

PROCEEDINGS
NINTH ANNUAL COMMUNITY
GROWTH CONFERENCE



INSTITUTE OF REGIONAL AFFAIRS
WILKES COLLEGE
WILKES-BARRE, PENNSYLVANIA

ARCHIVES

JS333
L8W682
9th, 1969

PROCEEDINGS

NINTH ANNUAL COMMUNITY GROWTH CONFERENCE

EUGENE SHEDDEN FARLEY LIBRARY

1933

WILKES COLLEGE WILKES-BARRE, PA.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1969

WILKES-BARRE, PENNSYLVANIA

Institute of Regional Affairs

Wilkes College

Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18703

ARCHIVES

JS333

L8W682

9th, 1969

FOREWORD

In recent years we have become quite conscious of the idea of the "New Federalism" in the United States. The Committee for Economic Development in its 1966 report entitled "Modern Local Government" emphasized the idea that many of our local municipalities, authorities, and special districts have become obsolete. At one period in our history, these local governmental structures were well designed and served a very useful purpose.

We are now in an area of great technological change. Twenty years ago Buck Rogers and a trip to the Moon was a figment of the imagination of its creator. Now it is reality. However, here on earth, adaptation to change has been very slow. The citizenry has been most reluctant to adapt local government to a twenty-first century role.

The problems of a municipality are increasingly larger. Better services such as police protection, fire protection, waste disposal and many of the other normal functions of the municipality are becoming too expensive for our municipalities to handle. The purpose of the Ninth Annual Community Growth Conference is to examine some of these problems not from a community or municipal approach, but rather from a regional approach. Thus the focus of the Conference on the term "Regionalism".

A region may be defined in a number of ways. It may be thought of geographically, politically, ethnically or in many other ways. A region may be large such as the megalopolis as described by Jean Gottman, or it may be the standard metropolitan statistical code as defined by the Bureau of Census, or perhaps it could include the confines of the region as defined by the Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania.

This conference will attempt to present to its participants a greater understanding of the term Regionalism on a relatively small scale just taking into consideration a few of the practical problems of our region such as the problem of mass transit and the increasingly important problem of solid waste management.

Hugo V. Mailey, Director
Institute of Regional Affairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreward..... ii

Table of Contents..... iii

Program v

Sponsors vii

Introductory Remarks by Dr. Eugene S. Farley 1

"THE NEW WAVE OF REGIONALISM"

Introductory Remarks by Donald D. Moyer 2

"Why Regionalism?"

 by Ralph R. Widner 3

"MASS TRANSIT"

Introductory Remarks by Edward Schechter 11

"The Erie Experience with Mass Transportation"

 by Thomas Burke 12

"Research and Development for a Balanced State Transportation System"

 by Edwin W. Bickhart 15

"SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT"

Introductory Remarks by Ellsworth C. Salisbury, Jr. 24

"The Proposed Solid Waste Disposal Program in Allegheny County"

 by Maurice A. Shapiro 26

"Factors and Attitudes in Solid Waste Management"

 by Albert J. Klee 31

"The Role of Private Enterprise in Solid Waste Disposal"

 by Samuel J. Joseph..... 38

"WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE COUNTY?"

Introductory Remarks by Edmund C. Wideman, Jr. 44

"What is the Role of the County in Regionalism?"

 by Bernard F. Hillenbrand..... 45

"PHILLIPS 66"

 Remarks of the Moderator by James Lee 57

Discussion Guide -- Mass Transit.....	58
Discussion Summaries -- Mass Transit	
by	
Frank Chadwick	59
Donald D. Moyer	61
James F. Furey	63
Discussion Guide -- Solid Waste	65
Discussion Summaries -- Solid Waste	
by	
Ellsworth C. Salisbury	66
Mrs. Marjorie Bart	69
Robert Betzler	71
Joseph A. Macialek	73
Leo A. Corbett	75
Frederick J. Karl	77
Eugene F. Borofski	79
Willis W. Jones	81
Introductory Remarks by Mrs. Frank Henry	83
"APERCU"	
by Tom Bigler	84
Closing Remarks by Dr. Hugo V. Mailey	86
Roster of Attendance.....	87

NINTH ANNUAL COMMUNITY GROWTH CONFERENCE

September 24, 1969

"REGIONALISM"

8:30 - 9:30 A.M. Breakfast Wilkes College
New Dormitory

Registration: Marjorie Bart, Wilkes-Barre City Councilwoman
Welcome: Dr. Eugene S. Farley, President, Wilkes College
Chairman: Donald D. Moyer, Economic Development Council NPA
Topic: THE NEW WAVE OF REGIONALISM
Speaker: Ralph R. Widner, Executive Director,
Appalachian Regional Commission

9:45 - 11:45 A.M. Wilkes College
Fine Arts Center

Topic: MASS TRANSIT
Chairman: Edward Schechter, Committee,
Luzerne/Lackawanna Transportation Study
Panelists: Thomas Burke, General Manager
Erie Metropolitan Transit Authority
Edwin W. Bickhart, Chief, Mass Transit Division
Department of Community Affairs

Coffee Break

11:00 A. M. Wilkes College
Fine Arts Center

Topic: SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT
Chairman: Ellsworth C. Salisbury, Jr. Executive Vice President
Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce
Panelists: Maurice A. Shapiro, Graduate School of Public Health
University of Pittsburgh
Albert J. Klee, Chief, Bureau of Solid Waste Mgmt., HEW
Samuel J. Joseph, Vice President
United Municipal Corporation, Harrisburg

12:00 - 2:00 P.M. Luncheon Hotel Sterling
Crystal Ballroom

Topic: WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE COUNTY?

Chairman: Edmund C. Wideman, Jr.
Board of County Commissioners
Luzerne County

Speaker: Bernard F. Hillenbrand, Executive Director
National Association of Counties
"PHILLIPS 66"

2:15 - 3:15 P.M.

Hotel Sterling
Crystal Ballroom

Chairman: James Lee, Assistant to the Editor
Times Leader Evening News

3:30 - 4:00 P.M.

"APERCU"

Hotel Sterling
Crystal Ballroom

Chairman: Mrs. Frank M. Henry, President
Junior League of Wilkes-Barre

Speaker: Tom Bigler, News Director, WBRE-TV

4:00 - 5:30 P.M.

Cocktail Hour

Hotel Sterling
Adams Room

SPONSORS

East Side Landfill Authority

Glance and Glance

Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce

Greater Nanticoke Chamber of Commerce

Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce

Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce

Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce

Home Builders Association
of Northeastern Pennsylvania

Jenkins Township Land Fill

Junior League of Wilkes-Barre

Luzerne County Borough Association

Northeastern National Bank

Pocono Mountains Chamber of Commerce

Redevelopment Authority
of the City of Wilkes-Barre

Alan M. Voorhees and Associates, Inc.

WILK Radio

WNEP - TV

West Side Landfill Authority

Wilkes-Barre Transit Authority

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

by

Dr. Eugene S. Farley, President
Wilkes College

It is indeed my pleasure to welcome all of you to the Ninth Annual Community Growth Conference. Many of you have joined with us in this Annual Conference to discuss the problems that affect all of Northeastern Pennsylvania. It is especially appropriate this year that we discuss the topic of "Regionalism". For those of us in higher education, we realize that there must be a greater relationship between the many and varied municipalities in Northeastern Pennsylvania. And being prompted by report issued just a few years ago by the Council of Economic Development entitled "Modern Local Government", we realize that we can no longer think in terms of specific municipalities, but rather in terms of a region. Wilkes College has played an important part in bringing together the independent colleges of Northeastern Pennsylvania. The College was also instrumental in establishing what is now known as the Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania. The theme of this Conference is aimed at taking a look at but a few of the basic problems of Regionalism. We hope that these problems will be fully explored in our proceedings today.

Therefore, we here at the College are extremely happy to be hosts and we hope that the discussions, comments and messages of the speakers will be of value to all of the public officials and interested citizens who are present today. It is indeed an honor for Wilkes College through the Institute of Regional Affairs to be the hosts for a program that will deal with the major problems of our region.

INTRODUCTION

of
Ralph R. Widner, Executive Director
Appalachian Regional Commission
by
Donald D. Moyer
Economic Development Council, NPA

I am very pleased and honored to have been selected as the Chairman for the opening session of the Ninth Annual Community Growth Conference. I am especially pleased since the over-all theme of the Conference is one that is of vital interest to me. In my position with the Economic Development Council, we cover a seven-county area in Northeastern Pennsylvania which we like to call a single region.

It is hoped that through the discussion this morning that a dialogue can be developed that will help lead to a breaking down of the barriers to Regionalism and the creation of new positions for cooperation.

Our speaker at the opening session is certainly a man of vast experience in treating the problems of Regionalism from his post as Executive Director of the Appalachian Regional Commission. His topic, of course, will be "The New Wave of Regionalism."

"WHY REGIONALISM?"

by

Ralph R. Widner, Executive Director
Appalachian Regional Commission

In the U. S. today we confront a wide range of domestic problems with which it is extremely difficult for local jurisdictions or states, by themselves, to deal. A new approach -- the cooperative, regional approach -- is developing as one way to solve such problems.

We have recognized for a long time that our water problems, for example, cannot be solved unless the states and jurisdictions in a river basin, such as the Susquehanna, are willing to work together with the national government in solving them.

As air pollution becomes an increasingly serious menace to public health, we have been forced to recognize that the atmosphere ignores political boundaries and that our air sheds cover vast territories that cross the lines of many local governments and states.

The problems of our cities cross innumerable local boundaries, and 30 of our larger metropolitan areas cross state lines.

Perhaps the most important reason for us to have finally recognized the need for cooperation between states and between localities has been the profound change during the last several decades in the way and where the American people live.

Since the end of World War II, the face of the U. S. has been drastically altered by massive migrations of people from rural areas into cities. About 35 million persons have shifted from the countryside into the metropolitan areas of the country since 1945. As a result, half the counties in the U. S. lost population between 1949 and 1960, despite the fact that the population of the U. S., during the same period increased by 47 million. Half of all our population growth in the nation is now occurring in metropolitan areas containing more than one million persons.

This is the largest migration of human beings in the history of mankind and it has led to two very severe and closely related problems.

On the one hand, the rural areas and our smaller communities have suffered a tax drain as people and their incomes have moved away. This makes it even more difficult for rural governments to provide the local services their citizens require, and this has the effect of driving still more people away to the metropolitan areas.

On the other side of the coin, our metropolitan areas are breaking down as these migrants jam into the ghettos and the economically better-off move out of the central city into the suburbs.

Intolerable tensions are building up behind these little Chinese walls of political boundaries. Rural communities are going broke. And the suburbs prosper and sprawl, duplicating the services and the facilities once provided by the nearby cities and smaller communities.

Politically, our metropolitan areas find it almost impossible to deal with many of their problems in a sensible fashion. They are splintered into a host of small governments.

To a certain extent our metropolitan areas are "inside out". The specialized, white-collar jobs and services find the city center the logical location, but the people who work at those jobs seek the attractive surroundings and space of the suburbs. On the other hand, the labor using, manufacturing jobs required by ghetto residents must locate outside the central city to find enough land and lower costs of congestion. And the more unskilled service jobs tend to be available outside the central city, too. Thus in our metropolitan areas the jobs are separated from the people who need them by a rather substantial bus fare, at least.

In the rural areas this drain of people has meant that many of the smaller jurisdictions are less and less able to generate the tax base required to provide adequate public services in such vital fields as education, health, waste removal, and transportation. This only aggravates their inability to attract economic growth, and this lack stimulates still more out-migration to the cities, which further compounds the metropolitan problems.

None of this is news to Northeastern Pennsylvania. Many of the rural areas in the Upper Susquehanna Valley have been losing people for a long time, and they are hard put to find the taxes to provide the services that their present population requires.

And right here in the cities of Wyoming Valley we have lost many people, too. And there are a good many jurisdictions lining the Valley, each with their own special pride but all of them with some common needs and problems.

The question is: What can we do about these needs in both the rural and urban centers of Northeastern Pennsylvania?

There are several things that can be done, but the first requirement is that we recognize that all of us are in this together, whether we live in the Valley or up on the plateau. We can achieve the kind of future most of us believe in if we are willing to abandon some of our old rivalries in exchange for an alliance under which we can tackle some of our bigger problems together.

The first thing needed to make that possible is some good sound State legislation, and fortunately Pennsylvania is finally in a position to move out on this front. The amendments to the State Constitution in 1968 give us unparalleled opportunities to devise new approaches to our problems.

The Appalachian Commission--the country's biggest example of regional cooperation, linking as it does 13 states and the Federal Government--recently provided funds to the Commonwealth to survey the local government problems in the 52 Appalachian counties of Pennsylvania.

That report points out that the area government provisions contained in the State Constitution should be interpreted broadly and implemented flexibly so that local government in Pennsylvania can develop their own unique approach to their problems. The General Assembly should not compromise the potential contained in these provisions in the Constitution through unwise and restrictive legislation.

The report points out the need for strong state leadership in implementing the intergovernmental powers which are authorized under the Constitution so that a better level of services can be provided, particularly in rural areas, by spreading the cost of services, among the many jurisdictions.

Few Pennsylvanians realize it, but this State has the largest rural population in the country--over three million persons. This represents just about one-fourth of all the people in the State and it is fair to say that many of them are underserved in many fields of public service.

At the same time, we have more local jurisdictions per county than any state. It makes little sense for each jurisdiction to meet local service needs by itself, duplicating that of its neighbors, if that same service can be provided more efficiently and economically by sharing the service among a group of communities.

It is not difficult for reasonable people to agree that it is easier for an individual tax payer to bear the cost of a new sanitation system or a new water system or a new airport or a new vocational and technical center, or a new health center or hospital, if the costs are spread among as many taxpayers as possible and among all jurisdictions that will benefit.

Too often in the past, however, local pride has triumphed at the expense of local pocketbooks. Those few of us left who remember World War II refer to this as the "Kamikaze" instinct. It is cutting off our noses to spite our faces.

In Appalachia we believe that a new and more economical way of providing public services can be developed if we can all work together.

This regional approach recognizes that towns and countryside are tied together. We look to towns for many of our services and jobs. The towns look to the countryside for their customers, the agriculture and resource requirements for the town economy, many of the workers who will man the manufacturing plants, and recreation opportunities.

Think of the United States as made up of several "functional economic areas" within the towns and countryside are locked together economically through commuting patterns, retail trade patterns, professional services, and so forth.

In Appalachia such areas, embracing several counties which tend to look to the same towns for their retail services and professional services and their jobs, share commuting patterns and administrative and political ties, are called "development districts." The Economic Development Council represents the seven-county area here in North-eastern Pennsylvania.

The job within each of these areas is to develop an approach to development that unites the towns and the countryside in a special way so that all the people of the area can share in the brighter future we hope to build.

How?

A New Delivery System for Jobs and Services

Slowly in Appalachia a new delivery system for services and employment in rural as well as urban areas has been designed.

Visualize something like a wagon wheel with several rims, one inside the other; at the hub is a key community or communities where many of the specialized services and jobs supporting a large surrounding rural area are located.

Spokes -- Interstate, Appalachian Development, and Primary highways--radiate from that hub out toward the rural areas and beyond, linking it and the area to national markets.

Move out from that hub. Imagine a ring of smaller towns where many local services and local jobs are located.

Far out on or near the rim of the wheel are the more isolated rural areas. In Appalachia many people live there. Here special public services in health, education and employment to serve the people residing in these areas are being located, and they are being given the transportation network they need to get the new jobs and services.

Delivery System for Education

Now superimpose upon that wheel a delivery system for education and you will begin to see how it works.

At the hub is an area vocational and technical center providing advanced technical training.

Move out on one of the highways to one of the smaller towns and you will find a high school-level vocational school that is a satellite to the area center. A student at one of the high school-level vocational schools may decide to take advanced training. If he is close enough he is transported to the area center at the hub each day; if too far, residential facilities at the area center are provided to house him. The satellite schools are linked to the area centers in many ways. They exchange faculty. They assist in placements. Students move back and forth. Library and technical equipment is shared.

What you are seeing is the vocational system, for example, being built with Appalachian assistance in Eastern Kentucky.

Right now the counties in central Pennsylvania, with Appalachian funds, are preparing for such an approach as the West Branch of the Susquehanna.

Similar efforts are getting underway to upgrade secondary as well as vocational education through area-sharing of school services and through the use of special area - serving technologies, including computer-assisted education.

Through such cooperation, quality education can be provided at a lower cost to the taxpayer.

A Health Delivery System

Superimpose upon this same "wagon wheel" delivery system an approach to health services.

Visualize, if you will, at the hub a regional health center with a full range of specialized services. At such a facility, the most delicate brain surgery might be possible.

Move out to the smaller towns where smaller general hospitals can be located that are capable of performing more routine operations, tonsillectomies and appendectomies.

Out on the rim, local community public health centers capable of identifying people with health problems can be located.

Let us suppose a gentleman appears at the community health center for a chest X-ray. The center detects a serious lung ailment. He can be referred to the physicians and health facility in his area capable of handling his problem, and transported via a new emergency transport network, including, in the more remote parts of Appalachia, helicopter ambulances.

This is the kind of health delivery system we are building under the comprehensive health program in Appalachia.

Such health planning is getting underway in central Pennsylvania, down the river from here.

Other Services

But success in such an undertaking requires the most harmonious cooperation between jurisdictions at all levels of government.

At the local level, municipalities and counties must work together if we are to build quality area schools, area health facilities, area sanitation systems, area water supplies, instead of fragmented below-par services which many jurisdictions can only afford.

The people deserve better of their governments, and our job is to see that this is accomplished.

In creating the Wyoming Valley Sanitary Sewer Authority you are moving in this direction, and soon let us hope that people will feel the benefits of that venture.

