

**Legislative and Oversight Accomplishments of
Pennsylvania's Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution
Control and Conservation Committee:
A 50-Year Retrospective**

The first purpose of government is to control the governed and the second,
equally important purpose is to control itself.
- James Madison (Federalist Paper No. 51)

December 2018

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

REPLY TO:
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
PO BOX 202254
HARRISBURG, PA 17120-2254



OFFICE:
ROOM 408
FINANCE BUILDING
HARRISBURG, PA
717-787-7570

SENATOR SCOTT E. HUTCHINSON
CHAIRMAN

TONY M. GUERRIERI
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control
and Conservation Committee

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

2017-2018 Session

Chairman

Senator Scott E. Hutchinson

Rep. Stephen Bloom

Rep. Donna Bullock

Rep. Carolyn Comitta

Rep. Eli Evankovich

Rep. Stephen McCarter

Rep. Marguerite Quinn

Rep. Rick Saccone

Rep. Perry Warren

Rep. Parke Wentling

Senator Richard Alloway

Senator David Argall

Senator Andrew Dinniman

Senator Scott Martin

Senator Patrick Stefano

Senator Sharif Street

Senator John Yudichak

COMMITTEE STAFF

Tony M. Guerrieri, Executive Director

Sakura Ung, Project Manager

Coleen P. Engvall, Research Analyst

Denise M. Plummer, Administrative Officer

Senator Scott E. Hutchinson
Chairman
Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee

I am pleased to submit to you the following retrospective on the work of the Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee, which, this year, will mark its 50th anniversary of service. Despite its long title, the Committee is the state government's smallest agency with only four full-time permanent staff. But it exerts an outsized influence on environmental policies in the Commonwealth.

The retrospective chronicles the evolution of the Committee between 1968 and 2018. It examines the Committee's major characteristics, delves into its development, and analyzes the changes in its setting, composition, structure and operations, work load, functions, and leadership under the respective chairmen.

The Committee was established with a unique mission: to monitor abandoned mine reclamation efforts, to assess water quality projects, and, most importantly, to identify further practical options for change. It has earned a solid reputation for crafting important environmental legislation, conducting major inquiries into conservation initiatives, and by monitoring key developments that influence the way environmental policies are determined in the future.

The value of the Committee's work lies in its ability to select the environmental issues of importance, along with those stakeholders having the greatest impact on those issues, and report its findings in the most objective way possible.

Its oversight extends to programs in five cabinet level departments and three independent agencies, including the Department of Environmental Protection, the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Community and Economic Development, the Pennsylvania Game Commission, the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission and the Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority.

It is my sincere belief that the work of this Committee has brought genuine benefit to overseeing the state's natural resources. In countless ways – many of which are described in this report – Pennsylvania has been well served by having an agency like the Committee serving the General Assembly. I hope that you will take the opportunity to read through this retrospective and examine the events and individuals which have moved the environmental agenda forward during the past 50 years.

Tony M. Guerrieri
Executive Director

Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee

As the Committee celebrates its 50th anniversary, it is worthwhile to look back at the rich history of a committee which, over the years, has impacted a diverse range of environmental issues and challenges. The Committee was established by an act of the legislature and signed into law by Governor Raymond P. Shafer (1967-1971) in 1968, but its conception was the culmination of developments reaching back the beginning of the 20th century. Its creation was hastened by the existence of rampant and highly visible pollution. The poster child for the state's major water quality issues was the legacy of lifeless streams, open pits and mountains of waste from our coal-mining past – rivers and streams that literally turned bright orange because of acid mine drainage from a hundred years of unrestrained coal mining in Pennsylvania.

In the 1960s there was no U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and no Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources (a predecessor of today's DEP and DCNR). But in 1967, Representative Orville E. Snare (R-Huntingdon) introduced legislation that would establish an independent legislative oversight agency charged with tracking the performance of water quality projects that were being funded by a \$500 million bond approved by voters in 1967.

Along with other like-minded legislators, Snare saw his efforts realized when Governor Shafer signed Act 448 establishing the Committee in order to strengthen legislative oversight of the programs and activities funded by the conservation bond referendum. We were very fortunate to have visionary leaders in the General Assembly during those years and a governor who chose to address the issues of pollution, water quality and conservation and who believed that it was time to work together in a bipartisan effort to manage our shared natural resources.

In the most general terms, the Committee was responsible for dissemination of information to the General Assembly on issues regarding: (1) abandoned mine reclamation projects that address acid mine drainage and (2) the allocation of funds generated through a bond initiative for improving existing drinking water and sewage treatment facilities throughout the Commonwealth.

In the intervening years, the General Assembly has enacted numerous laws to address a growing number of environmental-related issues. This body of environmental legislation has given the Committee greater opportunities to play an increasing role in government oversight. During this time, the Committee continued to serve the General Assembly through 8 governors, 25 legislative sessions, multiple cycles of state budgets, emerging environmental trends, and challenging political headwinds.

The Committee's reputation for independence, for objective research, and for constructive criticism has made possible an open flow of communications and increasingly broad oversight activity – from the highest levels of government and business to local grassroots environmental efforts. As a result, the Committee has witnessed the significant influence that its activities have had in shaping public policies, government programs, environmental actions, and new initiatives. This report highlights key accomplishments of the past 50 years.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The early 1960s were a period of new environmental awareness and values in Pennsylvania. The Committee is a product of the activity of this period. Its birth, and its early success, resulted from a rare alignment in Pennsylvania political history. During that time the public was alarmed by frequent reports in the papers and on the local news that the environment was in deep trouble; few institutions or laws existed that could facilitate real correction; and the political climate was favorable in the state legislature and a governor that was prepared to act. In the late 1960s and early '70s, major environmental initiatives were proposed heralding in what many refer to as the, "decade of the environment."

To mark the Committee's 50th anniversary and to show how much has changed since those early years, this retrospective highlights a number of its key activities. Over the last five decades, the Committee progressed from an oversight service agency charged with monitoring water quality projects to one as a catalyst behind a number of legislative, regulatory and public policy initiatives that have addressed some of the most challenging problems in Pennsylvania.

This retrospective highlights the accomplishments of the Committee in the years between 1968 and 2018. However, it first provides context for these accomplishments by discussing the evolution of the Committee – from its informal beginnings in 1967, through its official creation in 1968 and to the place it occupies within the Pennsylvania legislature today.

THE BEGINNING

Pennsylvania has been a leading producer of coal since the mid-1800s when coal was "king." Coal from Pennsylvania's mines spurred railroad development, created employment, heated most homes and businesses, served as a vital material for the state's flourishing steel mills and provided the energy to fight both World Wars. Unfortunately, the unrestrained mining of this valuable natural and economic resource left thousands of abandoned mines, countless culm piles, and other problems. By far, the most serious of these has been acid mine drainage (AMD).

Pennsylvania has more than 86,000 miles of streams and rivers with an abundance of surface lakes and ponds. For most of Pennsylvania's history, waterways were used as sewers and dumping grounds, and the health of the creeks, streams and rivers suffered greatly. In the case of AMD this happens in the mining process. It is formed when mining activities expose pyrite (iron disulfide minerals) to water and oxygen. Upon exposure to water and oxygen, pyrite oxidizes to form acidic drainage rich in dissolved metals.

This chemical reaction often continues indefinitely after mining operations have stopped and, unless controlled, can be a major source of water pollution for years. For most of the 20th century, inactive mines bled millions of gallons of acid mine water every year. Rivers and streams were so polluted with AMD that the water and everything it touched was stained a bright orange. Many waterways became unfit for drinking or swimming.

Acid mine drainage is difficult to treat by distillation, reverse osmosis or electro dialysis because of the corrosive and fouling nature of sulfuric acid. For many years, the common

method of treatment was the addition of limestone to neutralize the acidity, and cause most of the iron to settle out. This, however, produced water with a high degree of hardness and other characteristics undesirable in a public water system.

