They expressed

the need for local empowerment and a seat at the table when making decisions regarding public lands issues affecting their future.

The group boiled these ideas down to three community questions, which were to be followed by broad-based wild lands futures deliberations in a focused geographic area. The community questions were: What do we have?, What do we want?, and What can we do?. In short, the hypotheses proved correct. Asking citizens what they valued, how they wanted the future to look, and exploring options to achieve this vision on the front side of a county-wide general planning initiative, led to outcomes such as: 1. the formation of a public lands council, 2. county agreement to enter wild lands futures deliberations with a broad range of interests and affected parties from within and without the county, 3. a county proposal for the protection of over 500,000 acres of BLM land (including 184,000 acres of wilderness), and 4. the conceptualization of a public lands institute involving cooperative partnerships with the BLM and other agencies for the preservation and management of the San Rafael Swell.

COMMUNITY AND WILD LANDS FUTURES PILOT PROJECT (CWFP)

In the summer of 1993, the broad-based group of stakeholder volunteers known as the Process Advisory Group, including decision-makers and resource representatives, gave birth to the Community and Wild Lands Futures Pilot Project. As described in the opening of this paper, when challenged to consider how a wilderness bill passed Congress by working backwards from 1999, the Process Advisory Group agreed that the first step should be community-based. Out of the discussions came the following project goals:

1. Address community and wild lands futures in a rational and scientific manner.
2. Create a grass roots process for comprehensive local community planning and sustainability.
3. Identify resources to enrich the process and generate useful information to share.
4. Connect the local visioning/planning process with the issue of public wild land futures and with state and national processes and players.
5. Develop a broad based recommendation for the classification of public wild lands in the pilot region.
6. Educate the broader general public about rural planning and community self-determination, and ecosystem management of natural systems and wild lands issues.
7. Create a replicable model.

A concept paper was circulated among approximately 300 interested parties at national, regional, state and local levels requesting constructive feedback. The reviews were favorable, which meant the next task was to select from one of several receptive pilot communities. In October of 1993, Emery County became the chosen community for the pilot project, and the newly formed Canyon County Partnership (CCP) received CUF funding to initiate staff support.

Today, the seed is germinating and concepts are maturing. County initiated deliberations include ideas to 1. develop a resource area partnership among Emery County, the BLM, the Forest Service, and other public land users, 2. become a nationally supported pilot program, and 3. conceptualize a non-profit San Rafael Swell Institute. Today, Emery County is proposing and exploring a planning/management partnership arrangement with the BLM. The purpose would be to:

Incorporate direct local involvement in land management agency planning processes.

Incorporate direct local involvement in land management agency decision-making processes.

Reconcile differences between the Emery County Master Plan and the planning goals and objective of the land management agencies.

Develop consistency between the ordinances and regulations of the federal and county entities.

Cooperate in law enforcement activities. Cooperate in the provision of emergency services.

Cooperate in the permitting, design, placement, construction, and costs of public facilities (roads, buildings, etc.).

Cooperate in the facilitation of allowable uses.

Cooperate in the mitigation of impacts from various uses.

Cooperatively work to resolve local conflicts between uses, users, and stakeholders.

Leverage the limited resources of the local and Federal entities through coordinated efforts.

Share in a joint stewardship over the public lands within Emery County.

CUF believes it is a major accomplishment that Emery County is now adopting cooperative, problem-solving principles in newly conceived public lands initiatives within the County.

APPLICATION OF THE MODEL

In conclusion, the Community and Wild Lands Futures Pilot Project did advance environmental decision-making through inclusive community and interest group participation. Outcomes are evolving and project participant evaluations were overwhelmingly favorable. OPB's Brad Barber writes, "It [the project] taught us that this type of thing may work in the future. Once a wilderness bill is done in Utah—we should talk about moving into cooperative management." CUF board member and Moab Times Editor, Sam Taylor says, "In the event the [Utah delegation] bill does not become law, CUF has laid the ground work that will still lead to piece-meal resolution for the BLM wilderness issue. We have given them a road-map," he concludes.