Today you are going to discuss solid waste disposal and mass transit. But there are many services we can provide better together than separately.

Let us realize that in many areas of Northeastern Pennsylvania the space for large-scale growth is outside our older communities.

Watch the future between the Interstates on the Pocono Plateau or down in the Conyngham Valley along the Shortway. We will soon see a new world for Northeastern Pennsylvania in such areas.

If we allow matters to take their course, this growth will come helter-skelter. The rural jurisdictions where it will come will be forced to duplicate expensive services and facilities already available in older nearby cities.

The cities will suffer because they will not benefit from the growth occurring and their services will decline.

The result will be increased costs to the taxpayer in both the rural townships and the urban centers.

Just another case of having cut off our nose to spite our face.

But there is another option--the sensible one.

Is it not possible for all of us to sit down together and prepare a set of intergovernmental contracts between rural township and older city that will spare the township added costs of providing services--schools, hospitals, fire, police, sewage treatment, etc.--by sharing them with nearby communities while at the same time making it possible for the new growth in these townships to help defray part of the costs of the services from the older communities?

This would save the tax base and future of both.

This is the Regional Approach.

To those who say, "Impossible! We would never be able to agree on any such common sense arrangement.", I say "baloney."

Any country that can figure out to get to Mars can solve a question that is more important to the daily lives of its citizens.

In preserving and protecting the life of the community, cooperation--not competition--is the sensible approach.

Do we have the sense?

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

by

Edward Schechter
Committee

Luzerne/Lackawanna Transportation Study

One of the major problems that must be treated on a regional basis is that of transportation. In looking at the street pattern and the extensive use of land and at the affluent society, we find that there are growing numbers of motor vehicles having to contend with, to a large extent, obsolete street patterns. In large metropolitan areas, we are also concerned with what do we do at the destination of a motor vehicle. In many areas it is found that the only logical solution would be through the use of Mass Transit.

Our panel this morning is a group of men who have had a great deal of experience in tangling with problems of Mass Transit in a number of states and a number of areas.

THE ERIE EXPERIENCE WITH MASS TRANSPORTATION

by

Thomas Burke
General Manager
Erie Metropolitan Transit Authority

In 1950, the Erie Coach Company carried 16,254,000 revenue passengers. In 1965, the passenger volume had decreased 3,421,000. The company lost 79% of its business in these 15 years, a decrease of nearly 13,000,000 riders annually. Fewer riders and higher costs combined to produce a deficit of over \$9,000 in 1965. Further, the labor contract which expired on October 1, 1964 was extended to February 1967 with two wage increases to add to the company's financial problems.

When I first came to Erie, I was shocked to find out that the type of equipment it had was gasoline type equipment. It was expensive to operate. The repairmen had over 35 road calls a day which would certainly inconvenience the company's passengers. The transit picture was highlighted by service reduction, increased cost, fare increases, threatened strikes, declining passenger volume, equipment deficiencies. It was difficult to see public transit operations beyond 1970. It was really a run-down transit system.

Erie's public transit problems are similar to those being faced by cities all over the United States. Yet, no one community of our size has abandoned its bus system. No city can afford to because a good mass transit facility is essential to the economic growth of a community. While public transit is not the primary form of travel in Erie, it is, nevertheless, the important secondary system. In the future, the importance of this secondary system will increase, not decrease. Population is increasing. The present system of regular scheduled bus routes serves a population for an area of 175,000 people. By 1990, the area now served by bus routes will grow to approximately 75,000 more people than projected population in the area currently served by the transit system in less than 2 decades.

Throughout America it becomes painfully apparent to many transportation planners that you dare not rely on only the automobile to handle all transportation requirements. Traffic congestion can readily reach the proportion of a crises. If you don't believe that, try the California Freeway. Automobiles will continue to provide the primary transportation service. However, public transit will remain the major secondary facility.

A 100% increase in car ownership is projected for Erie by 1990. More and more property is being removed from the tax rolls to provide needed room for vehicles, roads, and parkades. And yet, highway and parking facilities construction have been unable to keep pace. It requires approximately nine times more space to handle each person arriving by bus. As you can see, there are many reasons why the City must lie heavily on an efficient public transit system and why the importance of this system will increase in the coming years.

In 1965, a 25 member citizen Erie Urban Transit Study Committee was appointed to study the transit problems and make recommendations. Guy W. Wilson, former head of the General Electric Locomotive and Car Equipment Division headed this committee. This group recommended the formation of a metropolitan transit commission to apply for and disburse public funds required to study metropolitan transit needs and make recommendations. The recommendations were followed leading to the formation of the Erie Metropolitan Transit Authority in 1966.

The Erie Metropolitan Transit Authority entered into an agreement on December 27, 1966 with the Erie Coach Company for the transition of its system to authority ownership on January 1, 1967. Government financing of \$2, 148, 255 was sought and secured for EMTA for capital improvements, acquisition of 50 new buses, modern garage and office facilities, and service equipment. The basis for financing this program was two-thirds Federal, one-sixth State, and one-sixth local.

Basic elements of the system were significantly improved and an entirely new bus fleet was placed into operation. A general manager, experienced in transit management was appointed. Plans were laid for the construction of a terminal and office facilities. Operational procedures were instituted to substantially strengthen the system. Even the tide of declining public use was apparently reversed. In 1968, the first full year of operation, complemented by improved service and a community effort to attract riders, reversed a 20 year decline in passenger volume and produced an 8.2% increase in passengers. Almost 300 more new revenue passengers boarded the busses in 1967.

Nevertheless, despite the accompanying increase in gross revenue the level of operating expenses continued to rise. To make EMTA entirely successful, 800,000 more riders must wisely choose to step into their comfortable, economical buses. This goal appears formidable as compared with 3,600,000 revenue passengers in 1968. However, it should be noted that the EMTA once carried 30 million riders a year. But 1968 was a successful year. We had the first new route in more than 15 years put on. This was put in the ghetto area. It has been operating about a

year and it is starting to pay its way. All existing routes were improved. Our construction of a new terminal began and our unique imported bus signs developed. We developed a new bus sign to give the passengers more information. There wasn't a bus sign in Erie when the EMTA took over. We have put all bus signs so people know where they are riding or where they can catch a bus. Administration and maintenance functions have been strengthened. There wasn't any preventative maintenance at all when we first took over.

A much larger community public service program was set in motion. A technical study of the system was started. A modest fare adjustment necessitated by rising costs of labor and material was instituted only after all alternative possibilities were exhausted. New bus tokens were placed in circulation. Community cooperation to attract riders was extensive and helpful.

While 1968 was a successful year, there still remains the job of making certain that substantial benefits offered by the system are fully utilized by the public. More than 800,000 more riders must wisely choose the buses. To this end, effort continues within the system and the community to attract these riders. A second new route has been added. Five of the existing routes have been extended. A special summer route was continued. A speed-up in service has been accomplished. Our new operations center has been in service since March 1, 1969. An extensive community relation program has continually placed the activities of the Authority before the public. It is constantly being reminded that today's best way is to ride their buses.

One of our successful promotional schemes is a cooperative effort with downtown merchants to attract people to the system through free bus rides one hour on Thursday and on Friday mornings. Radio, TV, newspapers, billboards, bus flyers, and special promotions are constantly employed to keep the advantages of bus riding before all the people.

In conclusion, the assistance and cooperation of all groups and individuals is essential. Federal, State, County, and City support and financial aid is, of course, an essential ingredient of success, as is the dedication of the members of the Authority and its staff. It is to this end of making EMTA successful that our community, the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, and the Federal Department of Transportation are all dedicated.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A
BALANCED STATE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

by

Edwin W. Bickhart, Chief
Mass Transit Division
Department of Community Affairs

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to present to you the State's program to transport people into, out of, and within the urban centers by common carriers. We must meet these - "our transportation problems" and resolve them by the cooperative efforts of all levels of government.

To do this means our thinking will have to change in many areas. It means we shall have to admit that often the "tried and true" is obsolete. It means that we must stop passively worshipping our machines and start to master them. It means we can no longer assume that we are obligated to fit the people to the machines. We need imagination, we need creativity ... and most of all, we need motivation and implementation.

These United States, the greatest nation in the world, has proven we can send three men to the Moon. Now let's show that we have the brains to move people in Wilkes-Barre and Scranton to work and back safely and conveniently without spending a couple of hours doing it). We can do it, and we will do it!

We know that the responses of the past simply will not lead to the solutions we want in the future. Conditions prove that to be true. We must re-examine our preconceptions if we are to prevent the centers of our cities, and eventually the suburbs from choking to death.

We are going to examine every kind of transportation and find out what kind of job each is best suited for. For one given purpose, that grand old American institution -- the automobile -- may be best. For other purposes, we might try V/stols, steam buses, gravitrains, hydrofoils, or tracked air cushion vehicles.

I firmly hold that no one mode is going to dominate the future in this country, because I know and you know that no one mode is best for all purposes. Our population is too dense in some areas, too sparse in others.

Our needs are too complex for simple answers. The conventional modes, like the automobile for instance, suffer from the liability that the more we expand our highways, it seems the more crowded those highways become.

The rumbling of discontent among people is becoming louder. I cannot believe that in the year two thousand some 280 million urban citizens will put up with anything resembling today's conditions.

And if we are wise, if we want to stop the commuting American from being the complaining American, we will start now --today-- to re-examine obsolete thinking and start to think in terms of the real needs and potentials of the present and future.

For instance, I find that more and more responsible people-- independent observers--are questioning the survival of the automobile in the centers of our largest cities.

In New York City today, to take perhaps the worst case, traffic moves an average of six miles per hour versus eleven miles per hour in the pushcart era of 1917. Off-street parking, computerized traffic flow and changes in patterns of use are often suggested but more often than not they are only stopgap measures.

The costs of pollution, sprawl, ugliness, business decay, tax losses--these are not worth the small gains. Pennsylvania must now accept the fact that the private automobile will not forever be the absolute monarch of our core cities.

How and when this change will come about, we cannot yet say. But the means are not altogether obscure.

We could make mass transit so attractive that habitual drivers would leave the highways. Some are convinced that Dial-A-Bus and other personalized modes will provide a breakthrough.

We could tax cars entering the city in order to pay for police services, traffic control, parking, and road repair, and so on.

More and more, the hallowed right to jump into our cars and drive them anywhere we please is being tallied against other community and individual values -- the need for elbow room, clean air, stable neighborhoods, more parkland, and many others. So far, we have sought sheer mobility above every other consideration; other needs have been neglected, and the social equation is clearly out of balance.

I maintain that the abuse of the human environment can be stopped by using transportation as a major tool in regional planning.

With the establishment of Penn Dot, which is in legislative process now, it will be the policy that any mode of transportation that commandeers or violates large sections of the landscape is going to be subject to a brutal analysis. Land is too precious a resource to be squandered. We can't always find enough of it where we need it, and it's one thing science doesn't have a substitute for. Multiple use of transportation corridors is an obvious solution, and will ensure over-all community development at very little more cost for land acquisition than we pay for ordinary highways and transit lines. Cities, whole regions, are now finding that they must plan their growth, control it, even in some cases, reduce it. They will have to decide consciously, not by default, what kind of places our people will live, work, and play in. U. S. Dot now has a project called Center City Transportation Program which I know will be of interest to all of you in providing some answers.

We have concluded -- and I am sure that a great many people in this room have come to the same conclusion--that the real transportation problem in the center cities is not congestion, parking and air pollution per se. Rather, the problem is that no one has been successful in solving, in a total concept, the problems of congestion, parking and air pollution.

As I noted earlier, we have the technical capability. What we haven't had is the effective implementation of this capability.

The reason for this lack of effectiveness--and again, I think you will agree-- is the lack of an action program for implementation. The Center Cities Program is such an action plan.

You know and I know that the filing cabinets in Mayors' offices are filled with unrealized plans. Unrealized not because they weren't feasible--but because they did not address the problem of gaining sufficient support from the private sector, from labor, from management, from the financial community, from the political structure, and from the traveling public. This we intend to do with your help.

The U. S. Department of Transportation--through the Urban Mass Transportation Administration--has signed a one-million, 461 thousand dollar contract with a group of the nation's top consulting firms--led by A. D. Little, and including Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill; Real Estate Research Corporation and Wilbur Smith and associates.

These firms, working as a consortium, under the guidance of DOT, will provide to five selected cities a thorough and concise research and development effort to formulate improved Center City Transportation Systems. The Cities participating in the program will be Atlanta, Dallas, Denver, Seattle, and Pittsburgh.

The consortium will -- in each city-- go beyond the traditional approach of research, analysis and recommendation. The program will actively involve many organizations and groups in the city.

Again, this is more than a planning program. It is an action program. I, personally will not be satisfied with the performance of the consultant teams until they, through their work, light the spark of community involvement in each of the participating cities.

The Center Cities Transportation Program is set up to give a nudge to communities--to draw all community elements together--so decisions will be made by not only those who will administer new transit facilities, but also by those who will earn a living operating the system, those who will ride, those who have businesses in the area, those who will be involved in financing, those who will manufacture the equipment, and those who are in political and governmental decision-making positions.

The benefits of such a program are manifold.

With these five cities sharing development, expertise and information, the manufacturers of transit equipment will have delineated for them a much more positive market potential. Investors--buyers of bond issues--will know better what sort of rate to offer. Labor, in helping plan new systems, can be expected to work with us for the common good. Merchants and businessmen in Center City areas--by being involved in the study of traffic patterns and pedestrian distribution--will know better what to expect in terms of economic growth. And the people--the ones who really are the "lifblood of urban society" will help these cities create Central Transportation Systems that blend rather than clash with the human environment.

We are delighted that the Mayors of the five cities have expressed initial enthusiasm for the program, and we look for it to become a major demonstration of what we can do if we all work together.

To me, this is money well spent.

To my way of thinking, these grants are only a first step. Over the coming decade we will spend millions on urban transportation.

The time has come when all communities seriously consider all internal modes of transportation. This is the reason for establishing a Department of Transportation for Pennsylvania.

A Department of Transportation has been created in six states: New York, New Jersey, Hawaii, Florida and California, and in three other states, Ohio, Michigan and Illinois, they are considering such action.

A key word in considering to solve our transportation problems is coordination, and the creation of Penn DOT will be a big step forward.

It seems obvious to me that these public monies cannot be spent effectively except by developing solid, well-thought-out plans for air, rail and highway in conjunction with the rest of the social structure--housing, utilities, schools and so on.

We must clarify the options for cities, encourage them to develop comprehensive plans, and give industry some notion of the potential market for their products. We will have to invest a great deal of money to make up for past neglect. We will need new methods to finance the answer in some cases; in others, Federal, State, and local subsidies may be more realistic. One thing is certain, if funds on the Federal and State level are not programmed for, not less than five year periods, capital programs cannot be reasonably planned. Our attitude should be flexible.

Perhaps we should expect to subsidize those who cannot drive--you know who I mean--the young, the aged, the poor, the handicapped. And those who are able to drive but prefer to avoid the aggravation and take a bus or train should also be given a choice.

We have the resources and the technology to provide these choices.. Whether we provide them will determine the prospects for a decent life in our cities. How we decide them will determine the quality of our civilization.

The integrated transportation network that we have set as our goal cannot be created overnight. But a system providing channels of choice out of the ghetto to suburban factories, insuring ready access in our leisure time to the varied pleasures of the countryside, safeguarding our precious heritage of historical sites and natural beauty, and saving the land from irresponsible exploitation--such a system must be started now if we are to achieve our objective within the next generation. It may even be necessary for physical survival.

The task is gigantic, but no more so than the challenges of a century ago when stout-hearted pioneers tamed a savage continent with their bare hands. Sometimes we forget that we have a tradition--a sacred one--of achieving the impossible dream.

Our roads and rails and airways have given us greater mobility--for all its frustrations--more than any other people have had in history. They have made the name of America synonymous with movement, change, and adventure. They have conditioned our mentality, formed our attitudes, opened new horizons to restless vitality.

What about traffic paralysis within urban regions? Today nearly eighty percent of our people live in cities. By the end of this century that proportion will rise to ninety percent.

Most of the one hundred million person increase in population will concentrate in metropolitan areas. So the urban population will double in about thirty years. Small and medium-size cities will participate in this growth as well as the huge regional complexes and linear cities that we see developing along our coasts and around the Great Lakes.

Now it has been said by wise men that everybody loves an automobile. Apparently that is so, because people rely almost entirely upon cars to meet their need for transportation in town. There are now more than eighty million cars in this country, double the number in 1950. By the year 2000 they will double again.

Cars are obviously being produced faster than people are, and they use up space and pollute the air at an alarming rate. In many areas we are going to have to choose between cars and people at some point and to some extent during the next ten years.

We recognize the dangers of relying solely upon one mode of transportation. It is self-evident that we have a gross imbalance when we spend more money on highways in six weeks than we spend on mass transit in six years! That is not an efficient allocation of our potential transportation resources. It's not balanced transportation. Let's take a look at where this imbalance has taken us.

First of all, public transportation has declined sadly in reliability and availability in the last twenty years. Transit patronage is only half what it was fifteen years ago. Profits have shrunk, fares have shot up and the commuters are so mad they have begun to organize into protest groups.

Low income people would like to get some of those good jobs being created in the suburbs, but often the bus just doesn't go where the job is. Likewise, a black man with any pride is not going to bother trying for such a job if the only way to get there is to get up with the birds and transfer two or three times and pay a dollar twenty-five for the privilege. It's against human nature.

To put it in one sentence, if we expect to make any headway with our urban problems in congestion, poverty, pollution and employment, we are going to have to try something new in the way of urban transportation.

We will be compelled to invest many millions of dollars over the coming years if we are to provide the new and updated public transportation our suburban residents need to assure mobility. But the cities alone cannot sustain this burden. I am as aware as you are that State and local expenditures have increased nearly three times in the last ten years. The National Debt has risen by the same amount and now exceeds one hundred billion dollars.