Understandably, by the early 1960s, Pennsylvania's environmental record of neglect drew strong criticism from the public, conservation groups, the press and many legislators themselves. It was also a time when environmental protection began to win government and public support. In response, the General Assembly passed laws that served as significant precedents for legislative action on pollution issues – for instance, the Gas Operations Well-Drilling Petroleum and Coal Mining Act (Act 225) became law in 1965 as did the Open Space Act (Act 515), the Sewage Facilities Act (Act 537 of 1966) and the Anthracite Coal Mine Act (Act 346).

The most significant of these new laws included the state's Clean Streams Law (Act 194 of 1965). It hastened the reversal of decades of degradation of the state's rivers and streams. The Clean Streams Law (whose prime sponsor was Representative John Laudadio from Westmoreland County and who would, in 1971, become chairman of the Committee) required industries to restore degraded waterways as well as prevent their abuse. Regulations around discharges and in particular, the 80 active coal mining operations, were significantly strengthened. This law hoped to ensure that Pennsylvania waters would no longer be contaminated by drainage from active mines.

While it was an essential initiative, given funding constraints and a focus on active mining, it came at a price. There were an estimated 10,000 abandoned mines in Pennsylvania where pollution had gone unchecked. Unfortunately, attacking the problem of AMD from abandoned mines was a far greater problem. The longer essential cleanup projects were deferred, the worse conditions got and the harder and more costly it became to remediate abandoned sites. In 1967, Dr. Beecher Charmbury, secretary of the Department of Mine and Mineral Industries, estimated that the cost of erasing the effects of years on unrestricted coal mining at well over \$2 billion.

Under the auspices of the state's Department of Mining and Minerals, a pioneering reclamation program known as "Operation Scarlift" was designed to identify and prioritize abandoned mine sites according to health, safety and environmental risks. It was the first recognition Pennsylvania gave to its abandoned mine land problems. The objective of Operation Scarlift was threefold: identify the sources of AMD, determine and implement the control techniques most applicable in each case and monitor the results. The program itself, however, was initially a laundry list of deferred projects and demonstration projects related to controlling acid drainage.

To address the growing gap between existing and needed funding for water quality projects and abandoned mine reclamation (AMR) efforts, at the start of the 1966 legislative session, Governor William W. Scranton (1963-1967) proposed the most sweeping change in environmental budget policy. Scranton called for a \$500 million bond initiative emphasizing clean water, providing money for land and water conservation and AMR. Requesting much needed funding, especially for mine reclamation efforts, was a major step in addressing AMD.

Under the proposal, the state would borrow money to provide dedicated funding under the wide-ranging "Project 500" moniker. Appropriated funds, for example, would be used by the

Department of Mines and Minerals to develop projects to address AMD, sewage and other pollution from streams and rivers. Abandoned mine reclamation efforts included closing and backfilling mine openings, backfilling open pits and combatting the advancement of underground and culm pile fires. In addition, the funds would also be used to provide financial aid to municipalities for upgrading aging water and sewer systems.

The proposal closely resembled an earlier bond initiative. In 1961, the legislature introduced "Project 70" to raise \$70 million for the purpose of purchasing land to be used for park and recreation purposes. The funds were only for the purchase of land and not for land development. It was signed into law by Governor Scranton in 1964 as Act 8. The vast majority of funds (\$40 million) were to be used by the Department of Forest and Waters. Many legislators, however, believed that the General Assembly was ill-adapted to deal comprehensively with budget appropriation matters such as Project 70. Concurrently, a generation of younger, reform-oriented legislators in both parties sought to force a more equitable distribution of authority and oversight within state government.

When Shafer was elected governor in November 1966, he pledged to continue Scranton's efforts during his time in office, including the Project 500 initiative. It was a key topic in Shafer's January 17, 1967, speech to a joint session of the state's General Assembly.

During the spring of that year, as Shafer continued to press for the bond referendum, legislative advocates of the bond began calling for the creation of an independent agency to act as a watchdog over state-funded conservation projects. Even though the legislature played a role in establishing environmental policy during the 1940s, '50s and '60s, the authority for defining the state's problems and recommending solutions became firmly established in the executive branch during those years. The governor conducted policy, proposed major new legislation and drafted the budget.

The mid-1960s featured a growing conflict between the governor's office and the legislature over which branch should establish policy and which should carry it out. Accommodations between the two branches that had made the process work in the past began to break down. While the governor would provide information to the legislature, inevitable questions remained. For example, did the governor keep the legislature adequately advised on progress and on problems which developed as environmental programs were carried out? A legislative oversight agency would assess the adequacy of information the executive branch provided the legislature for its use in overseeing Project 500 operations.

In 1967, Pennsylvania was a part-time legislature. Because of the General Assembly's inability to adequately monitor the various state agencies – primarily because of their time commitments – lawmakers wanted a larger role in administering any programs or projects using state appropriated funds.

It's interesting to note that at that time, legislators made \$7,000 annually with freshman representatives having no office, no secretary and no telephone. The only seat they had was the one assigned to them on the House floor. However in the mid-1960s, the General Assembly

slowly began transitioning itself into a full-time body in order to maintain status with the executive branch.

In the months leading up to the May 1967 primary election, the Project 500 bond referendum attracted widespread support from environmental, agricultural, conservation and recreation groups throughout Pennsylvania. The covers of national magazines and the front pages of local newspapers were devoted to covering every angle of the environmental movement. The evening and morning broadcast news (news channels and the internet didn't exist then) carried segments on national, state and local environmental problems. A growing number of people were concerned not only about natural resource conservation but also about their exposure to toxic chemicals and pollution. They began to call for strong government intervention to reduce levels of air and water pollution

On May 16, the bond referendum awaited the verdict of the voters. The question the state voters read on the primary ballot asked:

Shall article nine of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be amended by adding at the end thereof a new section authorizing the creation of a debt in the amount of 500 million dollars for a land and water conservation and reclamation fund to be used for the conservation and reclamation of the Commonwealth's land and water?

Pennsylvania voters may have had different opinions on the civil rights movement, the women's movement, or the antiwar movement, but when it came to clean water, voters had a lot in common. It passed overwhelmingly. Some 1.9 million votes were cast. Pennsylvania voters approved, by a 2-to-1 margin (1,163,779 in favor and 677,808 opposed), the Land and Water Conservation and Reclamation Fund. The \$500 million adjusted for inflation to 2019 would be equivalent to about \$3.7 billion. Obviously, voters thought investing in water infrastructure should be a priority for the governor and legislature. However, Project 500 guaranteed a tug-of-war between the two.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY MOVES TO STRENGTHEN ITS ROLE

With the passage of Project 500, attention centered on Operation Scarlift. The lion's share of the funds were to be used by the Department of Mining and Minerals which administered the program and decided its priorities. Project 500 was considered a contentious issue because it gave direct political control to the governor and a state agency that was not directly accountable to the General Assembly. As a co-equal branch of government, it is the role of the legislature to monitor state agencies as they implement new laws. Thus, conducting oversight is every bit as important as passing legislation.

By June 1967, those concerns prompted the creation of an ad hoc legislative task force to consider the proper method of overseeing Project 500 operations. Under the chairmanship of Representative William Wilt (R-Blair) the task force began developing basic guidelines for implementation of the amendment. Wilt had been active in mining issues since first being elected to the House in 1963 and later when he was appointed to the House Mines and Mineral Industry Committee.