Many participants believe that the pilot has application value for comprehensive planning efforts in rural areas, and some can see it being applied to growth management, transportation, education and topical problems in urban areas. It clearly is recognized as being superior to the conventional approach of deriving local input from a couple of perfunctory public hearings. Jane Brass suggests that the need for disseminating information regarding the pilot model "is pervasive as states struggle with public lands issues." She cautions that communities should not have consultants dictate a quick way out. Rather, she recommends working through a process to "find answers that will be more acceptable to your community". Another participant echoed the concern that it could be dangerous to create a "cook book approach". The emphasis from a model should be on need and a few questions to ask in the beginning, he cautioned. Chairman Petersen advises other rural county leaders, who might be considering a similar planning model, "1. Put together a good steering group, 2. Listen to their input, and 3. Listen to people from other areas and take advantage of their successes and failures."

COMMUNITY VISIONS: A CATALYST FOR CREATING POSITIVE FUTURES

CWFP demonstrated that engaging local citizens in discussions about their values and visions of the future enabled them to develop solid plans for economic development and empowered them to approach the highly polarized issue of wilderness as an issue which could be resolved with their traditional adversaries, not as a battle to be won.

The constructive progress made by the county in the relatively short time will con-

tinue to bear fruit for the county on public lands issues and other matters of county interest. In reference to "Discovering Common Ground" by Marvin Weisbord, project consultant, Susan Carpenter, summarizes her perspective. She writes, "Weisbord makes the point that creating the tension between what we have and what we really want is a much more effective way to get what we want than the more traditional methods of problem-solving and conflict management (identify the problem and then develop options to solve it). My experience bears this out. I see the Coalition's Emery County Community/Wild Lands Futures Project as a powerful, effective model which can be applied to a wide range of issues at the county and state level across the West." Currently, CUF is moving forward with an initiative focused on quality growth in Utah. History will reveal whether we, as a whole and increasingly diverse community in Utah and the West, are able to build on the lessons learned from the Emery County experience.●

TRIBUTE TO AN INDISPENSABLE AMERICAN

● 1Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last month I was proud to learn that a member of my staff received an extraordinary accolade that is as fitting as it is complimentary. U.S. News & World Report named Stanley Israelite, my friend, counsel, and senior adviser in my State office in Connecticut, as 1 of 12 "indispensable Americans." It was an honor and a tribute, but not a surprise. Stanley's friends, his colleagues—and most certainly the people of Connecticut—have known that for years.

The best decision I ever made was hiring Stanley Israelite. He has been a dedicated public servant in every sense of the term, and I have trusted his counsel and treasured his companionship throughout my 21 years as a Member of Congress. Mr. President, it is with pride, admiration, and deference that I ask that this article from the November 27, 1995 issue of U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

HOUNDING THE BUREAUCRATS

(By James Popkin)

Lots of people's problems with their government aren't ideological, they're logistical. That's why many rely on the congressional aides like Stanley Israelite to help them fight their battles with government agencies.

At age 70, Stanley Israelite is fighting a crusade to prove the cynics wrong. Since 1975, when the gravelly voiced former Brooklynite first went to work for then Rep. Christopher Dodd (now a senator), Israelite has helped thousands of Connecticut citizens replace lost passports, track down late tax refunds, ship dearly departed to grieving families overseas and even bail the occasional misbehaving Connecticut teenager out of Mexican jails.

All successful members of Congress have staffers like Israelite who can goose reluctant bureaucrats into action. Although Dodd happens to be a Democrat, effective constituent service is a congressional specialty that cuts across political lines. It's first and foremost a matter of good politics: Good service results in happy voters. But what distinguishes Israelite is his gusto for the job. And his not-so-artful technique: "When I call