Over the next ten years, the cities and states are going to run by another two hundred fifty billion dollars and there is no prospect whatever that they can plug the gap with bonds. Without federal help, public transportation would probably dry up in all but a few of the largest cities with consequences for civil disorder, urban decay, and air pollution that any reasonable man would want to avoid at all costs. Our current Federal expenditures of one hundred seventy-five million dollars annually for public transportation aren't even enough to patch the rough spots let alone provide the sophisticated services an increasingly educated and impatient public demands.

The Federal government has taken action to solve this problem before it becomes completely unmanageable. The President proposed to Congress that this nation invest ten billion dollars in transit grants and loans over a twelve year period from 1971 to 1982. They seek authority to commit funds starting at three hundred million dollars and rising to one billion dollars during the first five years. They are asking for "contract authority" to obligate funds over the full five years as to assure cities of the support they need to under-take long range projects.

Contract authority is the key concept in this bill. It is a well-established budgetary mechanism granting full Federal authority to enter into building commitments to the full extent of the fund authorization. The authorizations would not be limited to annual periods.

This is not a trust fund that we all are hoping for, but the President is for long time contract authority. And this approach will work. It obligates the Federal government to support programs once the contracts have been signed--period. No exceptions. They will be legally obligated to follow through on approved plans--and that will give the cities the assurance of continuity they have always demanded.

Cities of any size would be eligible for this aid. Up to two thirds of the cost of the projects could be paid for with Federal money. A kind of transit facility could be developed--new rail lines, better buses, new means of communication, real-time route information for riders or special services for low-mobility groups. Funds would be available for new systems to alleviate downtown congestion, provide more flexible service in the suburbs and in the ghetto, and encourage experiments with point-to-point service between employment clusters throughout Metropolitan areas.

A unique and vital feature of the bill would permit cities to purchase land in advance of transit construction where necessary to control speculation and exploding costs of rights-of-way. This feature could become a vital tool in long-range environmental planning for cities of the future and help us to make best use of our limited resources of metropolitan land.

However, nothing would be done hastily and local units of government would be required to conduct public hearings on all proposals. This legislation would provide financial help to operators of private transit lines--this is important because many such lines are still run by private companies. It would also support a much expanded U.S. DOT program of research on urban transportation to push for the technical breakthroughs that are within our reach.

This bill has been a long time coming, and it's long overdue. If enacted I believe it will result in new transit systems within three years of passage. It surely must be enacted if we are ever to have a transportation system that reflects a National and State transportation policy.

I think we have finally realized that the quality of public transportation can determine our standard of living, our productivity and our enjoyment of life just as much as schools, housing and job opportunity. Without a balanced system of personal mobility, the inner city decays and even the suburbs lose vitality.

And how would such a program affect our highway building activities? I am certain that you men are well aware that without healthy public transport, we can never hope to build roads fast enough in urban areas to get ahead of the traffic they generate. That's a mathematical fact.

I think it is clear, therefore, that the future of public transportation is not a mere matter of convenience for city dwellers. It transcends technical questions and becomes a matter of shape, the quality, and the existence of cities as we have known them. Access to urban environments that meet the needs and extend the measure of man.

I have faith that we will make the right decision. We have the emerging awareness. We have the resources. And I see determination to break with the past. Public transportation can be the royal road to a better life for the citizens of all our cities. The waiting game is over. The days of action loom ahead.

It was the intention of the Legislature, when the Mass Transportation Act was written in 1965 that transportation continue to serve the fullest purposes of life in Pennsylvania. It must do so, for time is, indeed, running short. All our efforts--especially at conferences such as this one--must be aimed at the development of a State, balanced transportation system.

I just want to say in closing that I hope that all of you understand that we are going to be asking a great many questions in the weeks and months ahead.

Because it was done a certain way 35 years ago is no reason to believe there is no better way. It seems about time we stop thinking about the way we have done it for the last 35 years and start thinking about 15 or 20 years from now, and not 35 years ago.

I trust that our conversations here at Wilkes will be very helpful to all of us. Thank you for taking your time to listen to me today, and I sincerely hope we may get started in Northeastern Pennsylvania to provide the finest transportation system in Pennsylvania.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

by

Ellsworth C. Salisbury, Jr.
Executive Vice-President
Hazleton Chamber of Commerce

Until the relatively recent past, Americans have not seemed greatly concerned with the problems of environmental pollution, and least of all with the pollution resulting from ineffectual management of solid waste.

The idea that solid wastes may contain valuable metals and other renewable resources that should be conserved, made little impression in a country blessed with an abundance of natural resources.

The most convenient means for disposal--usually an open burning dump--was (and unfortunately still is) most frequently employed. However, it is becoming increasingly obvious that such a casual approach to solid waste management--which may have been acceptable in an earlier day--can no longer be tolerated in a country of over 200 million persons.

The total solid waste load generated from municipal, commercial, and industrial sources in the United States amounts to more than 360 million tons annually. The annual total of agricultural wastes, including animal manures and crop wastes, is estimated to be over 2 billion tons. The present annual rate of mineral solid waste generation is 1.1 billion tons, with an anticipated rise to 2 billion tons by 1980. Even this projection for mineral wastes may prove low if ocean and oil shale mining become large-scale commercial enterprises. Altogether, over 3.5 billion tons of solid wastes are generated in the United States every year.

Primary responsibility for solid waste collection, processing, and disposal has traditionally, and quite properly, rested with local levels of government, with State agencies heavily involved in regulatory activity.

Pennsylvania, like every other state, is having its solid waste problem. Our elected officials have the almost impossible task of satisfying taxpayers by not raising taxes and at the same time satisfying citizens who are worried about pollution. If we are going to do anything worthwhile, we must make it clear to everyone that a problem does exist with solid wastes, and we must change our methods of disposing of them

Television specials, magazines and newspapers continually tell us how we are being buried in our own garbage--how our waterways are being fouled--our air contaminated--our land turned into junk heaps.

Solid waste management is on many public officials' mind these days and the more the subject is discussed the less understanding there appears to be.

It is doubtful if all are in agreement, or, at least fully appreciate what normally constitutes solid wastes.

Northeastern Pennsylvania has its solid waste problem, though perhaps a different aspect of the same problem. We in the Northeast, because of the availability and accessibility of mine voids, must be careful that our area isn't turned into the refuse pit for the great eastern megapolis.

THE PROPOSED SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM
IN ALLEGHENY COUNTY

by

Maurice A. Shapiro
Graduate School of Public Health
University of Pittsburgh

It is indeed a pleasure to be here today and discuss with you what I hope we're doing in Allegheny County and not what we've done, because what I hope is that we are on the verge of solving an age-old problem.

My task here today, really, is to summarize the summary - that is, the summary of a report which was submitted to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County by the Advisory Committee on Solid Waste Management, which was headed by Dr. Joseph James, the head of the Institute of Local Government at the University of Pittsburgh. This little presentation should be accomplished with descriptive slides. I will try to paint a mental picture to overcome that deficiency.

The increase of amount of solid waste generated in Allegheny County and the quality of the existing disposal systems with which we have to deal are two factors contributing to our problem and the need for immediate remedial action in Allegheny County. It is estimated, for example, in Allegheny County, 1.8 millions tons of solid wastes are generated by the households, commercial establishments, and other institutions. The average daily production is in excess of 6 lbs. per person per day. That's an amount that would fill the Gulf Building in Pittsburgh nearly twice each day. By 1975, it is estimated we will be generating a volume of waste sufficient to fill daily more than three buildings of that size, and by 1985 we will generate 2 million tons per year.

Our problem is that with very few exceptions, the quality of the existing disposal operations in the County is not only poor but deteriorating. The Pennsylvania State Department of Health has criticized us severely for this. Most of the landfills in the County are contaminating the ground water. Most of them are quite unsightly and improperly covered, and most also have control problems of dust, flies, rodents, and odor. We have eight incinerators in Allegheny County handling approximately 500 tons of solid waste per day. The biggest one is an outmoded City incinerator which the City would like to remove.

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee came up with 21 general policy recommendations which we hope will provide the guidelines for planning, development, and implementation of a County-wide disposal system. A specific action program was developed from these guidelines. The Committee suggested that responsibility for management of the solid waste system should be divided between the municipalities and the County, the division to be such that the municipal responsibility would be over collection. The County responsibility would begin at the point when the collection vehicle proceeds to a processing or disposal site or when the collection vehicle crosses a municipal boundary.

The committee believed that the problem of solid waste processing and disposal could be resolved adequately by the 129 subdivisions acting independently of each other. In its opinion, the resolution of the problem rests with a Board of County Commissioners which has the legislative authority to develop and implement the solid waste processing and disposal operation designed to handle all solid waste originating in the County other than such hazardous materials as radioactive wastes. However, it must be emphasized that facilities for processing and disposal of all kinds of waste are essential if public, private and individual haulers are to dispose of their refuse in a legal and really acceptable manner. The Committee also realized that a comprehensive processing and disposal system cannot be implemented immediately. It must be planned and placed into operation by stages.

The Committee recommended a well-designed, comprehensive system to include whatever types of processing or disposal are necessary to meet the existing and future needs which can be constructed and operated in accordance with criteria which maximize public health on one hand and safety, and which minimize on the other hand the cost to the public. The Committee recognized that at present any processing and disposal program will have to include sanitary landfills. The Committee recommended that the waste processing and disposal system should be publicly owned or operated, and that it should be oriented toward a transfer station sanitary landfill operation.

Of the currently acceptable solid waste processing or disposal methods, sanitary landfill provides the most economic and technologically feasible solution. This disposal method represents a way to reclaim wasteland, converting this land to more useful purposes than currently used. Suitable landfill sites are available within the County and reasonable trips can be established for all areas employing transfer stations. To implement this suggestion, the Committee recommended that the County purchase at least one suitable site within each one of the

service areas for the establishment of either a service transfer station or a combination sanitary landfill and land reserve. All such publicly owned facilities could be either publicly operated or leased under competitive conditions to private operators.

The publicly owned sanitary landfills and land reserved are to be located in less developed service areas and are recommended for restricted uses which would include (1) disposal sites for collection vehicles serving the population within that service area and (or) a land reserve retained as a hedge against long-term future needs when appropriate sites might greatly diminish.

Inasmuch as a projected trend is for the population to move into the remaining openland area of the County, the acquisition of such land now has major advantages: (1) land is becoming more expensive; (2) some sites now available will become developed with other uses; and (3) those who move near the service area site after it is established will know in advance that their neighbor is in the solid waste disposal business; and (4) in the future should a method other than the transfer station sanitary landfill system become feasible, similar site requirements will still exist.

The County solid waste disposal system will be financed in the following manner according to the Committee's proposals: (1) capital costs incurred in acquiring and constructing the County owned facilities will be financed by the County; (2) operating costs will be financed from uniform service charges collected from the municipality, private hauler, or other user; (3) development cost incurred in the planning and implementation of the County wide disposal system will be financed by the County; and, (4) research costs will be financed with County and other public grant or private funds.

One of the primary reasons for the establishment of the present Solid Waste Advisory Committee was to involve citizens of varying backgrounds, interests, specialties and skills in a development of programs concerned with the critical problem affecting their total environment. The present Committee views as permanent advisory committee as an essential component to the proposed program. The Committee's recommendations add several dimensions to the responsibilities currently vested in an Office of Solid Waste Management which was established a few years ago. The added duties include the development and implementation of extensive educational programs, administration of such research activities in the solid waste disposal field and feasibility studies the establishment of a solid waste information system, so sadly lacking and an operational responsibility for County owned and/or operated facilities.

The Committee recommended to further these courses of action: (1) that there be established a department of solid waste management directly responsible to the Board of County Commissioners; (2) that additional professionally qualified personnel be appointed to this department; (3) and, that a salary scale be adopted which would permit recruitment and retention of highly qualified professional personnel.

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee further recommended that the Board of County Commissioners request the Pennsylvania Department of Health adopt and enforce regulations governing the operation of disposal facilities in counties of abutting Allegheny County in order to protect the 1.6 million citizens of Allegheny County. No doubt this is really universal, but it's doubly difficult in Allegheny County because we dispose of much of our waste outside the boundaries of Allegheny County.

Another regional action suggested by the Committee is that the Board of County Commissioners request the Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission, which is composed of six counties in Southwestern Pennsylvania, to investigate the feasibility of a multi-county approach. This is in line with what was mentioned earlier this morning on solid waste management and disposal.

The Department of Solid Waste Management is to be vested with the authority for monitoring and enforcing of the operational regulations governing the County-wide disposal system, and for the architectural and other aesthetic control regulations governing the development and construction and processing of disposal facilities.

Although the Committee recommended that the County adopt standards regarding types of collection equipment used locally, the Committee recommended that the 129 municipalities in Allegheny County retain their authority to designate local truck routes for use by refuse vehicles not engaged in local collections.

The most important aspect of this whole program is the manner in which it is being set up in phases.

Phase one of the action plan consists of 9 recommendations requiring current action by the Board of Commissioners during 1969. These are: (1) the establishment of a model transfer station and sanitary landfill; (2) designation of service areas, site locations, and facilities needed; (3) adoption of solid waste management regulations; (4) reorganization of the Office of Solid Waste Management; (5) development of a legislative program; (6) appointment of a research committee; (7) initiation of a public education program; (8) appointment of a permanent ad-

visory committee; and (9) institution of voluntary purchasing assistance programs for political jurisdictions which desire to have their own collection systems.

I am happy to report that as of last week, the County Board of Commissioners did accomplish two things: they appointed the permanent advisory committee and a research committee. The committee has not detailed the amount of money required to implement phase one. However, it believes that phase one will cost no less than \$500,000, the major portion of which, or \$400,000 is required to construct a model transfer station.

Phase two of the program can commence prior to completion of phase one, which is to be completed no later than the end of 1970. Phase two is for the implementation of the findings resulting from recommendation number two in phase one, namely, the designation of service areas, site locations, and facilities needed. This phase two involves four items: (1) the purchase of land reserves; (2) the construction and/or acquisition of disposal facilities; (3) development of control specifications for operational facilities; and, (4) the actual operation of these facilities.

Phase three, the last of the three phases, involves the investigation of new technological developments in processing and disposal facilities and the possible utilization of these technological findings in the system as it goes along, on a continuing basis and not in a one-time type of an operation. Basic responsibility for phase three rests with the Research Committee, the Department of Solid Waste Management, and the Solid Waste Advisory Committee.

I have been connected with solid waste studies and reports in Allegheny County ever since I arrived there in 1951. I get the distinct feeling that this is the first time that the 129 municipalities are really willing to cooperate, and from that point of view I see some light at the end of the tunnel.

FACTORS AND ATTITUDES IN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

by

Albert J. Klee, Chief
Bureau of Solid Waste Management, HEW

The amount of solid waste has been increasing at approximately twice the rate of population. I really believe sometimes the problems have quadrupled, and basic to these problems is public apathy, lack of understanding and psychological resistance. People, let's face it; just don't want to concern themselves with seemingly mundane issues. The disinterest of the citizen in his waste materials and the overall public disinterest in waste has led to or at least is characterized by a profound public ignorance of the nature and the magnitude of the problem.

In general it might be said that as urbanization progresses and the daily life of the citizen becomes more and more remote from the production of his food and goods and as the removal of residues from his home becomes more convenient to him, he understands less and less of the associated problems. As a particularly profound lack of knowledge of alternative methods of disposal and their effect upon land, water and air resources of the nation or community. The opponent of land-filling, for example, cannot understand why incineration or composting is not adopted instead because no one has ever told him, you see, that neither of these two alternates do more than reduce the amount of material to be disposed of on land. Likewise, he is unprepared to comprehend the nature of competition for resource values. He often confuses preservation of areas in an untouched condition with conservation of resources. In an urban concentration this lack of a clear understanding becomes particularly critical. You've heard it before: "take it somewhere else, but don't raise my taxes in the process." Everyone wants you to garbage up and no one wants them to put it down. Anyway, this is a typical response of the citizen.

The one very difficult factor then in solving the problem of solid waste disposal derives from the uninformed status of the citizen which leads both the citizen and the public official to place a very low estimate on what the public can "afford" to pay and to hesitate to dedicate any resource value to solid waste disposal.

We in the Bureau of Solid Waste Management are currently studying the attitudes and values of individuals and organizations supporting or opposing various kinds of disposal and collection practices, and the situation is similar to that in any field of water quality management.

Industrialists, shipping interests, persons engaged in agriculture, sportsmens' groups, public health departments and numerous other groups all have their criteria for water quality and all agree that water quality is necessary. These criteria often conflict as in the case of the conservationist who wants water with high oxygen content and chemical purity and opposing industrial waste discharge who wants to utilize the entire pollution absorbing capacity of the streams. With regard to solid waste, all agree that something must be done, but that is an inherent conflict, just as in the water interest.

Among the interests of those who produce waste are those who see themselves as protectors of land value or as recipients of waste from more affluent neighborhoods. One black member of my own staff said that in my home town they dispose of the garbage by dumping it in the Negro neighborhood, so now I'm going away from this general idea of public apathy. Let's go into the conflict situations because all too often public officials do find solid waste management a controversial issue, and this is characterized by a rather forceful and persistent opposition.

Since solid waste management systems are always going to cost money, there always will be an opposition on the part of those who simply do not want to spend money. But a very special sort of problem is faced by the solid waste planner in the matter of disposal site selection. The prevalence of open burning dumps in many areas make local pre-conditioned opposition to any suggestions on the part of the public officials. The solid waste manager, therefore, must mend his way with much more care than in the case of the air and water pollution counterparts.

Last year I attended a meeting of the National Association of County Officials and I learned from these elected officials that in many many instances public officials have turned out of office on a solid waste issue.