On July 23, Wilt convened the initial meeting of the Project 500 task force. The Legislative members chosen for the task force included:

House of Representative Members:

Representative W. William Wilt
Representative Orville Snare (chairman of the House Conservation Committee)
Representative Joseph Semanoff (R-Carbon)
Representative Joseph P. Rigby (R-Allegheny)
Representative John F. Laudadio (D-Westmoreland)
Representative Thomas J. Forester (D-Allegheny)
Representative Stanley A. Meholchick (D-Luzerne)

Senate Members:

Senator Jack E. McGregor (R-Allegheny)
Senator Zehnder H. Confair (R-Lycoming)
Senator Edwin G. Holl (R-Montgomery)
Senator Jeanette F. Reibman (D-Northampton)
Senator Joseph M Gaydos (D-Allegheny)
Senator John F. Byrne (D-Philadelphia)

Despite the governor having serious reservations, at the insistence of Rep. Snare, the task force recommended the General Assembly create an independent agency to monitor Project 500 operations. Oversight is broadly defined as reviewing, monitoring and supervising the implementation of public policy. This includes ensuring programs are operating consistent with the requirements placed upon them and funds appropriated for a particular program are being spent effectively, efficiently and in accordance with legislative intent. Although the original concept of oversight came out of a desire to better manage AMD, the most important factor in establishing the Committee was a desire on the part of the legislature for a “watchdog” agency independent of the executive branch.

Administration officials had tried to discourage Snare from introducing legislation for a legislative agency because it infringed upon executive authority. During initial deliberations on the proposal, opponents expressed the view that if a new agency was to be established, it should strictly play an advisory role.

After preliminary discussions with staff from the governor’s office and leaders in the House and Senate, a compromise was brokered. On November 21, 1967, Rep. Snare introduced House Bill 2062 Printer’s Number 2637 creating a new legislative service agency to be known as the Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee. The Committee was charged with providing oversight to the General Assembly on the expenditures from the Project 500 referendum and make recommendations on how to properly manage the state’s air, water and land. The legislation contained mechanisms for the Committee, monitoring state natural resource policies and practices and conducting investigations, on a continuing basis, all

laws, programs and government activities involving Pennsylvania's natural systems. The Committee was to report to the Senate and House if it believed decisions had been made that did not meet legislative intentions.

Just before adjourning for the end-of-year holidays, the House approved HB 2062 in early December 1967. The Senate amended the bill, reducing the Committee legislative membership from 20 to 18, and voted its approval on December 21, 1967, by a unanimous vote. The amended bill was returned to the House the same day for concurrence and the House approved the amended bill without debate, unanimously, thereby establishing the Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee to serve the General Assembly in an advisory capacity. Initially, it was not clear how much such a non-legislative committee might be able to accomplish given that it could not receive bills or report them to the House or Senate floor. Yet, turning potential weakness into strength, the Committee by design and in practice was able to address a wide range of issues and topics.

EARLY ORGANIZATIONAL PRIORITIES

It was 1968, a year that is the very embodiment of the phrase "May you live in interesting times." It began with an appeal by Pope Paul VI to pray for peace and ended with astronauts Frank Borman, Jim Lovell and Bill Anders on Christmas Eve reading a passage from Genesis to a worldwide audience while transmitting images of the Earth from lunar orbit. Between those two events, the world was shaken by the Tet Offensive in Vietnam, the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Senator Robert F. Kennedy and the riots and protests in the nation's streets.

The year 1968 was a watershed year of major events, to be sure. But it was also a year of the usual chores of everyday life. For context, the average price of a gallon of gas was about 33 cents and a typical price for a gallon of milk was about \$1.07. The price of a movie ticket in 1968 – a year featuring movies such as 2001: A Space Odyssey, Planet of the Apes and The Odd Couple – was \$1.25. The cost of a first class stamp increased from 5 cents to 6 cents. The Beatles were still together; Edward Abbey published "Desert Solitaire" and Steve Jobs was just 13.

That year was also a landmark year for Pennsylvania's environmental agenda. On January 19, 1968, Governor Shafer signed legislation implementing the \$500 million bond initiative which was authorized by voters in the May primary, 1967. It was the largest environmental protection and funding package in Pennsylvania history. It was also the first act in the nation to address abandoned mine pollution. During ceremonies in the governor's reception room, Shafer also approved five other environmental bills. They did not attract as much attention as Project 500, but they nevertheless put into motion an effort that, like the environmental movement itself, is still going strong. Among the other measures signed by the governor was Act 448, formally creating the Joint Legislative Conservation Committee. Now the legislature would have access to information comparable to that available within the executive branch.

The Committee became the first legislative oversight agency to be established in the Pennsylvania General Assembly since 1940, representing a substantial change in Pennsylvania's state government. Among Pennsylvania's oversight agencies the Committee was considered

unique because for the first time in Pennsylvania's history, an organization independent of the governor's office gained responsibility for monitoring executive branch financial actions. The 1968 law remains the primary source of the Committee's legislative authority.

The Committee's jurisdiction gives it both a mandate and a focus to follow. It is, however, the Committee's chairman that gives it a unique character. The Committee's roles in the legislative process depend upon the direction provided by its chairman. Over time, different Committee chairmen have changed not only the Committee's operations and output but its function and development. In large part as a result of the differences in leadership styles, the Committee was a different agency under each chairman.

To lead the new agency, House and Senate leaders turned to Rep. Wilt and Senator Donald O. Oesterling (D-Butler) who readily agreed to be chairman and vice-chairman, respectively, in order to ensure bipartisanship. Wilt and Oesterling proceeded to recruit members based on their knowledge, expertise and interest in natural resource issues.

The original nine members of the House of Representatives appointed to the Committee:

Representative W. William Wilt, Chairman (R-Blair)
Representative Reid L. Bennett (D-Mercer)
Representative John L. Brunner (D-Beaver)
Representative R. Budd Dwyer (R-Crawford)
Representative Franklin L. Kury (D-Montour)
Representative John F. Laudadio, Sr. (D-Westmoreland)
Representative Michael J. Needham (D-Lackawanna)
Representative Frank J. O'Connell, Jr. (R-Luzerne)
Representative Raymond E. Wilt (R-Allegheny)

The original nine members of the Senate appointed to the Committee:

Senator Donald O. Oesterling, Vice Chairman (D-Butler)
Senator Richard C. Frame (R-Venango)
Senator D. Elmer Hawbaker (R-Franklin)
Senator Louis G. Hill (D-Philadelphia)
Senator Frederick H. Hobbs (R-Schuylkill)
Senator Edwin G. Holl (R-Montgomery)
Senator Martin L. Murray (D-Luzerne)
Senator William G. Sesler (D-Erie)
Senator Stanley G. Stroup (R-Huntingdon)

While the Committee now had a full complement of legislative members, it would take some time before an executive director was named.

After legislators met for only four days in January 1968, they began an extended recess to make way for the Constitutional Convention being held in the State Capitol Building, the state's first in 95 years. The convention utilized the House chamber in January, February and into early March while drafting proposed revisions to the state's constitution. Five referendum proposals

were approved by the convention and the measures were adopted by the voters in the November 1968 general election.

During the late spring of 1968, Rep. Wilt and other members of the Committee held informal meetings as they set out to create a new legislative oversight agency. The Committee, however, faced major challenges when it first met. While important logistical issues needed attention, the Committee had no funding, no budget and no staff of its own. This lack of resources limited the Committee's work in the early months of its inception.

A state budget line item funds Committee activities and operating expenses. While Act 448 was signed into law in January, funding for the Committee would not be available until the end of June when the new 1968-1969 state budget would be approved. Pennsylvania's yearlong budget cycle begins on July 1 and ends on June 30. However, due to a contentious debate over increasing the state's sales tax from 5 percent to 6 percent, the General Appropriation bill which called for \$700 million spending during Fiscal Year 1968-69 was not signed until the very last day of July.

That summer, making news at the national level, the presidential national conventions of the Republicans and Democrats were held in August. On August 5, 1968, the Republican Convention opened in Miami Beach, Florida. Three days later, Richard M. Nixon won the party's nomination on the first ballot. Then, on August 26, the Democrat Convention opened in Chicago. Hubert H. Humphrey won the Democrat nomination.