Now this is not the case in air and water pollution fields. Citizens go by and see the stacks belching forth noxious fumes and see the stinking stream but they don't associate that so clearly with a particular public official. Since so many of these open burning dumps are run by the municipality, they can put their finger on the person then, and the public official is in trouble.

One county supervisor in a little town south of San Francisco told me that whenever he gets reports from a women's club to speak on solid waste, he turns it down or sends an assistant. He said he wouldn't touch that with a ten foot pole. Air pollution he'll talk about, but they can pin that open burning dump in his county too closely on him and it would be politically very dangerous. Many people will tell you the same

thing. Bill Corbetts, who is in the Public Works director of Omaha, Nebraska said that every time that they've indicated that they were going to establish a sanitary landfill, everyone within 10 to 15 miles, people who wouldn't even go near the location, opposed it. It's just because they hear the words dump, garbage, trash.

Now, unfortunately, solid waste is saddled with many of these negative types of cues which automatically tend to put people on the defensive and rather than rousing an attitude of support, these cues tend to strike resistant cords. In Louisville last year, an industrial services corporation of America, a private firm, decided to establish a sanitary landfill. They had a devil of a time with public attitudes and convincing people. I am quoting from an article written by the president. Just one paragraph will give you an idea of these cues. He says "this, I think can be summed up in the instruction I recently issued to key people in our organization. The operation is not under any circumstances ever to be referred to as a dump, a landfill or even a sanitary landfill. It is to be called an ISA land reclamation project because that's just what it is." It is true, it is a land reclamation project down there. But you notice, stay away from these words.

Numerous sanitary landfills are now in operation and a study of attitudes toward these operations may provide insights as to how they can be made acceptable to the public. An official of the Los Angeles Department of Sanitation, that was recently in a controversy over proposed sanitary landfill, invited about a dozen of the local community leaders to accompany him to the site, explained the nature of the operation, showed them around, and then indicated the intended use of the landfill as a recreation area. These leaders then became favorably disposed to the proposed sanitary landfill and one fellow who owns a rather expensive home overlooking this landfill was convinced. He said, "everytime I look at it, I see the golf course that will be constructed." Now that doesn't work if you are building a sanitary landfill that's going to last 10-15 years. People cannot think that far ahead, so that would not be one approach I would suggest if you are planning a landfill for a long-term use.

But a clue to the approach of the problem influencing attitudes to solid waste collection disposal really can be found in the statement by this fellow about the golf course. A person's actions depend upon his feelings, his attitudes and beliefs, and these attitudes, feelings, and beliefs are related to his motivations. People tend to seek that which enhances their self concepts and other factors which they consider important. Of course, conversely they tend to destroy or to avoid that which detracts from themselves and what they hold dear.

There is currently, for example, a lot of resistance on the part of people to hauling of refuse to strip mining areas. This is particularly pertinent in these Appalachian areas. By stressing the fact that such reclamation is in harmony with the community's own goals, economic growth, beautification, recreational opportunities and so on, foundation is structured that may facilitate attitude change. This doesn't always work, however, because of the complicated nature of people.

While on the surface, solid waste disposal may appear to be the problem, it may really serve as a smoke screen for other problems of a psychological nature. We had some experience along this line trying to convince a county in an Appalachian area to permit a sanitary landfill to be developed on some strip mining areas. There was a lot of opposition. Yet the classical approach was tried--beautifully planned program by the state, by the private developers; federal officials were called in to lend needed technical support, but these people were not hearing any of it and in some of these communities, it's not a matter of solid waste, although they may say so.

In this particular case, it was felt that what this was, it wasn't opposition to the landfill so very much, but these people have been depressed, they have been down in the mouth and down in the dumps for years (and that's not a pun). Here another body of officials coming from without the community saying "well now here's how we're going to get you out of this mess". People tend to strike out at this. So it was the solid waste issue. We felt that it would have worked much, much better had the proposal come from within, and had some support been generated before the general idea was made public.

Now it has been suggested that catharsis or this ventilation of feelings by the encouragement of controversy may be helpful in certain of these ego defensive situations. I've just described to you the Appalachian areas. But unfortunately not all psychologists agree with this. In public sessions designed to allow individuals to express their opposition, negative attitudes can actually be reinforced unless there is a clear opportunity for the other side to be heard.

Now if you have attended some of these meetings, some of them just give up on hearing both sides. It just doesn't happen that way. People get emotional. Because of the intensity of feelings on the subject, a better device might be a television debate or a radio phone-in, both of which permit controversy to be aired in a much more satisfactory manner. Let's be fair, let's get both sides heard. You might be constrained by statute where you have to hold public meetings and they are so easy to get out of hand and what can you do about it. Now let's face it, if we're fair about this some citizens are obviously more affected by others

than by specific solutions to solid waste management problems of a community-wide nature.

Common sense would indicate that offering such citizens certain incentives might be one means to alter their attitudes. For example, if a citizen located near a proposed disposal site or facility were offered free garbage collection service, or if another citizen located on a street that led directly to a proposed site were offered a reduction in taxes, would this obviate resistance to the solutions that benefit the community as a whole.

Good question, and the answers aren't by any means simple. Inducements, for example, may easily be resented if they are interpreted as attempts to buy off the individual. It is not even true that the larger the inducement, the greater the shift in attitude. For when inducements are large, an individual may use the fact as justification for his change of behavior without feeling required to change his attitude. This, of course, leaves the individual psychologically free to resist future proposals.

A new interesting case occurred up in Milwaukee. There was a proposal to rail haul waste out of Milwaukee. The deal was that a private contractor suggested this--he was asking for \$6.50 a ton, pick up in Milwaukee and that was the last the city would see of it. He was going to truck it or rail haul it out of a remote community, a farm community, most German-American farmers, people who emanated from the real strong ties, that sort of culture, not too dissimilar from areas in Pennsylvania and had to convince the county to permit the landfill to be developed.

The idea was that the county would get a quarter for every ton of waste landfilled in the county and the original proposal was, look this will enable you to provide better schools for your children and it was hard to convince these people. They were right on the edge. The inducement for their children's education was beginning to get to them. But it was too slow for the private contractor. He decided to go up there and sweeten up the kitty. He had hired a public relations firm. They told him to stay away and he came nevertheless to sweeten the kitty. He said, "now look on top of this \$.25 a ton, I'm going to throw in a free country club. I'll build a country club for you people" and that down to resounding defeat because these people coming from their traditional values, equated a country club with a den of iniquity.

A lot of questions were raised on the part, "why are you doing this for us?" Before we saw the balance between the permission versus the \$.25 per ton for the school, but now a country club is kind of

a frivolous sort of thing, and there must be something wrong with it. It's a terrible thing, of course, to stumble on when this project was so close to completion. It would have benefited everyone around. But you can't ignore it; you may think it's silly, but you can't ignore it.

Well, one means that I think we've all seen is to employ attitude arousal in solid waste educational programs has involved fear appeals. Such programs show flies and rats in wretched abundance, analogous to the traffic safety films that feature headless corpses and the dental hygiene campaigns which fought the gangrenous jaws. Now when we got to the last, there was one study showing experiments using such fear appeals to coerce children into better habits of dental hygiene had an interesting consequence of a negative relationship between the amount of fear and the degree of change. The problem appears to be that unless the fear appeal is associated with a clear course of action; the subjects are likely to reject it. In this case the children did not associate the pictures of the gangrenous jaws of the aged with a failure to brush their teeth in a prescribed manner.

I just finished reading an attitude study report in the air pollution field. You ask questions like "is there air pollution in your community?" And you say, "is there air pollution in your neighborhood," and the percentage drops from 85-95 down to 30-35. Now what's the reason for this? Well, all of these people are aware of the air pollution problem, which incidentally is not the case in solid waste collection and disposal.

In air pollution, people are aware of the problem so they own up to the fact that the community has an air pollution problem. But there is no clear course of action for them. They don't believe public officials are doing anything about it. Therefore, to admit that there is air pollution in their own neighborhood, you see, would be to submit to essentially a fear campaign. You've seen the commercials on television--men wearing gas masks and coughing and hacking. You would be getting the individual to admit then, that he has a problem in his neighborhood, but with no clear course of action it causes psychological problems. But what does he do, he turns off, in the vernacular of young people nowadays, he tunes right out, and he says "oh, yes, the city is terrible. My neighborhood is perfect." Now in a similar way the typical suburban dweller cannot be led into the sanitary landfill site location merely by showing him pictures of rats cavorting in an open dump. He finds it difficult to identify himself with the situation. In his mind it's the other fellow's problem.

Now we're conducting psychological research in this area which gets quite complicated at times and really changes your own opinions when you find out what the real underlying reasons are. These are not

public opinion surveys. They are much more complex than that. An effective program of attitude change can be planned and implemented, but on the other hand, everyone wants to jump into a public information program. But such a program based upon an analysis of presumed reasons and intellectual arguments may just be a waste of time. A study of women in New York City housing developments, for example, illustrates how a psychological study can uncover a previously unrecognized requirement for training.

When a thematic appreciation test was given to them, the women perceived throwing garbage out of the window and the use of a garbage disposal machine as equally effective disposal means. Similarly, a careful study of motivation and attitudes toward solid waste collection and disposal may reveal hitherto unsuspected requirements for public education. It is pretty clear that quantitative psychological, or as we refer to it, psychometric research is really needed to explore these factors that influence the optimization of solid waste systems in which human elements significantly mitigate the essential technological considerations and specific goals of research should be (1) identification of resistance groups, (2) prediction of behavior, (3) minimization of the effects of social conformity, and (4) the optimization and humanization of the presentation of solid waste management plans. It's something in which all of us have a stake.

I've talked a lot about the old review, maybe theoretically. There is a good publication I commend to your attention. It is published by the National Association of Counties Research Foundation. It's called Solid Waste Management # 8 Citizen Support. It's a series of 8 or 12 of these things prepared under contract for the Bureau of Solid Waste Management. But this is particularly on citizen support, getting the support--practical things. Read about Freudian backgrounds to attitude theory or a definition of attitude; that gets quite complicated. This is available at 100 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C., 20036-Solid Waste Management # 8 Citizen Support, and there are a lot of practical suggestions and ideas there that I just couldn't discuss in this short time. I'll also leave a few copies of a paper that I wrote on the psychology of solid waste management. If you have insomnia, I commend it to your attention.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

by

Samuel J. Joseph
Vice-President
United Municipal Corporation
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Change is the name of today's social and economic game. On September 11th of this year it had changed the name from The United Municipal Incinerator Corporation to Scienscope, Inc.

Progress is change and while society reaps its many benefits, it also pays the piper because of the harmful side effects. We have developed great industries and have offered livelihood to the populace. These industries develop new products and services which reduce man's burdens, yet they pay their fair share of taxes to support the governmental agencies which regulate society.

The change in our basic economic structure from agricultural to industrial has brought about the concentration of population to the cities. Here industries develop because of labor markets and during this industrial growth, more people are attracted to these centers.

The development of new products and devices can create a great wealth whose distribution is enjoyed by more and more people in differing proportions. In face of vigorous competition, products and services are constantly creating new consumer demands, which in turn, turns new techniques into marketing and packaging materials, thus compounding the problem of solid waste.

As an example, recently a hospital in San Diego reduced its per day rate. This is partly due to the fact that many disposable items made of pulp stock are being substituted for reusable cloth-made ones. This includes bed sheets, pillow cases, hospital gowns and even over-socks for the surgical personnel.

Economies on one hand are adding disposal costs to the other. In recent years we have become aware that affluence was not all good. With our population explosion and the growth of industry in trying to capture the available markets, we did not until recently become cognizant that all of this growth is contributing to an environmental unbalance. We have actually detonated a pollution explosion. We are polluting our waters, we are polluting our air and our land.

In combating these evils, federal, state and local governments have passed laws, set standards and are regulating pollution control, all of which require huge sums of money. Pollution control cannot be accomplished by a single sector of society. If man is to survive, it must be done by concentrated effort on the part of industry and government.

Industry has responded reluctantly because of the high capital costs of new equipment which adds to their production costs. Although industry has begun to take corrective inroads in solving its pollution problems, it has a very long way to go before the total solution is an accomplished fact.

At a recent meeting of the Rocky Mountain Mineral Conference of the Society of Mining Engineers in Salt Lake, Mr. Bower Dellinger, President of the Society and Manager for the mining exploration for the National Lead Company, told the industry that it must solve the pollution problem rather than evade or fight it; that industry must anticipate rather than react. Also, he mentioned that restrictive legislation is inevitable unless industry is committed wholly to correcting offenses rather than to foot dragging.

Mr. Dellinger's statement can also be applied to the public sector of society. Political subdivisions are plagued with financial problems. At the same time the taxpayers are demanding more and better services. Yet this same taxpayer is in near revolt when taxes are increased to pay for them. The community fathers divert available funds to those projects or services which are most expedient politically.

Just as industry is changing its attitude to anticipate solutions to the environment problems, the community leaders have re-oriented their thinking. The city dump is no longer acceptable unless it is operated as a true sanitary landfill. Land values have become so high to the proximity of communities that remote areas are being sought, resulting in longer and more costly hauls. In more densely populated areas, communities become competitors for the same fill land.

Community leaders are beginning to develop total long-range plans. A community land-fill can extend the life of the ground five-fold by bulk reduction through good conventional incineration. There are a number of classic examples where communities have had feasibility studies, estimates made in the past with specific recommendations, only to find them shelved because of a change in local politics.

The problem becomes more acute with time. To avoid the responsibility of a decision, new studies are often made, only to find the same basic answers at higher costs. In the meantime the landfill life is shortened and the community is compelled to resort to crash programs.

Rapid increases in capital costs resulting from delays between the original feasibility studies and estimates and the actual bid have compelled many communities to re-evaluate their problems. They are beginning to realize that by joining projects they can accomplish their objectives more efficiently and economically. Authority or districts have been formed to solve their water and sewage problems. These authorities have been very successful. However, the regional approach as a solution to the solid waste program has not met with success. No one wants his neighbors' garbage.

Although each community welcomes the benefit from his neighbors, the stigma of being the regional dump is all too much. Water and sewer lines under the ground are not obvious to the eye, but a garbage collection truck in a neighboring community is too visible. True, refuse trucks can be a contributing factor to street maintenance and traffic problems. But these arguments are often politically motivated and magnified. By proper routing and traffic control, this problem should not be a deterrent.

Unfortunately, political jealousies and local patronage have to be overcome by a long and arduous educational program. Relentless pressure must be applied to accomplish this goal, but ultimately the change will occur.

On a larger scale, the handling of community services are not exclusive to a governmental agency; the most successful services are the investor-owned utilities, such as gas, water, electric and telephone utilities under exclusive franchise. Although some communities operate such utilities, it is a general practice, due to increased technical sophistication and a large capital investment, to rely on the private sector for such services. Many communities have private refuse collectors and haulers, but there are few privately owned incinerators in the country. However, there are a number of privately owned land fills, few of which are true sanitary land-fills operated by private collectors and haulers.

Today a few municipal incinerators meet present day air pollution standards. At the best the burn out exceeds 3% of the combustibles and the total residue averages about 20% of the original volume. Many of the older incinerators are over-loaded and are singeing rather than incinerating the refuse. Basically, the average new plant is similar in design to its ancestors, except that it may have better instrumentation, a sophisticated air pollution control system and possibly equipped with waste heat boilers as for by-product production.

A community or regional authority does not have the funds; nor are they permitted to spend money on the experimentation of new concepts in incineration. However, since the authority relies upon engineers to

design a conventional disposal facility, there is a hesitation to test new technologically advanced designs for fear of criticism on the part of the taxpayer if the project fails.

The private sector is more venturesome since it is motivated by the profit incentive (profit, by the way, is not a dirty word,) to seek approaches toward doing a better job. The private sector is also more flexible. After research it can standardize and make improvements; hence, it can either reduce capital costs in time or at least hold the line against increases.

Our company has approached in this direction and is presently offering an advanced solid disposal system. The residue of all combustibles is below 1/10 of 1% and the total residue is less than 5% by volume of the average refuse. Because this end product has a use, little, if any, landfill is required.

A few years ago the capital costs of the conventional municipal incinerator was in the range of from \$4 to \$7 thousand dollars per ton a day. At the same time, municipal tax fill bonds interest was 3 1/2 to 4 1/2 %

Today, because of inflation and plant sophistication due to governmental air and water pollution control standards, capital costs are in the range from \$8 to \$15 thousand dollars per ton a day. The interest rate of municipal fill bonds are now well over 6% and very few issues are sold at that. Some states have raised and many are raising the legal limits of interest rates to help communities to dispose of their bonds. In the last few weeks the City of Newark, New Jersey sold its bonds at an interest rate of about 7.73%, and this is a tax free bond. Last week, the United States government in its refunding sold 19 1/2 month rates at interest rates of 8% and 83 1/2 month rates at 7 1/2%. In the meantime Tenace, Inc., a private company, sold bonds at 9%.

It is believed that because many of the communities are approaching the maximum limits of their bonded indebtedness and because the differentials between the interest paid have narrowed materially, communities may lean more towards the investor-owned company for its solution in handling their solid waste problem.

Many communities also have been looking for federal and state funds, while assistance bills have been passed, funding of them may be in the distant future. Also, tax free bonds as we know them may be removed or modified in the near future, so that they may not have the same appeal that they do have today to the investor.

A regional type investor-owned solid waste disposal can offer a number of benefits to an area. It can generate local taxes to help provide other needed services. It is not burdened by the political patronage which often adds to operational costs. It removes politics from the solution of various problems in the areas by remaining neutral. Very important, is the fact that it eliminates delay in construction time since its system is completed. It has single complete responsibility of design, construction, and operation, unlike a public-owned facility which is subject to a divided responsibility of the engineer, manufacturer of the components, the general contractor, the sub-contractor, and the operator.

How does an investor-owned facility operate? First, in order to insure its capital investment, it has to enter into a long term contract and franchise of about 20 years with a regional authority or a group of communities to dispose of their solid waste on a per ton cost of refuse (subject to escalation or de-escalation depending on the economy) with minimum tonnage guarantee. The company must construct the facility with its own funds; operate and maintain the plant. The refuse must be delivered by community-owned trucks or private haulers with each truck being weighed on an automated scale and each community or private hauler being billed monthly for the exact tonnage at the contracted price.

Since our plant is so highly technical and sophisticated, it requires professional management and personnel for its proper operation. Most community owned operations either lack or do not attract such personnel due to the lower pay scale. Technicians expect compensation commensurate with their training and ability and this often exceeds the salaries paid to city managers, public work directors or chief officers for whom they work, thus causing many personal problems.

As a result of our investigation for a complete system with a minimal labor requirement, we have offered not an incinerator but a pyro-fuser. Within our system pre-heated hot temperature air under controlled conditions is used to pyrolyze, this is, destructively distill the hydrocarbons in the combustibles. The fixed carbon is oxidized by dissociation of carbon monoxide at high temperatures to form carbon monoxide. The heat of formation elevates the temperature sufficiently to fuse or liquify the non-combustibles which are tapped and quenched in water. The gases under differential pressure are drawn off and burned with about 5 to 10% excess air in a combustor so as to reduce the total volume of gases to be cleansed. The spent gases are cooled through a waste heat boiler and the particulate matter is removed through a filter bag. The effluent gases are emitted with a minimum of pollutance to the atmosphere, thus meeting the most stringent air pollution control codes. The non-combustibles, after leaving the quenching tanks, are in the form of a frit, which can be used as an aggregate or can be put to

other economic uses. It bears absolutely no resemblance to the residue of the conventional incinerator.

The basic principles of the system have been employed for years in the metallurgical and gas-making industries. Capital cost is no higher than the more sophisticated incinerator; higher labor salaries for highly trained professional personnel is offset by reduced man-power working parts, which reduces mechanical failures and maintenance. The pyro-fuser does not require specially shaped refractories, so there is no delay in maintenance, nor is a large inventory of parts required. When related to the volume of residue produced, the cost is lower than the conventional incinerator. Investor-owned companies cannot afford to own and operate small isolated facilities and earn a reasonable return in its equity.

The regional approach creates a situation in which larger units can be installed and operated at a more reasonable cost per ton and still provide the necessary return on equity. The larger installations permit private enterprise to be competitive with the tax exempt entities.

INTRODUCTION

of

Bernard F. Hillenbrand
Executive Director
National Association of Counties

by

Edmund C. Wideman, Jr.
Board of County Commissioners
Luzerne County

This morning at this Conference we have already covered the basic topic of the Conference--Regionalism. In addition our panelists have discussed two of the major problems that are facing regions because of their cost and complexity.

In looking at the topic of Regionalism we find that there are a number of alternatives as to what regions are and how regions should be formed. Our speaker at this luncheon meeting is the Executive Director of the National Association of Counties. Because of his vast experience with counties in all sections of the United States, he is more than qualified to discuss with you the topic of "What is the Role of the County in Regionalism".

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE COUNTY IN REGIONALISM?

by

Bernard F. Hillenbrand
Executive Director
National Association of Counties

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I can't tell you how much I appreciate that beautiful introduction, particularly since you were thoughtful enough to turn on the tape recorder right underneath here. I want to take that tape recording home and play it for my wife and let her know what a great guy she's married to. It wouldn't bother her mother to listen, either!

You know, you never know how important it is to get a good introduction until you have an experience like I had not too long ago in the State of Maine. A fellow got up and said, "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is Bernard F. Hillenbrand, Executive Director of the National Association of Counties, who comes here from Washington, D.C. at no expense to this association!" and he sat down.

I have one story to share with you which I hope you will consider appropriate to the solid waste meeting, and it's a true story. One of our county supervisors in California is Bob St. Clair. Maybe some of you know him. He's a professional football player. He was all -pro with the San Francisco 49ers, and it seems that in one of his games he tore a ligament in his leg and was in the hospital for over a month. It seems he had a very efficient nurse who used to come bursting into his room in the morning saying "my, don't we have a beautiful day?" "Would we like the pillows plumped?", and so on. He used to start calling her the "we" girl and she got more and more obnoxious.

One morning she comes bursting in at six in the morning with a breakfast tray and she sets it down on the bed and she says, "My, don't we have a beautiful day. Would we like some fresh water?", and so on. The, she says "Oh, by the way, today is the day that we have to have a specimen", so she handed him the bottle. She says, "I will be out in the corridor and when we are ready, holler." So he looked down at the breakfast table and there was some apple juice, and he poured the apple juice in the specimen jar. Then he hollered, "We are ready" and she came bursting back in. She picked it up and said, "My, aren't we cloudy?" and he said "Well, we certainly are. Here let me run it through again.

I think if we had it to run through again, we would do a whole lot of things differently in our democracy; and one of the things is, of course, the subject that you have been wrestling with this morning. I think that would have paid a lot more attention from the very beginning to what you might call environmental pollution, and I want to take just a few minutes here to tell you about some of the things that we've been doing in this solid waste management field.

Maybe some of you receive our American County Government magazine. We've published a series of guides and have inserted them in to magazine. These guides are the very basic things about a solid waste management program; the area-wide approach to solid waste management; the legal authority to regulate dumping; planning of a solid waste management program; the organization of a program; design and operations of landfills and incinerators; budgeting and financing; technical assistance; citizen support; personnel; and an action plan. We have packaged these together in a rather attractive box and have done a similar series in air pollution control and water pollution control. It takes approximately 2 and a half hours to read.

While Dr. Mailey was writing his question, I was reading it again. It's about 2 1/2 hours in each of the series, and I think they are extremely worth-while. If any of you would like them, write down your mailing address and specify whether you want solid waste, water and air pollution, or all three. Give the information to Dr. Mailey and we will be very happy to send them to you.

The second thing I wanted to talk about briefly is the question of mass transit, your second major topic here. We in the National Association of Counties are vitally interested in mass transit. In the first place, we are particularly interested because of the nation's 3,750,000 miles of those roads. We hold a strong opinion that unless something is done in mass transit, there will be a hysterical uprising and they will start diverting our regular highway funds into mass transit use.

On the surface that might not be a bad idea; but there are still 100 million Americans who have automobiles and trucks; and we've got to have some place to put them. We can all sit in our automobiles now, you know, and talk to each other, using every mile of road in the U. S.. So we're supporting the mass transit act because of (1) self preservation of the highway program, but, (2) in an infinitely more aggressive manner, we believe there needs to be a mass transit program of great proportion.

I think it's important to note, as you will, that we're not just talking about rail subways. I personally feel that subway systems are vastly

too expensive, and we won't be building them in the U. S. in very large numbers. But we do need bus systems in smaller communities as long as we have a certain number of people who are disabled and we aren't going to be able to use cars. Obviously, in most urban areas, we can no longer park cars anyway, so we are going to have to have a new mass transit system.

We have taken a contrary position to the administration's proposal that we fund a mass transit program through a contract authorization, and in effect leave it up to the annual appropriation of the congress. We in the National Association of Counties are going to be joined by the Conference of Mayors and Governors, and have proposed that a mass transit fund should be created. The argument is made that there's no user fee to put into a transit fund, and we argue that there certainly is one--and it's the tax on automobiles.

When you buy an automobile, there is an excise tax. I think maybe many of you are under the opinion that it goes for highway purposes. It does not. It is used for general revenue, and we think that that tax in its entirety, or a major portion of it, should be ear-marked for mass transit on the very legitimate ground that the guy who has an automobile, if we have a good transit system, is going to get the benefit by being able to drive his own car. Now these ideas were not very popular with John Volpe. We had a shouting match about it at a meeting on public works last week in Cleveland.

My topic today is to discuss the role of the county with respect to regional affairs. I don't think we need to spend a whole lot of time talking about the importance, for example, of having an area - wide approach in solid waste management. I think there's no need to talk to a sophisticated audience like this, to say that we can no longer plan a transportation system, a mass transit system, on an individual unit basis.

As a point of fact, we are reaching -- very rapidly reaching -- a place in our American democracy, where there are going to be very, very few things that we can do on a do-it-yourself, go-it-alone basis. I'm now referring to things like police protection. If the criminals are organized through the Mafia and so on, I think it's about time we began to get things organized on the law and order side, and on some others, too.

I'd like to talk to you very, very briefly about what we think to be our theme--simply that the county is becoming the regional government in most areas. It is in effect the city of tomorrow, and I know we've got a lot of critics and a lot of detractors, but I'd like to review for you some of the basic advantages of a county which I think spells a very bright

future for us. As a matter of fact, if county government were listed on the New York Stock Exchange, I'd personally buy some of the issues because I think we're going to go somewhere with it, and it's for this reason. The counties in the U. S. have area-wide jurisdiction.

This is going to be increasingly important as we progress in our American civilization and have more and more things regulated and controlled. We're going to need it for the police powers and the solid waste. We can't let everybody decide what they are going to do about solid waste. We can't let every collector decide what standards he's going to impose on collecting trash. We can let every community in an area collect sewage, but we can't let everybody decide at what level of treatment they're going to have it, or else we're never going to have any clean streams for fishing, or any of the amenities of life.

We've been the pioneer in this field. As a matter of fact, the idea originated with our past president, Ed Connor, who was, lo and behold, both a city councilman and a county supervisor or commissioner up in Detroit. We've been strong supporters of this idea of having the elected county officials and city officials sit in an area-wide legislature of multi-jurisdictional composition to plan and organize, and to set standards and implement area-wide programs in these areas. The National Associations of Counties and NACO jointly have a service called the National Service to Regional Councils. We're available through that service to help counsel communities who would like to explore establishing these councils of government, or who would like to strengthen their existing councils. Again, we would be very happy to aid and assist in that effort.

The second basic advantage that a county has is that it has an area-wide tax base and I know that the commissioner on my right is going to say "this guy's about to suggest something else we should spend our county money for." I know how hard-pressed this and all counties are. But still the fact remains that all property in the U. S. with very, very few exceptions is in the county that is taxable, and if you just look at the statistics, I believe these are relatively sound. 87% of all the economic growth in the U. S. in the last decade has occurred in suburban areas --- in other words the factories, the shopping centers, the houses that carry their own weight, and the apartment house in the suburban area. We've been depopulating the cities; we've been depopulating the rural areas; and unless we want to run a democracy with two or three Americas, we're going to have to find a way to stop it. Then this economic development can be taxed through the county. The county offers the kind of a base that we're going to need to finance these things in the future.

The third great advantage that a county has is its economy of scale. I'm always impressed with one of the banks in the Washington area that has this slogan: "our bank is large enough to serve you but small enough to care;" and I think that this is what we're going to come to. We're going to have to operate on a larger scale if for no other reason than the high salary costs of the kind of people we are going to need to run things.

For example, in solid waste disposal, a municipal incinerator is one of the most complex pieces of equipment operated like this, on a multi-million dollar investment, unless somebody really knows what they're doing. I think with respect to a sewage plant, again a complex piece of equipment, a vast public outlay is totally useless unless it's managed properly.

These are the kinds of things to get the right kind of people: You're going to have to have a broader tax base. You can't have a situation like you'd have in St. Lewis County, Missouri. They have 96 municipalities. You can't have 96 treatment plants, you can't have 96 police departments. They do, but you can't do that for a long range. You've got to have more economy of scale if for no other reason but this is the age of specialists and we are not going to be able to get specialists to do these things unless we operate on a much larger base than we have in the past.

Again, most states, even Pennsylvania, have got many small counties, but again it depends on what small is. I think if you look at the average statistics that Pennsylvania is pretty well situated, and that most of the counties are big enough to operate and have an economy of scale, which is not the case in many of the other states.

I think the fourth major advantage is that the county has political accountability--political accountability with very few exceptions. Every American, all 200 million of us, are governed by a county. The population breakdown in the U.S. is 1/3 rural, 1/3 central city and 1/3 suburbs.. We're a nation of thirds and the county offers us a vehicle to start putting these things back together again.

I know that we're all increasingly aware of the situation with central cities with large collections of minorities and rural areas with the same thing and vast poverty in between these affluent rings around urban areas. Well, again we need to pull these all together. I personally think that we've got to start creating political units of government at the local level that take this into account, that has representation in the central city, the suburbs, and rural area. Again the county is the unit to do it.

Chicago, with a great collection of minority people, poor people and so on, in downtown Chicago, and Cook County encompass not only rich suburbs but also parts of the rural poor as a point of fact. I think we need to put it all back together again like we did at the beginning; return to some of the promises of our democracy that every man is equal. We have a theory of government to put it all back together again and I think that every effort finds us dividing ourselves, creating new special authorities and districts so on outside the control of elected officials, is like pushing snow ahead of you. Some day its got to be removed. Some day we've got to go back to some of these promises unless we're willing to forego the essence of a democracy.

I think the fifth major advantage of a county is that it has closer ties with the state and with the federal government. All of us have had our share of demogogery. I think almost everybody in this sophisticated audience has had an opportunity to make a fourth of July speech denouncing the federal government and the state government. But the plain fact is we do have to have the federal government and the state government involved in these things. We do have to have what everybody likes to call a partnership, that overworked word. A partnership also has to include private business, too.

But again we have 1,600 federal programs now of various types of aid. I notice your questions this afternoon--a hunting bee. Can you fellows in this audience think of any grant application where we could get some dough from the new solid waste management act for a demonstration project. We're all doing it. It's gamesmanship. We used to play Monopoly; now we figure how we can get a grant. There are 1600 of these programs; they account now for \$17 billion of federal dollars poured back into local efforts in some form of a grant. At the state level, both my native state of New York and my adopted state of Maryland, about 60 to 70% of the state-collected money goes back to the local governments in some sort of a division schedule.

Again, we've got to find some mechanism in this country to overcome an unequal distribution of resources. I'm told that there are communities in the state of Pennsylvania that are fortunate enough to have incorporated around the Bethlehem Steel Works or some other big installation and have almost a free tax ride, while other communities have got a desperate problem just to educate their young. I think that any reasonable American will say that a child, if he is born anywhere in the U. S., is entitled to an education equal to any other child that is born anywhere in the United States. I think we've got to use the mechanism of state aid and federal aid if for no other reason than the totally unequal distribution of resources and economic activity across the face of the United States. In this, the counties have had infinitely more experience.

We started out with a road program in the early 20's, a welfare program by and large, with exceptions like Pennsylvania, which have been run by the counties. Perhaps the most successful program in all the history of mankind has been the partnership between federal government and the county agricultural agent through the university in solving the agricultural problem. That is one problem that does not nag at us, but it nags at almost all the other of our fellow human beings on this planet. This kind of partnership paid off in agriculture and I think it is going to begin to pay off in some of the other areas, too. So the county again has got these tremendous potentials and almost everybody will concede these potentials and the they say, "well, you make that kind of a speech but you do not know counties in our place."

We've got some terrible handicaps at the county level that are not of the making of the county officials and the people who try to run them. As a matter of fact, the miracle is not that we who are in county government do not run these things magnificently. The miracle is that we can run them at all the way we've got them organized. We started out to do one thing and we've been asked to do something else and the institution has not changed structurally, politically, and financially to meet the new responsibility.

We started out to be a local administrative agency of the state. We were doing things that the state mandated. The elections were mandated by the state. The courts, the administration of justice, is mandated by the state and what we did is say that we are going to create some subdivisions. Everybody cannot run to the capital every time they've got a court case. So we said we are going to create counties that are going to be political subdivisions of the state and that they're going to administer these state programs on a community-by-community basis and be paid well instead of having these people appointed by the state. We will elect them the same way we got in this business which we've been in for quite a while--350 years. We've been in the county business twice as long as we've been in the business of the national government.

We started in 1609. The national government started in 1789 with its first congress, so we've had a lot of experience and our role has changed. Now we're asked to do totally different kinds of things, and two of them you've got before you today, mass transit and solid waste management. This can't be mandated by the state. This has got to have local variation--local kinds of responses. You've got to be able to make local decisions. At this point what we need at the county level is to get some unleashing, to get the state to give more and more authority and responsibility back to the local level and let the counties do things.

Let me cite one example. There is a constitutional provision in the State of Arkansas which reads as follows: no county official shall handle public funds except the county judge". The same statute says: "however, every county official shall be bonded, except the county judge, who may not be bonded." When I go to Arkansas, I could get a lot of laughs about Pennsylvania because you've got just as many idiotic provisions.

I was in New Jersey yesterday morning and they have what we call the Dillon Rule in county government. Dillion was a backward judge in Iowa 100 years ago who made a ruling, the famous Dillion Ruling, which said the county cannot do anything unless the legislature specifically authorizes it. If the legislature authorizes them to pick apples, they may pick apples; they may not pick crabapples because a crabapple is not an apple and this is literally how we've been trying to operate county government. So to get around it, we've tried to adopt some imagination saying you cannot make a rule for one county that does not apply to them all.

So we came up with the idea we are going to have classifications of counties. I was in New Jersey yesterday. One of their classifications "class counties of the six classes, any county of 630,000 population that does border on the Atlantic Ocean." That is one classification. In another classification, "the eighth class is any county of 300,000 population that does not border on the Atlantic Ocean." Well, it is ludicrous and laughable. I wish young people thought it was laughable and that it will be that we will just get rid of these idiotic things. I hope they keep the faith because we've got to make some changes in this--the structure has to be changed.

Another major cause is that we do have one thing called county. We hacked and split and chopped and whacked them. Every time a problem came up, we created some new machinism. We created a new authority, a new board, a new this, a new that, and then to top all of that off we've specified in the state constitution that we're going to have departments run under individual elected officials. I do not personally see anything wrong with that, but you have to have some way to put it all together, so that you can respond as a unit of government and not as a committee. You know how elective a committee is, and that is how we've tried to run things.