By this time, nearly eight months had passed since the Committee was established, but there was not much progress to show for it. When the General Assembly reconvened in mid-September 1968, members of the Committee met again. Before the Committee formally began operations, it was agreed that its work would require a full-time executive director. Act 448 granted the chairman \$25,000 to hire professional staff and conduct studies. Throughout the summer of 1968 names of individuals who might be considered for the director's position made the rounds, but there was no consensus as to who should be hired. As a temporary measure, Chairman Wilt proposed that James Bashline be hired to serve as the Committee's interim director until a permanent director was named. Bashline was employed as the editor of the Pennsylvania Game News for the Pennsylvania Game Commission under Governor Shafer.

In early October 1968, James Bashline took on the challenge of leading the newly formed Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee. On the fifth floor of the Capitol, in '68, there were offices of Democratic and Republican members of the House, the Governor's Office of Administration, the State Conservation Commission, the State Government Commission and the Legislative Reference Bureau. Bashline started setting up his cramped, windowless office in room 601 of the fifth floor in the State Capitol Building in Harrisburg.

THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE (1968-Present)

Throughout the history of the Committee, there are four distinct periods of time easily characterized by certain themes. The four periods are:

- **On-site inspection tours (1968 – 1970).**
- **Shaping the environmental legislative agenda (1970 – 1978).**
- **Reporting on environmental performance (1978 – 1989).**
- **Legislative oversight – the tools of the trade (1989 – Present).**

The four eras can be defined as follows: The first period was about gaining first-hand knowledge of water quality issues, specifically AMD; the second period consisted of a burst of new environmental legislation and regulation, and the third period brought informative reports to the legislature that examined issues state agency's faced in administering various environmental programs.

These approaches led to significant and lasting gains, but new concerns require new solutions – and that's where the fourth period comes in. Determining a viable path to ensuring a healthy environment and economy is like solving a complex algebraic equation. There are many interconnected factors, values, and variables to be considered, calculated, and compared. Some loom larger than others. Some are more constant. Some can change rapidly in short periods of time, depending on what is happening in the overall situation. That's why it's so important to take the long view in regard to environmental policies. For the Committee, it's a familiar path.

The fourth period, from 1989 onward, marks the transition to a comprehensive approach to environmental sustainability and involves bringing the right people to the table (government officials, industry representatives and stakeholders) and providing viable options for consideration.

ON-SITE INSPECTION TOURS: 1968 - 1970

One theme dominated operations during the first years of the Committee, dictated by the language of the act: the inspection of field operations that were applying for grants under Project 500. At that time there were just a handful of active operations under Scarlift that addressed acid mine pollution. But when Project 500 was established in January 1968, hundreds of new applications from across the state began to flood the Department of Mines and Minerals offices in the Townhouse Apartment Building in Harrisburg.

Bashline's first order of business was to begin organizing legislative fact-finding tours of the state's six major watersheds. The tours provided lawmakers with a look at the magnitude of the AMR efforts and the innovative water treatment technologies that could reduce AMD. By inviting experts along on the trip, inspection tours went a long way in establishing a common frame of reference for legislators which was helpful for discussions in Harrisburg.

Just days after assuming the acting-director's position, Bashline began organizing the Committee's inaugural inspection tour. Four separate newspaper articles – in the New Castle News, the Altoona Mirror, the Titusville Herald and the Oil City Derrick – announced that a new legislative conservation committee would be inspecting proposed and ongoing water quality projects in west-central Pennsylvania. At the end of October, Rep. Wilt, Senator Oesterling, Senator Frame, Senator Hawbaker and Rep. Dwyer, along with five other legislators and Secretary Charmbury conducted a two-day trip to several counties. The first project to be inspected was the site of a proposed ion exchange water treatment plant in Philipsburg (Centre County). Next was St. Mary's (Elk County) to inspect an AMD project, then to Venango County to visit Sandy Creek, which had AMD problems, and Scrubgrass Creek, a tributary of the Allegheny River at Kennerdell, was the last stop of the day.

The next morning, the group visited Mill Creek, a tributary of the Clarion River, at Fisher Dam, and explored the possibility of a Yellow Boy Plant at the mouth of Little Mill Creek for water pollution purposes. They then traveled to the Clarion River at Gravel Lick Bridge to inspect water quality issues in the river.

One month later, in November, the Committee toured AMD sites on the west branch of the Susquehanna River. Stops included sections of the river between Lock Haven (Clinton County) and Selinsgrove (Snyder County). According to newspaper reports, AMD was blamed for killing thousands of fish along that stretch of the river in 1967. Rainstorms in the old mining area upstream from Lock Haven were blamed for the discharge of AMD into the river.

In the spring of 1969, the Committee traveled to Myersdale, Pennsylvania (Somerset County) to see the condition of the Casselman River, a polluted stream which emptied into the Youghiogheny River. A number of communities along the Casselman were in the process of upgrading aging sewage treatment systems.

The Committee traveled to Clinton and Potter Counties in April with stops along the Kettle Creek watershed. Legislators inspected AMD projects and talked to residents about the impact that mine drainage had on their communities. Later that same month the Committee toured Little Toby Creek in Elk County. The tour focused on AMD treatment systems and how poor mining practices influenced remediation of area streams due to mine water discharge.

According to the May 23 edition of the Titusville Herald, on a three-day tour the Committee visited several counties in northeast Pennsylvania to examine the impacts of coal mining in Carbon, Schuylkill and Northumberland counties. The Committee inspected the St. Clair Sewerage Disposal Plant, the Mahanoy City Strip Mine Reclamation Project, the Locust Lake Recreation Area, the Greenwood Mining Company strip mine, the Tuscarora Culm Banks, the Rausch Creek Recreation Area, the Glen Burn Deep Mine in Shamokin (one of the largest anthracite coal mines in the state) and the Mt. Carmel Mine Fire Containment Project.

An article in the July 22, 1969, New Castle News stated that members of the Committee and staff were joining 300 environmentalists, legislators and state officials from six Mid-Atlantic States for a two-day whirlwind tour of the state's coal mining operations and reclamation areas.

The tour was hosted by the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) and co-hosted by Committee members Senator Oesterling and Rep. Laudadio.

The NWF tour which started and ended in New Castle, covered various projects in Lawrence, Butler, Mercer, Crawford, Cambria and Indiana counties. Sites listed on the agenda included: the Shenango Reservoir, the Pymatuning Spillway and the Linesville Fish Hatchery. The second day of the tour included stops at the coal-fired Keystone Power Plant that had just come online in Indiana County, the Slippery Rock AMD Treatment Plant in Butler County and a stop at Ambrosia Lake, a restored strip mine with a lake in Lawrence County.

It was soon afterward, in September 1969, that Bashline announced that he would be resigning as acting-director at the end of the month in order to concentrate on his career as one of the country's leading outdoor writers. At the close of the 1960s, Ralph Abele was appointed as the first director of the Committee, serving from 1969 thru 1971. Abele shouldered the responsibility of building the Committee's brand in the General Assembly.

SHAPING THE ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA: 1970 - 1978

The 1970s marked a different era for Pennsylvania's environmental agenda. Starting at the beginning of the '70s and ending around 1978, almost all of the environmental laws, the state environmental regulatory agencies, and specialized environmental organizations appeared. This first wave of legislative initiatives included passage of almost 40 major environmental statutes. The role of the Committee changed greatly during the 1970-78 period. Ralph Abele's contribution to these efforts were enormously important.

Abele was an especially distinguished appointment. Prior to his hiring by the Committee, he had been a major force in the conservation field in western Pennsylvania. Abele was respected within high levels of state government, business and the conservation world. His philosophy would come to be defined in just one phrase, "Do your duty and fear no one."

In October 1969, the Committee and its new director joined staff from the Fish Commission on a trip that visited three Western Pennsylvania waterways to show that the health of state rivers, lakes and streams hinge on future investments in water quality projects. The trip included another stop at the Shaw Mines Complex along the Casselman River in addition to stops along the Youghiogheny River and the Monongahela River in southwestern Pennsylvania.

According to an article in the October 2 edition of the Wellsboro Gazette, by the fall of 1969, some \$15 million worth of AMD treatment plants were under construction in both the bituminous and anthracite regions – and the Commonwealth owned five mobile neutralization plants for use in emergency situations anywhere in the state.

The following year, on July 27, 1970, Committee members inspected three pulp and paper mills in Central and Northcentral Pennsylvania. According to the Altoona Mirror newspaper, the three sites visited were: the Combined Paper Mill at Roaring Springs (Blair County), the Westvaco plant in Tyrone (Blair County) and the Penntech Mill in Johnsonburg (Elk County). Issues about discharges and treatment facilities at these mills were the topic of discussion during

the tours. Most pulp and paper mills are located near major waterways and have access to a large, uninterrupted supply of water. After using the water for pulp and paper production, these mills often discharged the used water into the waterways as waste.

Two months later, in October 1970, the Committee traveled to Antrim, Pennsylvania (Tioga County) to inspect the Pine Creek watershed and the impact of AMD on local municipalities. Pine Creek was known to be polluted for decades, but the pollution grabbed headlines that year after a blowout at a local mine poured millions of gallons of acidic water into Pine Creek. Fish kills were reported for miles downstream.

When Abele became director of the Committee he brought with him a larger sense of mission and direction. Abele enjoyed a personal relationship with the members of the Committee and he intended to build on it. By 1970, a new tradition of providing direct assistance to the legislature had become a standard practice. Although established for one purpose, committees often change their purpose as the General Assembly changed its views on the issue. Soon the tasks and activities of the Committee outgrew its original purpose of monitoring Project 500 appropriations.

The spate of seminal environmental legislation of the '70s embodied the General Assembly's response to newly understood threats to health and the environment posed by pollution. These examples were more than legislative tinkering; they were legislative responses to new problems.

During this time, in its legislative role, the Committee was responsible for scrutinizing all environmental legislative measures that were referred to it by its chairman. Committee staff worked with legislators as the General Assembly developed, considered and enacted major environmental legislative initiatives. For instance, among its early legislative successes, the Committee was instrumental in passing legislation to create Pennsylvania's Department of Environmental Resources.

Pennsylvania's state government manages the environment through both legislatively enacted laws and administrative agencies that implement these laws. Before 1970, the responsibility for protecting the environment was scattered over different boards and commissions. That separation was a mismatch with the scale of the problems and the reality of the environment's interconnectedness. A lesson of the past was that environmental issues must be addressed in an integrated way. Rep. Laudadio and Abele began working closely together on drafting what would become House Bill 2213 that would combine the Department of Forests and Waters and other environmental conservation entities into a single department with vast regulatory responsibilities. Laudadio was the prime sponsor of the legislation. With Governor Shafer's signature, Act 275, creating the Department of Environmental Resources, became law on December 3, 1970. The state environmental protection organized by the DER emphasized preventing and reducing pollution in the 1970s (twenty-five years later, in 1995, the General Assembly divided the department into regulatory and conservation agencies).

At the beginning of the 1971 legislative session, Rep. Laudadio, an avid outdoorsman, became chairman of the Committee (a position he would hold until the time of his death in

1977). Senator Robert “Budd” Dwyer became vice-chair. For Laudadio, conservation had always been a priority. For example, back in January 1966, he was honored as the “National Conservation Legislator of the Year” sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation. Very quickly the Committee’s purview expanded even further to include an important role in many of the Commonwealth’s most groundbreaking environmental laws and regulatory programs.

Under Laudadio and Abele’s direction, the Committee focused on an aggressive legislative agenda. In the early years environmental regulations focused on controlling the immediate problems – point sources of pollution such as smoke stacks and wastewater discharge.

During those years, the Committee was instrumental in the development of the following groundbreaking environmental initiatives. For example, because of legislation introduced by Laudadio (House Bill 40) the Bituminous Coal Open Pit Mining Amendments (Act 147) would now include the surface mining of anthracite coal. The Committee also played a role in the creation of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission in 1970. Abele’s position was “this isn’t going to last forever so let’s get as much done as we can while we can.”

Throughout the late 1960s and early ‘70s the public began to demand action on environmental questions. To attract voters, political figures started to incorporate current environmental messages into their campaigns. Committee member Rep. Kury was one of the first to recognize the value of this strategy. Kury was instrumental in the passage of the Clean Streams Act along with passing legislation on floodplain and stormwater management.

A seasoned environmental crusader by 1971, Kury was the chief architect of what would become known as Pennsylvania’s environmental rights constitutional amendment. Kury introduced House Bill 958. Under the names of 28 co-sponsors (22 Democrats and 8 Republicans), it proposed to add the following words to the first article of the state constitution: “The people have a right to clean air, pure water and to the preservation of the natural, scenic, historic and aesthetic values of the environment. Pennsylvania’s public natural systems are the common property of all the people, including generations yet to come.” Abele provided much needed public support of the Pennsylvania Environmental Rights Amendment.

The legislation passed both the House and Senate in two successive legislative sessions. On Primary Election Day, May 18, 1971, the proposed amendment to the constitution, broadly defining Pennsylvanians’ individual right to an unspoiled environment and the state’s duty to care for its natural systems, was passed by voters by an overwhelming majority (Yes: 1,021,342 – No: 259,979). Since that 1971 amendment, the Committee’s scope has continued to expand.

During the fall of 1971, Committee staff worked closely with Senator Oesterling on legislation to take away local ordinances which hindered flood control and would empower DER with the necessary authority to set up an effective and comprehensive flood control and management plan.

The New Year brought with it some unexpected news. In January 1972, Ralph Abele was appointed as the new executive director of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission (1972-1987). The

legacy of Ralph Abele's tenure laid the foundation for the Committee's growth and the subsequent projects over the following years. He left a permanent stamp on the Committee, molding it into an agency known for its independence and integrity.

Peter Duncan was the second director of the Committee serving from 1972 thru 1979. Duncan built on Abele's work in most areas and took on some new initiatives. From large issues to small matters, the Committee continued its work. First on the year's agenda was a fact-finding tour to the Shippingport nuclear power plant located on the Ohio River, 25 miles west of Pittsburgh, in Beaver County. Members of the Committee had an opportunity to see a nuclear reactor in operation and gain a better understanding of how it relates to environmental concerns. It was the first ever commercial nuclear electric power station in the United States, beginning operations in 1957.

The summer of 1972 saw one of the worst natural disasters in Pennsylvania history when Hurricane Agnes carved a path through the Commonwealth with deluges of record-breaking rainfall and gale-force winds. On June 22, much of the state received more than seven inches of precipitation, with central Pennsylvania getting in excess of 10 inches and peaking at 19 inches in Schuylkill County. CBS News reported that of all the devastation within the eastern United States, central Pennsylvania was the "hardest hit," with 50 fatalities and \$2.3 billion in damages.

The Susquehanna and Schuylkill rivers remained above flood stage for days, ultimately causing 68,000 homes and 3,000 businesses and public buildings to be inundated.

Drinking water and sewage treatment systems across the state were forced off-line due to the flooding. Hundreds of central Pennsylvania communities had to rebuild sewer and water systems that were damaged by Agnes. On June 29, Governor Milton Shapp (1971-1979) called for the legislature to appropriate \$50 million for immediate flood relief. In the following weeks after the flood, one of the most monumental tasks included the flood debris clean-up of the mountains of trash piled high in the mud baked streets all throughout the Susquehanna Valley. (Uprooted trees, broken furniture, sodden carpets, soggy sheet rock, smashed fencing, crushed carports and moldy clothing made up the mix of items destroyed by the June storm and subsequent flooding.) In addition to the removal of debris, hundreds of barrels containing hazardous waste and waste oil were visible in the Susquehanna, confirming that the environmental effects lingered for months.