It seems to me what we did is we made a basic error. We took the county government structure from England, but in England they have a parliamentary system where every executive of a department has to be a legislator, put it that way and then the group meeting in effect selects a prime minister who we call a chairman or something. Well, that system worked beautifully in Britain, but it is totally unworkable here.

I know of no aspect of American life that responds to committee response. None--zero! I do not know of any corporation that is run by a committee. I do not know of any legislature that really is run that way. I mean it just does not operate that way. It does not function without an executive. We've seen it at various times in the U. S. when we've had a strong Congress and a weak executive. You all know what the problem is. We need central management of the county. We need qualified people there. We're going to have to attract them.

We've got 3,000 counties in the U. S. -- We've got 1,200,000 employees and we spend \$10 billion a year. We're growing faster--almost twice as fast as the cities are. We're growing fast--we're the fastest growing unit of government in the U. S. and this may surprise you. A very high percentage of those county officials and county employees are professionals. They're doctors, nurses, welfare workers, school teachers, superintendents of schools, engineers, county attorneys, psychologists and psychiatrists. We've got a huge array of professional people and we need now to make structural and administrative changes that reflect the new county, the new look of the county in the U. S.

And finally, one of the really tough problems is that we do not have some type of an executive. We need a position at the county level. If you say "governor", everybody in this room knows what a governor is. If you say "mayor", everybody knows what a mayor is. If you say "is it prothonotary?" nobody knows what a prothonotary is; you do, I don't. It's a freeholder. What's a police juror? I mean, we need some kind of a leadership, some kind of an executive position.

We've got a strong trend running in the U. S. toward a position called a county executive. It's really the strong mayor type. You have a strong mayor who has responsibility for appointments and item veto of legislation. Because then by the same token you take the county governing body and make it a legitimate legislature. They can pass rules and regulations and be a legislative body and not a combined legislative, executive and judicial body.

One of the men on my board of directors is a county judge from Tennessee, an administrative judge which means that he's like a county executive. But he's also very sad. He said, "I just had to sentence a man to die." He's also a judicial judge and a legislator. He serves on the county board. He's all three. Well, if there was ever anything we started out with, it was a concept that we're going to operate powers in our national government and our state government, but we haven't done it at the county level. Again, we've got the model before us.

There are 18,000 cities in the U. S. -I don't know of any of them that doesn't have a mayor. We've got the models before us, but we just have to start changing our thinking of what a county is. We say it's the city of tomorrow. It's the area-wide government. It's the metropolitan government. It's the new thing. It's in. It's going. We've got to make the changes that's going to facilitate that.

I was in New Jersey yesterday, as I mentioned. They have what they call the Musto Report, and I know you have a parallel effort here. There are a lot of people, I think it's fair to say, my good friend Commissioner Barr, that your Department of Community Affairs understands the potential of this. His experience, as you know, was in municipal government, but he can see. I was an assistant director of the City National League of Cities. I worked for the City of Syracuse. My experiences were municipal----I consider myself a city guy. A county is just a big city. It's a super city. We need to change the structure to recognize this fact, to make it useful. Now in New Jersey, they have what they call the Musto--M U S T O--Report, and if you're interested in local government you ought to write to Senator Musto. Just write to Senator Musto in care of the state legislature--Bill Musto--William--M U S T O. They've got the finest report I've ever seen, which is exactly on the subject of this conference--regionalism. They're saying that there needs to be a unit of government between the municipality and the state--a regional government. They are saying that government should be a county, even a county that has all the weaknesses we've just enumerated here. In New Jersey they have even more, and it's got to be strengthened. Their immediate start is to give each of the 21 counties an option of one of four things that's called an elected executive.

Well, to me that's a strong mayor system in the municipal sense. The second form is the appointed executive. Well, that's a county in the council manager form. Now, one of them is an elected chairman, which to me is the commission form that we had a wave of in municipal government about thirty years ago. And the last is what you might call a weak mayor kind of system in which you elect one of them at large, and he becomes a supervisor or county mayor. But he really does not have very much more power and authority than the legislative body.

But the whole point of this is that your sister state of New Jersey recognized these are not theory or thought men. There wasn't a college professor on this, in all due respect to college professors. These are work - a - day political leaders, some of the hardest skinned political leaders in the state of New Jersey, coming up with this kind of plan. Not us--them! It's a terrific plan, and I think it's going to go in New Jersey.

I think that we keep forgetting, and maybe this story will illustrate it. This is a true story. I have a little daughter age five as of last summer. We were staying at the farm, sleeping in sleeping bags out on the lawn. I said to my daughter, "Susan, that looks like a man in the moon, but it isn't." She said, "I know, Daddy. They have a rocket at Cape Kennedy, and it's going up there in three stages, and when the first stage falls off, the next stage does, and then the next stage. And there's going to be three men in there who are going to have to wear oxygen masks because there's no oxygen on the moon. They're going to go up around the moon, around the back of it, because we've never seen the back of the moon, and later on they're going to land." I said, "Susan, you better go to sleep. It's getting late."

My point is that the public, the American public, is way ahead of us. We've been going on the assumption that the American public will continue to endure the lag between our current experience and our institutions. They're not going to endure in any of the areas that I know. The students are not going to endure in the educational area; the minority groups are not going to endure in the job bias and civil rights areas, and I think the new citizens in the U. S. are not going to endure with respect to our institutions. Again, one half of all of our Americans are under twenty-five years old. More than half of the people in the whole earth cannot remember World War II. These are the realities with which we're dealing. I say the time is here that we be the voice. I felt like St. John, the voice crying in the wilderness, ten years ago.

Now, we're beginning to get somewhere. We're beginning to get other people saying the things that we say. We have a modest grant that hasn't been announced yet from a foundation to set up a center in Washington to provide information, not to sell particular wares, but provide information about management and organization. We will be in a position to provide all kinds of materials for groups like this--for League of Women Voters, for the Chamber of Commerce. We're going to do this cooperatively with about one hundred different organizations such as the AFL-CIO and the Urban League. We are going to be in a position to help with meetings like this where people are interested in revising their government structure. So I would like you to volunteer if you will want to do it. We'd be very happy to help with staff back-up, speakers. If you want, next year, when you have one of these meetings, you may have help on revitalization of county government or local government, and just counties, cities and states.

Let me conclude this way--to change political structures in the U. S., someone said, that it is easier to merge two Baptist churches than it is to make a structural change in the county government. I'm

not a Baptist but I understand they have never merged any Baptist churches. But it's a long haul. We're cemented in constitutional restrictions. We wear out men. We have to team. It's like a relay race. We wear out a set of elected officials. They get too tired of it. Just the obstacles are too overwhelming, particularly the obstacles that we, as citizens, create by not understanding, not helping, sitting around complaining, and not paying taxes.

We are part of the problem, not part of the solution. But I do think that day is past. We have to worry about doing our thing--it is going to be a long effort, and I personally believe, along with the young people, that everybody has got to do their thing. You ought to be associated with something bigger than yourself, something that is very important. I'm very proud to be associated with it. I know it is a long, tough effort. But I know that if we don't do something like this we might very well face a real catastrophe in American democracy.

So, I'll tell a final true story which I think illustrates the point. Senator Theodore Green, from the state of Rhode Island, was the oldest man ever to serve in the U. S. Senate. On the occasion of his ninety-first birthday, he was interviewed by the newspaper reporters. One young reporter said, "Senator Green, how does it feel to be ninety years old?" The Senator thought a minute and said, "Son, not bad, when you consider the alternative."

"PHILLIPS 66"

REMARKS OF THE MODERATOR

by

Mr. James Lee, Assistant Editor
Times Leader Evening News

For the next hour we will break down into relatively small groups for the purpose of considering specific questions relating to the two problems discussed this morning. The format of the discussion was formulated by Dr. Don Phillips, a Professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan and is known as "Phillips 66". He observed that, in a series of experimental discussions group sessions, the optimum size for group discussion is most often six persons. A group smaller than this may not be able to keep the discussion going. A group larger than this tends to break down into sub-groups.

The "Phillips 66" format has been successfully used by many organizations in "brainstorming" and "think" sessions. It is thought to be most useful in generating new ideas or new approaches to well-known problems.

Each table has been assigned either the topic of Mass Transit or Solid Waste Management. A discussion guide has been provided for your use along with the program on the Conference. The chairman is responsible for keeping the discussion at the table on the problem assigned to that table. I do hope that everyone at a table avails himself of the opportunity to make his views known. We have decided to follow this format because individuals are likely to weigh the difficulties of these complex problems in accordance with their backgrounds and the roles they play in the area's social and economic structure.

DISCUSSION GUIDE

MASS TRANSIT

1. How can Northeast Pennsylvania avoid the plight of some of our bigger American cities that find themselves unable to operate a transportation system? It is transportation an essential element for a growing region?
2. What does Northeast Pennsylvania have to offer which would convince transportation planners and designers that our region justifies the development of a mass transportation system?
3. It is time to stop developing transportation systems on a fragmented piecemeal basis when the whole Northeast region could become a more cohesive community politically, socially, economically and physically. Health and social services, marketing, manufacturing, housing, and the total urbanization process could be linked to a long-range plan for mass transportation. How can an integrated delivery system for all kinds of consumer services be brought about by mass transportation.
4. Is a transit authority, with sufficient powers to establish an integrated circulatory system, politically feasible? Is a mass transit system possible without some form of regional or metropolitan government in Northeast Pennsylvania?
5. Should an efficient mass transit system, which puts the service where the people are, be privately owned with access to a public subsidy, or should it be publicly owned?

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

MASS TRANSIT

by

Frank Chadwick

Luzerne County Planning Commission

Transportation is an essential element in the growth and development of any region; Northeast Pennsylvania is no exception. An efficient mass transit system will have to be planned and developed if this region is to continue its rise from a depressed area category to the status of a prosperous and burgeoning community.

It is somewhat ironic, but perhaps Northeast Pennsylvania is fortunate in not having developed as rapidly as other areas of the state and nation. The plight of larger, more rapidly developed urban areas, is reflected by their choked and congested inner-cities. The planners are trying desperately to cope with the situation, but are using stop-gap techniques to try and alleviate the problem that has already engulfed them.

For Northeast Pennsylvania, now is the time to initiate feasibility studies, so that the planning, development, and implementation of a modern, safe, clean and efficient mass transit system can get underway before it is too late. It is possible for us to profit from and avoid the plight of bigger American cities.

Northeast Pennsylvania has many assets that justify the planning and development of a mass transit system. Geographically, the region is ideally situated within easy driving distance of both the New York and Philadelphia Metropolitan markets; the excellent state and Interstate highway systems make the area the crossroads of Northeastern United States; the growth of tourism and recreation as a major industry of the area; the increase in the number of new, diversified industry as a result of industrial development programs; vast areas of open space and vacant land for the development of new towns; and many fine educational institutions. All these things point to continued growth and influx into this region.

An integrated delivery system through mass transit would be the optimum of any comprehensive transit plan of the future. However, our group felt that the cost required to develop such an overall system would be prohibitive, especially in the light of priorities for more pressing problems of solid waste, air and water pollution, and other aspects of urban decay.

It was concluded that a less ambitious goal to be used to get started in the area of mass transit and that a prototype of the overall system be set up on a smaller scale so people could see the advantages of such a system and therefore cause its expansion over the entire region. Most people can not identify with such concepts and probably consider such a plan too costly.

Parochialism has probably been one of the main hindrances to continued or more rapid growth of this region. A higher authority is needed to establish such a system. This authority would have to take in many of the smaller political units so as to provide the broad scope that such a system would require to be feasible.

Two alternatives were offered: Either private ownership with public subsidy to help develop and establish such a costly system; or, public ownership with the operation contracted with a professional management firm.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

MASS TRANSIT

by

Donald D. Moyer, Executive Director
Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania

Throughout the discussion of the five questions was a thread of concern about public or private operation of mass transit systems. The participants agreed that an important historical note should be underscored, i. e. public authorities have come into the operation of mass transit systems in many larger American cities only after the private systems were no longer available.

It was agreed at our table that the luncheon speaker's recommendation that the present auto excise tax be set aside for mass transportation is commendable and should be encouraged with the operation of a transportation system.

Some at our table expressed concern about the definitions of mass transportation and region. Mass transportation can mean a highly complex and technologically-advanced system including rail, subway, monorail, sky buses, etc. ; but in our region at the present time it may simply mean much more efficient use of public transportation within the region. Mass transportation is a priority concern today for the Scranton/Wilkes-Barre/Hazleton area for internal circulation, but there was a common agreement that the surrounding counties especially toward the Poconos constitute an important area for mass transportation plans because of their relation between our urban center and the Megalopolis in the East.

We provided the following inventory of assets and liabilities with regard to the justification of the development of a mass transportation system.

1. The highway transportation grid as completed or on the drawing boards is probably very adequate at least to the year 2000.
2. The present airport facilities and capabilities are not adequate and the necessary supplemental public funds do not appear to be in the near future. There is, however, some possibility that the pressure on air services in the Greater New York Area may force the creation of facilities to handle that traffic in an area that might be as close as 50-60 miles from here.

3. There is optimism about the growth potential of the total region even though there is no promise of population growth from within. In other words, developments will be made to create patterns of in-migration.
4. The existing rail systems and rights of way are under-utilized and could be effectively included.
5. The quality industrial development in Northeastern Pennsylvania tends to take place in modern industrial parks.

The participants agreed that an authority is politically feasible once there is enough pressure to create the political feasibility. An authority can come into being without regional or metropolitan government because the local communities who give the authority will not need to give up very much present power. They would probably enter into an authority so long as there would be assurance of no additional cost to local government.

Our table was evenly divided on the desired pattern of ownership: public, private, and private with subsidy. It was agreed, however, that public ownership may be the most acceptable if the entire subject of mass transportation is placed before the electorate.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

or

MASS TRANSIT

by

James F. Furey
Area Operating Supervisor
Pennsylvania Power and Light Company

Transportation is an essential element for a growing region. However, the facilities should be planned initially so that the region can grow, knowing what the transportation facilities are.

In order for Northeast Pennsylvania to avoid the plight of some of our bigger American cities that find themselves unable to operate a transportation system, planning must begin now, not when it becomes a problem. The County Planning Commission is an organization that can do some background work on what is needed in the area. Initially, this research would be on a county level. A Transportation Authority would then be needed to determine how to implement the items that are needed.

The biggest item that Northeast Pennsylvania can offer that would convince transportation planners and designers that our region justifies the development of a mass transportation system is the inducement that whoever operated the system would not lose money. The establishment of industrial parks and the influx of industries to these parks is adequate justification that a mass transportation system is needed.

It is time that the entire Northeast region stop developing transportation systems on a fragmented piecemeal basis and make plans that would benefit the entire area. The way to start is by getting the two counties, Luzerne and Lackawanna, to enter into a joint study as to what could be done. At the present time, this is needed, but the feasibility seems doubtful because of political jealousy.

A Regional Distribution Center would help make a more cohesive community. By using the railroad to bring goods to this center and trucks for distributing the goods, we may reduce the number of trucks involved in long hauls of goods.

A transit authority with sufficient powers to establish an integrated circulatory system is politically feasible in a county. Once outside of county lines, there may be difficulty.

A Mass Transit System is possible without some form of regional government in Northeast Pennsylvania, but to be able to take advantage of government funds, it would be well to have one agency dealing with the federal agency. The Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania, Inc. could do tremendous work in this area.

A privately owned mass transit system would operate more efficiently because it would be part of the free enterprise system and would be trying to run the system as a profit. As long as the service is provided, the general public probably would not care who owned the system. During our entire discussion, one idea was predominate: that was Mass Transportation is a service. If people realize this, the problems of putting a system into operation could be kept to a minimum.

DISCUSSION GUIDE

SOLID WASTE

1. The National Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 provides money for demonstration projects and research projects on Solid Wastes. What new and innovative approaches might be pursued to help solve the Solid Waste problems in the areas of collection, storage and disposal in Northeast Pennsylvania?
2. Waste making has become a way of life with the American. Companies plan fixed life into their products, which then become solid waste to dispose of. What techniques might be employed in Northeast Pennsylvania to recover or recycle these wastes into the economy as basic materials for new or old processes? Could new industries be developed? What?
3. What are the advantages of sanitary landfill as against incineration for Northeast Pennsylvania?
4. With the rising costs of wages, land and equipment, and the ever increasing volume of solid waste to dispose of, Regional Systems for Solid Waste Management are the best way to keep down the per ton cost of disposal. What elements should be taken into account to provide a highly efficient Regional Solid Waste Management System? Can county government be used as the unit of government as part of a multi-county system?
5. Approximately 6 million junk automobiles are scrapped each year. Some find their way to junk yards, parts salvage operations; others remain along highways or streets and in backyards. What methods can be employed to insure that junk cars will be disposed of in a proper manner? Can these methods be part of a county or multi-county system of disposing of junk cars?
6. Although it might be advantageous for several (or many) municipalities or counties to jointly support a solid waste disposal plant ---possibly on an authority basis---could this be an area that might be attractive for private enterprise? Is so, how are rates assessed against each community being served? By population? Tonnage hauled? Other?

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

SOLID WASTE

by

Ellsworth C. Salisbury
Executive Vice President
Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce

Our society is crisis oriented. It appears that you must face tragedy or near tragedy before implementing change. The area of pollution control and abatement is approaching these proportions. We are told that we produce seven to ten pounds of solid waste per capita per day. This figure does not include agricultural and other types of waste which would conceivably increase that figure significantly. The enormity of the problem becomes quite clear when you consider a community of 35,000 persons, such as Hazleton, will produce 350,000 pounds of solid waste per day, or 2,450,000 pounds per week. As technology and packaging advances, this figure will, in all probability, increase.