Once the flooding receded, the conversation regarding flood control and mitigation began nearly overnight. Calls for floodplain regulations and concerns regarding proper regional planning and land use surfaced. Duncan assisted legislative members with exploring potential state legislation to help victims of Hurricane Agnes during the weeks and months of recovery. Proposed legislation included changing flood plain zoning so that more dams and reservoirs could be built, and creating a Land Development Agency to assist in planning new housing sites.

Fieldwork was an important activity begun during Abele's tenure and continued by Duncan. In the late summer of 1972, Larry Schweiger, field representative for the Committee, participated in several meetings with Committee member Rep. Kury that examined ways to protect

waterways through planning and management programs. As a result, in December 1972, Governor Shapp signed into law the Pennsylvania Scenic Rivers Act (Act 283). Committee member Rep. Kury was the prime sponsor of the legislation that created the program. This law allowed for designations of rivers with unique scenic and recreational values as part of the state Scenic Rivers System.

Over the course of the next few years, the Committee played a role, to varying degrees, in most of the environmental legislation of the day. However, in late 1973, its role changed from shepherding environmental bills through the political process to one of defending established laws and policies. In October 1973, Arab oil-producing states announced an embargo of oil exports to countries supporting Israel in the Yom Kippur War. The U.S. imported 30 percent of its oil from such countries, sending the country into an energy crisis. Soon afterwards, the debate in Harrisburg focused on proposals to ease anti-pollution laws in response to fuel shortages and rapid price increases, such as modifying state laws to permit greater use of Pennsylvania coal. At that time, regulations prohibited its use in many situations because of high sulfur content. In a House floor debate, Chairman Laudadio led a coalition of legislators urging caution in any attempt to roll-back environmental regulations.

Later that year, Act 148 of 1973 was passed by the legislature authorizing municipalities to establish local environmental advisory councils. Four of the cosponsors of the enabling legislation (HB 197) were members of the Committee (including Chairman Laudadio). The purpose of the councils was to identify local environmental issues and develop recommendations for solutions. The 1974 Clean and Green Program was initiated with the passage of Act 319. This act was based on the Constitutional amendment to preserve farmland through preferential property tax assessments.

On a melancholy note, Committee Chairman John Laudadio passed away while in office on June 7, 1977. He had been an original member of the Committee since 1968 and had served as chair beginning in 1971. Among Laudadio's legislative achievements was enactment of the Clean Streams Act of 1965. At the time it was one of the toughest stream pollution laws in the nation. Representative Russell Letterman (D-Centre), an avid hunter and outdoorsman, became the Committee's third chairman.

The Federal Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act became law in 1977. It required states to regulate surface coal mining and established the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Trust Fund to pay for reclamation of abandoned surface mines. The excise tax imposed was 35 cents per ton of surface mined coal and 15 cents per ton of underground mined coal.

The last half of the 1977-1978 legislative session saw several important bills signed into law that dealt with flooding issues. This was a result of the Great Johnstown Flood of 1977. It began on the night of July 19, when a line of severe thunderstorms that stalled over Johnstown, dropping as much as a foot of rain in some areas. Small streams overflowed their banks, crashing through neighborhoods, highways and businesses. Laurel Run Reservoir and several other dams failed, causing an estimated \$300 million in property damages in an eight county area and took the lives of more than 100 people. Eight separate pieces of flood plain legislation were quickly

introduced including the Flood Plain Management Act (Act 167) and the Storm Water Management Act (Act 167). Interestingly, these two acts were originally debated and matured together as a single law throughout two legislative sessions. Ultimately, the separation into separate laws during the third session was largely a tactic to aid passage.

The Flood Plain Management Act directed communities to adopt flood plain ordinances and participate in the federal flood insurance program. The Storm Water Management Act required DER to develop model storm water ordinances and required counties to prepare storm water management plans. Senator Kury was the prime sponsor of the enabling legislation.

In November, the legislature passed Senate Bill 1145, the Dam Safety and Encroachment Act (Act 325), again with Senator Kury as the prime sponsor. The purpose of the act was to reduce flooding by identifying the hazards presented by unsafe dams. The Committee staff worked with Walter Lyon, director of DER's Bureau of Water Quality Management and Committee members Rep. Tom Fee (D-Lawrence) chairman of the House Conservation Committee and Rep. Roy Wilt (R-Mercer). The law strengthened dam safety standards.

The second period ended in 1978 with a downturn in the economy. Beginning in 1978, inflation began to intensify, reaching double digit levels in 1979. Little money was left for environmental purposes after that, the environmental honeymoon had ended. The debate between environmental and economic objectives characterized the years ahead for the Committee.

REPORTING ON ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE: 1978 - 1989

By the late 1970s the pace of legislation and environmental reform began to slow. The environmental movement that had prospered in the early 1970s changed with the advent of the 1980s. In the late 1970s and early '80s, the General Assembly's response to environmental problems began to be tempered with an increased awareness of the potential economic costs of resolving these problems. A second oil embargo in 1979 began a three year recession in the U.S. Legislators became reluctant to expand on or initiate new environmental regulatory controls during this time.

However, from creating a single state environmental agency to enacting numerous comprehensive laws to control pollution, Pennsylvania made a firm long-term commitment in the 1970s to clean up its environment. With this increased emphasis on environmental concerns came an increasing reliance on state agencies to carry out legislative air pollution, drinking water, solid waste and water pollution mandates.

Generally, state agencies are responsible for establishing environmental standards, developing and issuing regulations and guidelines, providing technical support, awarding and administering grants, and enforcing the various acts.

Although the Committee continued most of its traditional activities, its work gradually changed reflecting new priorities in the General Assembly. The Committee's legacy is found in the many items of legislation it influenced in the early 1970s. The Committee's legacy is also

found in its nearly 100 reports. The reports are one set of documents among the variety of document types produced by the Committee that address legislative and other environmental policy issues. Through the 1970's and well into the 1980s, the Committee's reports helped legislators to assess complex issues and make wiser choices.

Most Committee reports went beyond the question of whether state money is being spent appropriately to ask whether state programs and policies are meeting their objectives. The Committee's reports ran the gamut of subject matter, with approaches tailored for each topic and legislative request.

As far back as 1970, the Committee's debut report, Comprehensive Review of the Water Pollution Enforcement Program, was an examination of the dispute between the federal government and the state over pollution law enforcement. Federal officials said the state's efforts lacked a detailed overall enforcement plan. Such a plan was promised by the state in a water quality program approved by federal officials in 1969. Another example would be a 1973 report on construction and operation of sewage treatment plants in Pennsylvania. A 1975 report provided a comprehensive examination of various types of waste management options available in Pennsylvania.

Beginning in the early 1980s, the number of Committee reports provided to the legislature increased steadily. The third period of the Committee's progress started in 1981 with the publication of a report examining integrated flood management proposals in Pennsylvania. Then Chairman Harry Bittle (R-Franklin) introduced House Bill 1483, supported by 42 co-sponsors, directing DER to develop a state water plan for maintaining ground and surface water supplies. Because the bill was controversial in that it would create a water withdrawal permit system, it was never reported out of committee.

Later that same year, voters overwhelmingly approved a \$300 million water bond issue. It would be used to finance loans for flood control, dam safety and water system improvements. Chairman Bittle introduced a package of bills creating a Water Facilities Loan Board to make loans and inspect proposed project. The legislative package was consolidated to become Act 167 of 1982.