We are faced with a situation requiring our best efforts and thinking.

The Pennsylvania General Assembly adopted in 1968 Act 241 which is known as the Pennsylvania Solid Waste Management Act. The purpose of this legislation is aimed specifically at the problem and provides guide lines and procedures for approaching its solution. It creates high standards for the handling of solid waste. It requires municipalities, singularly or jointly, to approach their problems in an intelligent manner. It, in short, enunciates public policy and provides the teeth to insure rigid enforcement and compliance.

Solid waste should be viewed as an economic asset requiring recycling. The technology in the area of solid waste is just evolving. However, there are a number of indicators that this material through various techniques, such as composting, can be utilized to economic and, indeed, social advantage.

Solid Waste Management, as it exists today is generally inefficient and socially unacceptable. However, we must recognize the need for broad-based public support in order to generate the needed changes for the following reasons:

The present systems for handling solid wastes are outmoded. Any solution for meeting the problem, particularly in urban, congested areas, will require intergovernmental cooperation.

The economic implications, particularly when considering initial investments, will be high and it will be difficult to communicate the long range economies for such a cooperative venture.

And finally, the need for research and the time factor present in such programs make it difficult to gain public acceptance.

There are several techniques for handling solid waste. There will, in all probability, be others developed in the future. Existing techniques will be altered as research produces better means.

Any program if it is to be successful, must be approached on a multi-jurisdictional basis and the parochial points of view must be resisted. With this type of cooperation on a broad scale, there would then be an opportunity to apply for and perhaps obtain, a Federal demonstration grant.

A consolidation on a governmental service or functional basis would, if successful, lead to additional approaches and other service areas which, in turn, may result, ultimately, in a single functional and geographic government.

In order to assure a successful program in solid waste management, there has to be total cooperation. This would include cooperation on the part of manufacturers of goods as well as consumers. Manufacturers of durable items should be encouraged, through some fashion, to maintain responsibility for their product for its lifetime. Suggestions were made that a manufacturer be required to physically reprocess his product when it reaches its final stage of obsolescence. Another suggestion might be that there should be government subsidy to manufacturers to make up any cost differentials in using scrap steel. This would encourage greater use of this metal in products which could be imposed through stricter restrictions on the use of resources.

The consumer must also bear a certain responsibility for a system if it is to operate effectively. Trash might be presorted in the home prior to disposal. This would insure better utilization of its eventual re-use by diverting glass, metal, rags, and paper from actual garbage. It was felt that garbage itself could be eliminated through the widespread use of garbage disposal units, and it would eventually become part of the sludge in the sewage treatment plant and find other adaptive uses. By presorting and developing systems for processing or recycling the assorted waste, economic advantages would be realized.

The entire operation could be set up on a regional basis. An Authority comprised of leading citizens should be appointed to operate the system. This would eliminate or minimize political influences. The Authority would be run as a business with profits, or any gains developed being returned to the communities. Or, the Authority would establish programs for such monies generated which could include back-filling, recreation, beautification, for example.

By presorting waste, it can be more efficiently handled and this would encourage the development of such facilities as a glass plant, kraft paper plant, or other such operations at the final staging site to utilize the waste effectively.

The regional Authority could also be set up as a profit making operation, whereby the local communities would buy stock in the corporation, and the profits generated would be returned to the communities in dividends. Any corporation operating on that basis would be required by its contracts with the municipalities to introduce applicable technological advances to insure consistent and up to date performance.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

SOLID WASTE

by

Mrs. Marjorie Bart
Member of Council
Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania

The 1965 Act provides for demonstration projects. A close surveillance on the results of these demonstration projects should be maintained on them before making plans. A suggested demonstration grant would be to make a determination of the content of the solid waste in this region. On the basis of this data, a determination should be made if incineration would take care of the largest share of the solid waste. A further determination should be made to ascertain if the scrap could be separated at the landfill and made available at the site to private waste businessmen via bidding procedure. Although it is not anticipated that this would be a money-maker, the procedure would take care of some of the expenses of either the demonstration projects or the resulting operation.

Waste making is one of the natural problems of an affluent society. In a capitalistic society, as long as there is demand, this type of activity will continue. Since the profit motive is of primary concern to commercial establishments, we can assume that the scrap industry as a whole has a keen eye for the materials that will make for additional profit. This observation is amply demonstrated by the recent publicity given to the salvage factor of the aluminum beer can. The salvage value of aluminum products has been well established for many years.

The Northeastern Pennsylvania area has a unique situation as far as sanitary landfill is concerned due to the large acreage of anthracite strip mining pits. Some of this acreage could be available at extremely favorable acquisition cost. Thus the unfavorable land involved in strip mining operations can and should be diverted to favorable land uses.

A county-wide group, preferably an authority, should be established for solid waste disposal. This should be preceded by a public relations campaign so that proper zoning can be enacted or complied with, and this will provide an opportunity to coordinate with the overall planning of the County. In this regard, some areas now have refuse

collection while others do not. However, there is still the same amount of solid waste to be disposed of in the very same piece of geography. Our neighbors problems with respect to solid waste, therefore, are our own problems on a county-wide basis.

The establishment of a county-wide group can be an effective first step in the regionalization process. The population of the entire County will know that particular service they are receiving for their money. In some quarters, it is felt that the people usually accept additional costs if they know fully that everyone is getting the same service on a fair-share basis. Understandably, this will take a tremendous public effort, particularly in those areas now receiving solid waste disposal services. However, if the localities can show that the money previously applied to solid waste services is put to good use for items which would otherwise raise taxes, it may be possible to convince people that a regionalized solid waste service would be beneficial.

An automobile shredding operation is expensive and requires an enormous supply of raw materials. Neither one county nor several counties could supply the number of junked automobiles necessary to make a profitable shredding operation. Perhaps a private business firm would be in a position to establish a reverse production line which would strip the automobiles of useful parts and flatten and sell the body and frame to a central shredding operator.

A solid waste disposal plant would not be profitable at this time, and therefore, would be unattractive to private enterprise.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

SOLID WASTE

by

Robert L. Betzler
Assistant Director of Public Works
Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania

In discussing approaches that might be pursued to help solve the solid waste problems, it is apparent that solid waste fill of existing strip mine pits is highly desirable. Therefore, it is imperative that the future effects of large scale controlled filling be ascertained.

It was also suggested that basic materials be magnetically coded (like blank checks) to allow for easy separation for salvage.

Recycling and recovering of wastes into the economy as basic materials for new or old processes should be handled as a national rather than a regional problem. The basic design of manufactured goods should take into account their eventual disposal. Disposal cost could be included in the original cost, forcing the user to pay. However, the application of such a proposal is extremely difficult. Economics and technology are at the base of a recycling process and both are independent of Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Sanitary landfill is advantageous in Northeastern Pennsylvania in comparison to incineration because it is less costly, reclaims waste land, causes little air pollution, and requires little capital investment.

At this point in time, our needs cannot be met by a regional solid waste management system or multi-county system. Similar groupings of neighboring or adjacent municipalities are presently more efficient. Overall standards should be set at the multi-county level, with the methods of compliance to be worked out at a local level depending on conditions. These conditions include optimum size collection agencies, large enough to provide bulk purchasing, maintenance, etc., and yet responsive to the individual needs. Also, centralized landfill location is necessary to minimize travel time and eliminate transfer stations, etc.

In order to insure that junk cars will be disposed of in a proper manner, the Bureau of Motor Vehicles should require a deposit when each vehicle is registered. This deposit is to be returned when the vehicle is deposited as some special disposal point. Since these disposal points will process a large number of automobiles, salvage operations should be profitable due to the economy of size.

A county or multi-county system would be ideal. Even if the deposit idea does not work, a centralized disposal point would provide some revenue to cover the cost of collection.

There are presently several private corporations that provide solid waste disposal service. Most of the charge is on a tonnage basis.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

SOLID WASTE

by

Joseph A. Macialek
Resource Development Agent
Cooperative Extension Service
The Pennsylvania State University

An approach to solid waste disposal now used involves the use of strip mine pits for solid waste disposal. Run-off, seepage, and effects of mixing mine acid water and seepage from solid waste should be thoroughly studied. Duplication of projects undertaken at other locations should be avoided.

On the basis of conservation of natural resources, recycling should be done because it is wasteful not to recycle. This includes replaceable resources like paper as well as non-replaceable resources such as metals. This problem should receive national attention and legislation.

Since it may not be profitable to sort wastes in most cases, perhaps the user should pay a premium for materials that have a one-way ticket. This premium would then be used for helping to dispose of material in its waste state.

One of the elements that should be taken into account to provide a highly successful regional solid waste management system is to identify the land resources which are suitable for land fill. The reservation of such land is of apparent importance.

Sample ordinances and contracts should be developed to assist municipalities into a regional system. (Note--the Penn State Extension Service has copies of the contracts used in the State College Area system). The Institute of Regional Affairs might provide this service similar to the work done on the regional sewerage systems.

One of the problems is the lack of power of a waste management group to acquire a site without local government approval. It was indicated that this power might be vested directly to the management group.

Most felt that county government could be made the basic unit of government for a regional system; however, there has been much discussion by lesser government units about erosion of their authority.

Legislation and enforcement is needed by each municipality to remove old autos from streets and unauthorized dumping areas. This should be followed by regulation and control of existing salvage yards (not elimination).

An added fee to the original cost of the auto can be of help to move the auto back into the production cycle. The user, then, would subsidize the recycling operation. Another suggestion was to purchase and stockpile the shredded auto waste until it became profitable to reuse.

It is feasible that solid waste disposal operations could be attractive for private enterprise. Most of the activity in the past was private enterprise and it could be returned. Each local government must make a commitment--that is to adopt a code forcing home owners and businesses to participate and then license private contractors to operate. This would be similar to a utility operation. Payments would be on a per family or per can basis.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

SOLID WASTE

by

Leo A. Corbett, Professional Engineer
Director of Public Works
Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania

Suggestions on new and innovative approaches to solid waste disposal are varied and extremely interesting to explore. A laser beam incineration method is possibly too expensive and would still leave a by-product requiring disposal. Control problems would be difficult, including the breakdown of bulk wastes, particularly junk cars. But this is good incentive for research on this type of disposal method.

A built-in disposal-vacuum system could be used, whereby waste can be conveyed by high speed to landfills or a transfer station directly from the building, similar to a sewer system.

In discussing techniques to recover or recycle wastes, perhaps land-fills can be reduced and replaced by incineration in order to better balance conservation and reclamation. Pollution control would be necessary in incineration. However, modern day and future research would provide control devices to take care of the problem.

Presently the country has food and drug laws. Why not control of disposal products and types of containers? Ordinances can be drawn outlawing the one way bottle.

Recoverable wastes should be separated and reclaimed. Reclaiming of new materials could create new industries. Reclaiming of paper has been done in the past and is feasible now, with many markets available throughout the country. The method of recycling is not, however, within the capacity of a municipality, but must be governed by National and/or State law.

The citizen must be educated either by news media or other methods to separate the waste materials which can be reclaimed for other uses.

The advantages of sanitary landfill as against incineration for Northeastern Pennsylvania are:

1. Cost and availability of land areas.
2. Reclamation of usable land.
3. Reduction of air pollution and maintaining of stricter controls of disposal.
4. Investment is low. However, a joint effort by Authorities, with many communities is more advantageous.

Consideration should be given to incineration methods, as eventually land areas will diminish and this will be the only method now known which will remain. High intensity incineration is now being done, although it is expensive. Mass compression of waste materials into blocks to be discarded in deep open areas would reduce storage areas and transportation costs.

Some elements to be taken into account in providing a highly efficient regional solid waste system are:

1. Collective combining of areas (may be the most practical procedure).
2. County and/or local municipality combinations (are considered more preferable for our area at this time).
3. Multi-county programs (not considered pertinent at this time).

In order to insure that junk cars will be disposed of in a proper manner, the state should mandate responsibility for disposition. Consideration should be given to including disposal costs in initial licensing cost or by tax. This could be done on a deposit basis with the owner receiving his deposit back when the auto is turned in at a disposal center. Progressive steps toward compaction of junk autos into cubes which could then be used for filling deep stripped areas, should be given immediate attention.

Joint support of solid waste disposal plants can be handled by private enterprise with local municipalities or the county making land available for the builder. Plants could be leased to the city or municipality for a 10 to 15 year period, then turned over to the governing agency. This could also be done on a turn-key operation or allowed to operate at a fixed rate of profit.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

SOLID WASTE

by

Frederick J. Karl
Regional Solid Waste Coordinator
Pennsylvania Department of Health

The National Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which provides money for demonstration projects and research projects on solid waste could be a source of funds to investigate the possibility of combining sewage wastes and selected solid wastes --excluding metal and other reclaimable material -- and treating it as a combined process.

Since collection is approximately 70% of the cost in getting rid of waste, a system might be developed as a demonstration to show how to cut down the cost of collection of solid wastes. A project could even be set up to study the effect of home incinerators which would be used to reduce the volume of solid wastes to be disposed of. Of course, the incinerator would have to be designed to meet all air pollution standards.

On the question of recycling or recovering solid waste, perhaps paper and cardboard could be worked up into thin sheets to be used in construction. Examples of this would be pressed wall board for housing. Another use for a great deal of solid waste would be to use animal offal as a food for livestock.

In Northeastern Pennsylvania, the advantages of sanitary landfill over incineration are that there is much land available and the cost for the operation is comparatively low.

The elements that should be taken into account for a highly efficient Regional Solid Waste Management System are:

1. A good working operation of the communities to provide a good cost reduction factor.
2. Good sites that will insure long life and nuisance free operation.
3. Power for the counties to provide effective solid waste management systems for the whole area.

The best method to insure that junk cars will be disposed of properly is to provide legislation to govern the ultimate disposal of the auto as part of the original cost of the auto. This money could then be used to establish a regional plant to dispose of the auto.

We feel that a waste disposal operation could be run efficiently either by a public or governmental authority or by private enterprise. Each community might then be assessed on a tonnage basis.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

SOLID WASTE

by

Eugene J. Borofski
Pennsylvania Department of Health

The National Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which provides money for demonstration projects and research, could be used to finance deployment and construction of transfer stations in rural areas. Research could be conducted in compressing solid waste into blocks or bails before land burial. Shredding of organic material and depositing it in community sewage treatment facilities could be investigated.

Some of the techniques that might be employed in Northeastern Pennsylvania to recover and recycle waste are:

1. The salvaging of aluminum products for re-use by the aluminum industry.
2. Crushing of automobiles.
3. Using of solid waste (animal offal) as live stock food.
4. Reusing of paper products and building materials.

The advantage of sanitary landfill as against incineration for Northeastern Pennsylvania are preservation of available land--strip mining, cheap land--and the overall cost of disposal.

The elements that should be taken into account for a highly efficient Regional Solid Waste Management System are:

1. Combined storage, collection and disposal methods.
2. Location of disposal facilities.
3. Laws and regulations governing solid waste practices. practices.
4. Development of a research program covering different methods of storage, collection and disposal to increase efficiency and lower cost of solid waste management system.

In order to insure that junk cars will be disposed of in a proper manner, state legislation should be enacted to govern the ultimate disposal of autos. A tax on the manufacturer to insure proper disposal should be given serious consideration by the General Assembly. It would be a good idea to establish a Regional Auto Crushing Plant.

A solid waste disposal plant could be operated efficiently by either government or by private enterprise. However, there would be a need for control of cost and rates by a governmental body such as the Public Utilities Commission. Rates could be assessed on the tonnage handled.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

on

SOLID WASTE

by

Willis W. Jones
Executive Vice President
Scranton Chamber of Commerce

At the present standard of living it has become quite obvious that the amount of solid waste has increased at a fantastic rate. This has been caused by a number of factors such as the population explosion, the pre-packaging of food and other items, and the planned obsolescence of some basic appliances and automobiles. In addition Health Departments have insisted that open dumps be closed.

The costs of disposal such as the securing of basic equipment used for incineration and sanitary landfill are extremely high. Solid waste disposal is considered to be a municipal function, however, the cost of disposal because of the fractionalization of our municipalities is excessive for some of our smaller municipalities. Therefore, it is obvious that solid waste disposal should be a Regional and/or County function.

There are a number of ways that municipalities can handle this particular function. Among the alternatives already mentioned are incineration and sanitary landfill. A third alternative suggestion is to seek out industries that can use certain types of solid waste such as waste paper which can be re-used and automobiles, if properly stripped and compacted. This, of course, will require that a great amount of research be devoted to a means of separation of solid waste in order to effect these economies.

In Northeast Pennsylvania it would seem logical that the best approach to solid waste is the use of sanitary landfill methods. This has the advantage of relatively low unit cost and it also provides a means of reclaiming much of the ravaged countryside.

There are many examples of this type of reclamation already in existence in Luzerne County. Although we are just beginning to use the

to effect these economies -

WILLIAM W. JONES
Secretary of the Council
Solid Waste

The amount of solid waste is increasing at a rapid rate. This has been caused by a number of factors such as population increase, the growth of industry, and the development of new products. It is estimated that there will be a 50% increase in the amount of solid waste generated in the next 20 years.

The cost of disposal of solid waste is also increasing. This is due to the fact that the cost of land for sanitary landfills is rising, and the cost of incineration is also increasing. In addition, the cost of disposal of hazardous waste is also increasing.

It is therefore necessary to find ways to reduce the amount of solid waste generated and to find ways to dispose of it more economically. This can be done by encouraging the use of recycled materials, by encouraging the use of energy-efficient products, and by encouraging the use of public transportation.

Particular attention should be given to the problem of hazardous waste. This is a waste that is highly toxic and can cause serious health and environmental problems. It is therefore essential to find ways to reduce the amount of hazardous waste generated and to find ways to dispose of it safely.