Small water utilities have many problems that make their regulation by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC) difficult. Problems such as the number of employees required for small systems and the necessity of certain equipment created burdensome overhead that had to be picked up by the customers. In February 1982, a Committee report examined the PUC's handling of small water systems, specifically its service standards.

Coal mining issues continued to be a frequent subject for the Committee's activities and reports in this period. For example, in 1982, Director Larry Schweiger worked closely with former Committee Chairman Letterman on legislation mandating utility companies using oil to prove they could use oil more cheaply than coal.

In the spring of 1983, the Committee conducted several public hearings to gather information on the state's abandoned mine reclamation program. Later that spring, the Committee released a two-volume report evaluating various means of stretching reclamation dollars and to stimulate reclamation work. In mid-1984, then-Chairman Lincoln introduced legislation (Senate Bill 1309) designed to encourage coal recovery and land reclamation by reworking abandoned mines which still have recoverable coal. Eventually, the bill was passed in both chambers and became Act 158 of 1984.

On a side note – it was also in 1984 that Senator Roy Wilt introduced legislation to put controls on oil and gas operations to protect public and private water supplies, especially in the northwestern counties of the state which had been polluted by oil and gas drilling. At that time, Pennsylvania virtually had no laws regulating oil drilling. The new director of the Committee, Tom Beauduy, was the chief architect in drafting the legislation that ultimately became Act 223 of 1984. The act states that when the activities of a company result in the reduction of water quality, it must restore or replace the affected supply.

Legislative use of the Committee had become commonplace by 1985. In June, the Committee released a report on low-level radioactive waste (LLRW). The federal Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act of 1980 mandated states to provide disposal capacity for LLRW generated within its borders. The Committee's report highlighted eight compacts enacted by other state legislatures across the country.

In 1985, Committee member Senator Patrick Stapleton (D-Indiana) introduced Senate Resolution 6 directing the Committee to conduct an investigation of the land application of liquid and composted sewage sludge. Concerns had been raised about the hazards posed to water sources from land-applied sewage sludge. The result was two reports in 1986 on the administration issues and the technical criteria of sewage sludge application in Pennsylvania. Two years later, in 1988 revised regulations for land application of sewage sludge were established under Title 25, Chapter 275. The revisions required that site-specific permits for land application be issued.

The Committee continued to issue oversight reports on water quality issues. The proper construction of water wells should protect the groundwater in the well from contamination by surface runoff. Pennsylvania has over three million rural residents who depend on private water wells for drinking water. A 1986 report dealt with protecting water quality with well construction and location standards. Water well construction standards remains a topic of debate.

In 1987, the Committee issued three reports. The first was a detailed examination of Pennsylvania's water and sewage infrastructure needs. The second report was an overview of the safe drinking water amendments of 1986. The amendments increased the regulation of drinking water quality and started a groundwater protection program. And, the third report highlighted Pennsylvania's role in the new federal Superfund Program. It focused on new provisions affecting state involvement and a review of other significant Superfund amendments.

A 1988 report provided a review of three public hearings the Committee conducted on the Oil and Gas Act of 1984. The report addressed 24 issues related to oil and gas drilling in

Pennsylvania. Important issues included bonding, well plugging, preemption of local ordinances, and erosion and sedimentation control.

For years, reports prepared by DER and stakeholder groups highlighted challenges that the Bureau of State Parks faced – particularly fiscal challenges – and the Bureau reported that its funding did not cover the cost of its mission to preserve the parks for current and future generations. In a 1988 testimony before the annual budget hearings, the secretary of DER, Arthur Davis, said that the agency faced a maintenance backlog of \$90 million.

In 1989, the Committee issued a report on Pennsylvania's State Park System. The report reviewed the testimony received at three public hearings and the information gathered on the inspection tours of various state parks. It examined how the Bureau makes maintenance decisions and actions it is taking to help address its maintenance needs. The report included recommendations on fees in state parks, resort development and funding for major maintenance projects.

Pennsylvania's wetlands are significant natural resources that cover less than 2 percent of the total area of the state. Wetlands provide for natural flood control, flow stabilization of streams and rivers, improved water quality and aquifer recharge. In the late summer of 1988, DER issued revised standards governing the issuance of permits for activities in or near wetlands. This led to confusions among those who had to comply with the new standards and among DER officials who administered wetland policies and programs. A few months later, in November, the Committee held three public hearings on wetland identification, regulation and the state's Wetland Protection Action Plan.

There are thousands of roadside springs in Pennsylvania and many people rely on them for drinking water. Many of the springs consist of little more than a pipe emerging from the base of a hillside. There had been reports of groundwater contamination and a growing concern about the quality of the water from roadside springs. The Committee released a report in October 1990 on the use and regulation of roadside springs. It examined the question of the state's ability to monitor water quality at roadside springs. The report recommended that DER conduct an inventory of springs in Pennsylvania; begin water testing of springs; and establish a public education component on the risks of drinking water from roadside springs.

While the written reports produced by the Committee did not always drive legislative decision making, it did set boundaries to the debate, rule out some incorrect arguments and help frame political decisions in factual ways. Thus, the reports, combined with an emphasis on oversight hearings, plus conferences, task forces and inspection tours, became the toolkit used by the Committee during its fourth wave.

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT – THE TOOLS OF THE TRADE: 1989 - PRESENT

The first wave of environmental regulations passed in the 1970s sought to advance environmental protection by emphasizing enforcement, one-size-fits-all policies and prescriptive technologies. Although conditions initially warranted that approach, by the late 1980s and early '90s, Pennsylvania found its environmental framework grounded on an essential but aging foundation of laws and regulations. There was growing recognition that the passage of time created a

compelling need to update many of the state's environmental policies to remain relevant to contemporary environmental conditions.

Pennsylvania's air, water and land were much better off in 1990 than they would have been without the environmental regulations put in place in the 1970s. However, nothing lasts forever. Pennsylvania's body of environmental laws seemed outdated, fragmented and ineffective. By the early 1990s, recognition of the deficiencies had reached a critical point. The times had changed and environmental policy had to change with them. Regulations and policies were in need of a tune-up to be relevant and effective in a new era of environmental problem solving.

This section includes a broad overview of the Committee's activities between the late 1980s and 2018. A promising approach to identify and address the important current and emerging environmental issues in the long run is to seek to understand the key processes that drive each issue. Beginning in 1989, the Committee's charge to support oversight activities grew in size, scope and stature. While under the chairmanships of Senator William Lincoln (D-Fayette) from 1983 to 1992, Senator Raphael Musto (D-Luzerne) from 1993 to 1994, Representative David Argall (R-Schuylkill, State Representative 1984 to 2008, State Senator 2009-present) from 1995 to 2000 and Representative Scott Hutchinson (R-Venango, State Representative 1992-2013, State Senator 2013-present) from 2001 to the present day, the Committee monitored a diverse portfolio of issues while pursuing a legislative agenda seeking necessary improvements to government operations and activities.

It was no longer sufficient for the Committee to be an information-driven agency. The primary purpose of the Committee was still to provide oversight to the General Assembly. Of the numerous approaches that the Committee had crafted to assist the legislature, one of the most effective was public hearings.

By and large, hearings became the capstone of the Committee's work. Committee hearings are open to the public. The purpose of the hearing is to obtain information and opinions on proposed legislations, conduct an investigation, or evaluate/oversee the activities of government department or the implementation of a state law. In conjunction with the hearing, the Committee may also release a Committee report containing investigative findings, introduce legislation to reform the identified problem; refer the matter to an agency; or determine that no further action is required.

Other approaches during this period included initiating ad hoc task forces to complement the Committee's work; sponsoring conferences and listening sessions, roundtable discussions and stakeholder meetings; organizing fact-finding tours and a number of other means.