In addition, it is important to find ways to reduce the amount of solid waste generated in the first place. This can be done by encouraging the use of recycled materials, by encouraging the use of energy-efficient products, and by encouraging the use of public transportation.

There are many ways to reduce the amount of solid waste generated and to find ways to dispose of it more economically. It is therefore essential to find ways to reduce the amount of solid waste generated and to find ways to dispose of it more economically.

regional cooperative approach as to the disposal of solid waste, the planning bodies of our municipalities and counties should devote more time to engineering a plan of present and future disposal. We should anticipate that grants will be available for research and/or construction, but above all, all of the governmental bodies affected by the problem of solid waste disposal should promptly insist on strict control as to the existing areas and methods of disposal.

INTRODUCTION

of

Tom Bigler, Director
WBRE-TV

by

Mrs. Frank M. Henry, President
Junior League of Wilkes-Barre

We have now reached what can be considered one of the closing aspects of our Conference. Since over the past several Conferences he has done an admirable job, we have once again invited Mr. Tom Bigler to conduct the unenviable part of our program. That part is the summation of the many topics and ideas which have been presented and discussed. It is an unenviable task because he must select the most cogent points of our discussion, many of which have been extremely pertinent to the problems of the area and especially to the new concept of Regionalism, and suggest as to how these problems can best be solved.

"APERCU"

by

Tom Bigler
News Director, WBRE-TV
Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania

"APERCU", means a "summing up of what has gone before". And, as we've said before, we sometimes feel as tho we've heard it all before and are in danger of losing heart because while the words of wisdom are plentiful, the action is sparse.

While we've wrestled today with two particularly severe problems of local government everywhere, they are symbolic only of the kinds of crises facing local governments and which most local governments are not able to solve. Two of our major speakers today--Mr. Widner at the breakfast and Mr. Hillenbrand at lunch--underscored our basic problem: local governments that are too small to serve.

Certainly this is not news to Wyoming Valley. We think there is a wider acceptance in this metropolis of our division as being our major problem than most of us realize. We think that we are overripe for a solution. We think that the examples of intergovernmental alliances that have developed and which are under discussion in this decade demonstrate recognition of a need for some solution. We might suggest that acceptance of the new telephone directory--providing for the first time a metropolitan directory for the Valley--is a good omen.

And, as was emphasized by speaker after speaker in today's Conference, we cannot begin to resolve our mass transportation and solid waste disposal problems within the confines of any one of our local governments nor without some kind of intergovernmental alliance.

We are not certain that the ultimate solution for our time lies in the county government. Certainly we do not believe this is the answer, if county government continues as it exists today in Pennsylvania. The structure of County government is too weak to handle even the responsibilities it now has. Nor do we believe that the present 67 counties of Pennsylvania constitute the kind of geographical division that would permit even a modern county government to be effective.

One associate at breakfast this morning advised us that a movement is underway in Hazleton to secede from Luzerne County---to demonstrate its unhappiness with proposed location of the Community College. This movement suggests that if their wisdom does not prevail

for all the rest of the County, they want to become an island unto themselves. Interestingly enough, it was only 91 years ago that Lackawanna County was formed by secession from Luzerne County.

From much of what we've heard today, we suspect that the thrust if not the particular of the Hazleton revolt runs against the time and needs of today. We think that instead, the traditional rivalries which have divided Lackawanna and Luzerne counties; Scranton and Wilkes-Barre, have hurt us both and helped neither; that our real competition lies not between these two cities or two counties but between us together and the other metropolitan groupings such as the Allentown-Easton-Bethlehem complex; the Harrisburg-York; the Erie; and of course the Philadelphia and Pittsburg metropolitan areas.

One needs only visit the Allentown area and observe the bustle of construction, the new housing, new highways, new shopping centers, the whole explosion of the 20th Century to discover how still our back-water is.

There has been widespread agreement expressed here today that we, in our present organization of government, cannot deal with the multitude of problems that threaten to destroy us. We do not have the government structure, the tax base, nor even the civilian leadership to manage our own affairs. We need, desperately to do something better.

For 9 years now, these Community Growth Conferences have explored specific problems and have pointed to this same need for better local government structure, concept, philosophy, people to get this region into the 20th Century. We still haven't made it and we still show no inclination to accept the changes needed to make it.

What has been proposed and what is proposed is not theory nor dream. Other communities in the nation have made it and are making a move. All our problems are subject to rational solution. Unless and until we get off our haunches, these Conferences merely will be the right hand shaking the left, the voices of one being heard by another, a tree falling in a remote forest--and this "aperçu" a review of what others have accomplished in some far distant land.

CLOSING REMARKS

by

Dr. Hugo V. Mailey, Director
Institute of Regional Affairs

The success of this Conference will be determined by what you do with these problems in the next two or three years. A Conference is an educational kind of thing. We ought not to expect results in the immediate future. Either as individuals or as members of organizations, you should begin to tackle some of these problems that you explored today. Your active participation here and your participation after you leave here determine whether or not these conferences are successful.

I want to thank all invited to participate in this Conference. You contributed immensely to the program. I want to thank those of you who participated in the discussions at the tables. I certainly want to thank all of those who in any way had a share in the arrangements for the Conference.

And certainly last but not least, I want to thank all of you for coming. A Conference is never successful without participants, it is never successful without the people that come. But I have a special word of thanks for you who have come. You have not come as passive participants. We stopped that kind of format a couple of years ago. We found out it didn't work. We wanted our audience to participate and be active participants, and you have been very active.

ROSTER OF ATTENDANCE

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Aikens, Harry	Commonwealth Telephone 100 Lake Street Dallas, Pa. 18612	Personnel Supervisor
Aita, Judy	Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania 704 First National Bank Building Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Public Information Coordinator
Bacon, Allan E.	Commission on Economic Opportunity of Luzerne County 6 South Washington Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Executive Director
Barber, Edward S.	Commonwealth Telephone 100 Lake Street Dallas, Pa. 18612	Personnel Director
Barnasevitch, Francis	Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce Solid Waste Committee	Member
Bart, Marjorie	Wilkes-Barre City 100 Charles Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Councilwoman
Beard, Shirley	Commission on Economic Opportunity of Luzerne County 6 South Washington Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Program Director
Benning, Harry L.	Rice Township Planning Commission	Chairman

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Benscoter, Ruth	Pennsylvania Department of Health 383 Wyoming Avenue Kingston, Pa.	Regional Public Health Educator
Betzler, Robert L.	City of Wilkes-Barre City Hall Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Assistant Director of Public Works
Bickhart, Edwin W.	Department of Community Affairs Harrisburg, Pa. 17120	Chief, Mass Transportation Division
Bigelow, Clifford W.	Wyoming Valley Motor Club 303 Market Street Kingston, Pa.	Manager
Bigler, Tom	WBRE-TV South Franklin Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	News Director
Borofski, Eugene J.	Pennsylvania Department of Health 383 Wyoming Avenue Kingston, Pa.	Regional Sanitarian
Brezinski, Edward W.	Nanticoke Chamber of Commerce 171 East Church Street Nanticoke, Pa.	Executive Director
Burke, Thomas	Erie Metropolitan Transit Authority P. O. Box 2057 Erie, Pa. 16512	General Manager
Butler, William C. M., Jr.	Lower Luzerne Solid Waste Management Committee Box 213 Conyngham, Pa.	Chairman Advisory Committee

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Butler, Wm. C. M., III	Lower Luzerne Solid Waste Management Committee 133 Woodland Road Conyngham, Pa.	Conyngham Council Representative
Caputo, Mrs. A. Richard	Junior League Committee 40 Forest Road Mountaintop, Pa.	Research Chairman
Chadwick, Frank	Luzerne County Planning Commission Court House Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Senior Planner
Chaplinsky, John	Pennsylvania Power and Light Cedar and Buttonwood Street Hazleton, Pa.	Community Service Manager
Chesney, Ray J.	Wilkes-Barre City School District 730 S. Main St. Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Secondary Curriculum Coordinator
Clarke, P. J.	Luzerne County Commissioners Court House Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Chief Clerk
Coates, Mrs. Sterling	YWCA and Junior League of Wilkes-Barre, Inc. 589 Charles Avenue Kingston, Pa.	Public Affairs Chairman
Corbett, Leo A.	City of Wilkes-Barre City Hall Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Director of Public Works

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Costello, Albert J.	330 Front Street Dupont, Pa. 18641	Mayor
Crahall, Brinley	Luzerne County Boroughs Associations	President
Cronin, Richard	Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce	Executive Secretary
Curran, John J.	Economic Development Administration	Chief, Planning Division
Davidson, John S.	Pennsylvania Power and Light Company	President, Economic Development Council of N. E. Pa.
Davis, Warren C.	Pennsylvania Department of Commerce	Regional Representative
Del Marcelle, Davis J.	Lebanon Valley Chamber of Commerce	Board Mamber
Dzuris, George	Housing Authority of the County of Luzerne	Board Mamber
Earley, C. A.	Pennsylvania Power and Light Company	District Manager
Farber, G.S.	Pennsylvania Power and Light Company	Supervisor of Community Palnning
Farley, Dr. Eugene	Wilkes College	President
Farrell, John J.	Pennsylvania Department of Health Comprehensive Health Planning	C. H. P. Consultant

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Feldman, Robert	WNEP-TV, Channel 16	News Director
Furey, James F.	Pennsylvania Power and Light	Area Operating Supervisor
Gilbert, Walter J.	Pennsylvania Department of Health	
Gramacke, Stanley	98 Chapel Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	
Halpine, Walter	Kings College	Chairman, Sociology Department
Harenza, Stanley	95 Main Street Inkerman, Pa.	Employee of Celotex
Hawke, Herbert	West Side Landfill Authority	Treasurer
Henry, Mrs. Frank	Junior League of Wilkes-Barre	President
Hibbard, Mrs. John	Elmcrest Drive Dallas, Pa. 18612	
Hillenbrand, Bernard F.	National Associations of Counties	Executive Director
Heiselberg, Edward	Luzerne County Planning Commission	Director
Hunter, Willard	Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce	President
Hyman, Mrs. Allan	League of Woman Voters	Chairman of Municipal Government Committee

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Jarzenbowicz, John	Luzerne County Borough Association	Legislative Representative
Jones, Willis W.	Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce	Executive Vice-President
Joseph, Samuel J.	United Municipal Corporation. Harrisburg, Pa.	Vice-President
Karl, Frederick J.	Pennsylvania Department of Health	Regional Solid Waste Coordinator
Kazmerski, Sylvester	Lackawanna County Parks Recreation and Tourism	Executive Director
Kearney, Edward F.	Concentrated Employment Program Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Program Director
Klee, Albert	Department of Health, Education and Welfare	Chief, Bureau of Solid Waste Management
Klemencic, John	Pennsylvania Power and Light	Customer Contact Analysis
Kneidinger, Joseph	Pennsylvania Department of Commerce	
Kohl, H. Robert	Lebanon County-City Planning Department	Director
Kopec, Michael	Jenkins Township Planning and Zoning Commission	Treasurer
Lashford, Edgar	Chamber of Commerce Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Executive Vice-President

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Lauer, Paul	Luzerne County Tourist Promotion Agency	
Lavelle, Mrs. Mary	Betty Kannarr	Realtor
Lee, James F.	Times Leader Evening News	Assisstant Editor
Lipscomb, Robert	Pennsylvania Department of Commerce Scranton, Pa.	
Lutz, George	East Side Landfill Authority	
McClure, Lamont	Model Cities Agency	Research-evaluation Officer
McGee, James J.	Lackawanna County Regionsl Planning Commission	Director of Community Prigrams
McGee, Philip	Pennsylvania Department of Health	
McHugh, Michael C.	Greater Wilkes-Barre Jaycees	
Macpherson, Elizabeth	YWCA Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Executive Director
Macialek, Joseph	Penn State Cooperative Extension	Resource Agent
Mailey, Dr. Hugo	IRA - Wilkes College	Director
Manley, Robert	Pennsylvania Power and Light Scranton, Pa.	Community Service Co-ordinator

80-153479

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Masoner, Robert	Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania South Franklin Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	District Manager
Molinaro, Frank	1601 North Mulberry Street Berwick, Pa.	
Moyer, Donald D.	Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania	Executive Director
Muench, Alfred	Glace & Glace, Inc. Harrisburg, Pa.	Secretary-Treasurer
Mullen, Leo A.	Northern Tier Regional Planning Commission	Staff Member
Niehoff, Walter	Wilkes College - IRA Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	
O'Hara, Vincent T.	Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce	Executive Vice- President
Olson, Jerry	Wilkes-Barre Transit Corporation	
O' Malley, J. J.	First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Wilkes- Barre	
O'Neill, Joseph D.	U. S. Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Acting Area Director

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Pataki, Frank	Keystone Job Corps. Center Drums, Pa.	Acting Director
Patton, Eleanor	Betty Kannarr Realty	Realtor
Pavlovich, Steve P.	Jeddo Borough	President of Council
Peel, Joseph A.	Wilkes-Barre City School District 730 S. Main Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Assistant to Superintendant in Secondary Curriculum
Peters, Fred J.	Bureau of Employment Security 32 E. Union Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Manager
Pfeiffer, Mildred C. J.	Division of Planning Pennsylvania Department of Health 609 H & W Building Harrisburg, Pa. 17120	Planning Director
Phillips, John W.	Pennsylvania Power and Light Williamsport, Pa.	Community Service Manager
Pierce, William	East Side Landfill Authority 31 Maffet Street Plains, Pa.	Treasurer
Poerio, Carlo R.	Redevlopment Authority of the City of Wilkes-Barre First National Bank Building Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Director of Community Relations

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Pugh, James E.	Wilkes-Barre Record 15-17 N. Main Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18701	Editor-in-chief
Pyros, Nicholas J.	Waskell & Pyros Townhall Building Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Architect
Radkewicz, John F.	Lackawanna County Regional Planning Commission 310 Jefferson Avenue Scranton, Pa.	Executive Director
Ransom, R. Lanning	West Side Landfill Authority 26 E. Walnut Street Kingston, Pa.	Mamber
Rees, Mrs. Marnie	Osterhout Free Library 71 S. Franklin Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Head of Public Relations
Reid, William W.	Central United Methodist Church 65 Academy Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Pastor
Robinson, Karl E.	Public Service Institute Department of Education Box 911 Harrisburg, Pa.	Public Service Education Supervisor
Rubin, Roger	David M. Walker Associates 1600 Bankers Securities Building Philadelphia, Pa. 19107	Director of Renewal Planning

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Ruffaner, Robert E,	Pennsylvania Power and Light Williamsport, Pa.	Community Development Coordinator
Salisbury, Ellsworth	Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce Northeastern Building Hazleton, Pa. 18201	Executive Vice-President
Sammon, John P.	Wilkes-Barre Real Estate Board 314 Linden Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Member
Sawicki, Clement J.	Redevelopment Authority of the City of Nanticoke 37 N. Market Street Nanticoke, Pa.	Relocation Technician
Schechter, Edward	Stressteel Corp. 221 Conyngham Avenue Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18702	President
Schoonover, William	Redevelopment Authority of Wilkes-Barre First National Bank Building Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Land Development Administrator
Schrey, Ralph	Luzerne County Planning Commission Court House Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Senior Planner
Shane, John B.	Bell Telephone 120 S. Franklin Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Division Operations Manager

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Shantz, Frank P.	Luzerne County Commissioners Court House Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	County Commissioner
Shapiro, Maurice A.	Graduate School of Public Health University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213	Professor, Environmental Health Engineering
Shelburne, Thomas P.	WNEP-TV Avoca, Pa.	General Manager
Shelhamer, Walter	Rice Township R D #4 Mountaintop, Pa.	
Sheperd, Bob	Economic Development Council 704 First National Bank Building Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Research Director
Shoemaker, Myron	Endless Mountains Associations Laceyville, Pa.	President
Siesko, Joseph	Nanticoke Chamber of Commerce 221 W. Main Street Nanticoke, Pa.	Past President
Sites, Edwin A.	Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs 320 Chamber of Commerce Building Scranton, Pa.	Regional Coordinator

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Smith, Robert	Lackawanna Planning Commission 310 Jefferson Avenue Scranton, Pa. 18503	Senior Planner
Snively, Foster	Rice Township RD 4 Mountaintop, Pa.	
Snyder, James P.	Pennsylvania Department of Health Harrisburg, Pa.	
Solomon, Paul	Luzerne County Planning Commission Court House Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Junior Planner
Stockwell, William R.	Pennsylvania Power and Light Company Williamsport, Pa.	Lock Haven Manager
Sweeney, John P.	Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce Scranton, Pa.	Executive Secretary
Townend, Frank	Property Owners Protective Association of Luzerne County 1400 United Penn Bank Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18701	Director
Tuhy, Philip	Wilkes College - IRA Wilkes-Barre, Pa.,	
Vanore, Frank	City of Wilkes-Barre City Hall Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	City Manager

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Position</u>
Van Der Werker, Ralph	Public Health Service 42 Broadway New York City, N. Y. 10004	Regional Environmental Control Director
Wideman, Edmund C.	Board of County Commissioners Luzerne County Court House Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Commissioner
Widner, Ralph R.	Appalachian Regional Commission 1666 Connecticut Avenue NW Washington, D. C. 20235	Executive Director
Williams, Joseph A.	Joseph A. Williams Agency 39 N. Franklin Street Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18701	Insurance
Williams, Morgan F.	West Pittston Borough 321 Parke Street West Pittston, Pa.	Borough Secretary
Yashinski, Edward J.	Redevelopment Authority of Nanticoke 37 N. Main Street Nanticoke, Pa.	Real Estate Director
Zabowski, Francis L.	Wright Township	Supervisor
Ziolkowski, Leonard W.	Economic Development Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania 704 First National Bank Building Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Planning and Development Coordinator



1000160203

WILKES COLLEGE LIBRARY