Since 1989, the Committee has held an unprecedented number of public hearings on a range of topics including: water resources; waste management and recycling; forest resource management; recreation and tourism; energy development and biodiversity. At each hearing, the Committee handled the logistics, developed agendas, organized information for effective use, and, in most cases, issued a follow-up report containing a summary of the hearings and viable recommendations.

Many of the environmental high-profile concerns that the Committee has been involved with over the years required long-term, sustained attention. The following issues will help illustrate both the depth and flexibility of the Committee's work for the General Assembly. They are grouped thematically, and their order does not indicate priority.

WATER RESOURCES

Managing and Restoring Water Resources

One of the biggest challenges facing the state is the proper management of water resources. Throughout its history, Pennsylvania has had to deal with the effects of too much water through excessive rain and flooding, and too little water during periods of little or no rain. Working to improve Pennsylvania's water resources has been a top priority for the Committee since 1968.

Pennsylvania's lakes, rivers, streams and underground aquifers have long supplied residents with abundant fresh water, but due in part to recurrent droughts, this vital resource is not always available when and where it is needed or in the amount or quality desired.

One of the worst droughts on record parched much of the state starting in 1988. The multi-year drought (1988-1992) ranks among Pennsylvania's worst droughts of the 20th century. The drought put water resource management on the General Assembly's agenda. Providing adequate water supplies to all users, watershed protection and control of surface and groundwater withdrawals were among the many water management issues that needed to be examined.

The Committee took a number of important steps to address these problems. Among the most prominent reports produced by the Committee was a 1990 study on watershed protection. The main focus was Senate Bill 1012 that was introduced by Committee member Senator Musto. Revenues from the sale of lands adjacent to drinking water reservoirs have helped water utilities meet regulatory mandates and increase profits. Senate Bill 1012 provided for Public Utility Commission approval prior to public utility sale of watershed land. The Committee held three public hearings to give stakeholders an opportunity to voice their opinions.

The following year, in September 1991, the Committee held four public hearings on water resource management. Recognizing the need for a comprehensive water resource strategy in Pennsylvania, the Committee issued a special report to the General Assembly in January 1992. The report, *Water Resources Management in Pennsylvania*, outlined the policies necessary for the effective management of Pennsylvania's water resources such as regulating groundwater and surface water withdrawals, updating the State Water Plan, and water conservation.

In addition, the 1992 report also recommended that a conference be held to help in the development of water resources legislation for Pennsylvania. As a follow up on the recommendation, the Committee hosted a two-day water resources management conference in Harrisburg on April 8 and 9, 1992. The conference began with presentations on the role of the federal, state, and local government in water management; trends in state water management legislation; and

regional approaches to water resource management. It was an impressive gathering of water professionals from across the state, offering the opportunity to network and learn about current issues impacting water management.

One year later, on February 24 and 25, 1993, the Committee sponsored its second water resources management conference. The conference brought together experts in water law and water management to address the components of the proposed water resources management legislation. One of the purposes of the conference was to discuss Pennsylvania's proposed Water Resource Conservation and Management Act (Senate Bill 351). The legislation was introduced by Committee member Senator Jeanette Reibman (D-Northampton) and cosponsored by then Committee Chairman Musto, former Chair Senator Lincoln, Senator David Brightbill (R-Lebanon), Senator Eugene Porterfield (D-Westmoreland) and Senator Roger Madigan (R-Bradford). This legislation addressed many of the issues that the Committee identified in its earlier reports. For example, it included provisions for drought management and planning; a new state water plan; and an inventory of the state's water resources.

The ensuing report on the conference was issued to the General Assembly in May 1993. The report contained eight recommendations concerning SB 351. The recommendations covered the issues of water withdrawals, permitting and registration, statewide water resource advisory committees and water conservation.

It would be almost ten years later that Pennsylvania's Water Resources Planning Act (Act 220 of 2002) would be passed. Several Committee members played important roles in its passage including: Senator Mary Jo White (R-Venango), Representative Art Hershey (R-Chester), Senator Musto and Senator Madigan.

The plan would be used as a planning and policy guidance document. One of its mandates included developing and adopting a statewide water plan that would be updated every five years. In addition, the plan's three main principles included: collect and disseminate water resources data, manage water resources in an integrative way, and develop policies encouraging technological advances to conserve water resources. All of these were included in the Committee's earlier reports to the General Assembly.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority

The majority of water infrastructure in Pennsylvania was installed over the course of three major timeframes: the early 1900s, the 1930s, and from 1950 into the 1970s. Yet, because of the lifespan of materials used during each of these timeframes, the state's water infrastructure – from pipes to treatment facilities – is old and in dire need of repair and/or replacement. Water infrastructure supports every facet of our daily lives, but was facing a constellation of challenges: increased demands, deferred investments, aging infrastructure, rainfall flooding, and more.

While each municipality's water infrastructure needs, challenges and resources are unique, reinvestment in the systems has been a priority for decades. For example, on March 1, 1988, Governor Robert Casey signed House Bill 1100 creating the Pennsylvania Infrastructure

Investment Authority Act (Act 16 of 1988). The new PENNVEST program was a \$2.5 billion effort to rebuild the state's decaying water and sewer treatment systems. It was a program that won the endorsement of the state's electorate, by a 4 to 1 margin, as citizens approved a \$300 million bond issue to help finance the "clean water" initiative. PENNVEST is administered by a 13-member board headed by the governor. Committee members Senator Musto; Representative Camille "Bud" George (D-Clearfield); Senator Richard Kasunic (D-Westmoreland) and Representative Anthony DeLuca (D-Allegheny) have served on the PENNVEST board.

In the years that followed, the Committee would periodically review the PENNVEST program in addition to a number of water related issues. For example, the Committee held five hearings on the PENNVEST program in 1991 and a report containing nine recommendations for the program was issued to the General Assembly in that same year. The recommendations in the report called for more funding for the PENNVEST program; additional technical and management assistance for small drinking water systems; and a recommendation to include stormwater control projects as eligible for funding under the PENNVEST program.

In 1992, an additional \$350 million bond issue for the PENNVEST program was approved through a bond referendum. Legislation was also enacted so that PENNVEST funding could be used to construct and improve storm water management projects. Senator Brightbill introduced SB 275 that eventually became Act 149 of 1992. Small water systems received help with the passage of the Small Water Assistance Act (Act 5 of 1992). This act established a "Small Water Systems Regionalization Grant Program" and a "Small Water Systems Technical and Management Assistance Program."

Infiltration and Inflow into Sewer Systems

The infiltration of unwanted water into sewer systems overloads wastewater treatment plants creating environmental and health hazards and places a financial burden on municipalities and homeowners. The excess water usually infiltrates the system through deteriorated pipes in old or already damaged wastewater systems. The DEP began imposing moratoriums to enforce compliance with a state law requiring wastewater systems to have enough capacity to handle flow even in wet weather.

In 1998, House Resolution 376 was introduced directing the Committee to investigate the infiltration of unwanted water into sewer systems. It was to look at techniques and procedures to abate the problem. Two hearings were held in the spring of 1999. Much of the testimony addressed the extent of the infiltration problem and the best approaches for dealing with it. One of the difficulties involved in eliminating infiltration into sewer systems is the large percentage of sources that are located on private property. A report issued by the Committee in October 1999, "The Infiltration of Water into Sewage Treatment Systems", painted a picture of aging wastewater systems with many parts deteriorating and in desperate need of repair. It concluded that due to the pervasive inflow and infiltration problem in Pennsylvania a special task force be created to develop a comprehensive state policy to address the infiltration and inflow problems in the state.

In the summer of 2000, the Committee organized and held the initial meeting of the Legislative Infiltration Task Force. Convening a task force gave the Committee the flexibility required to effectively and efficiently review legislative measures and to more expertly evaluate the performance of state agencies and programs according to its broad oversight jurisdiction. The subject of discussion was legislation introduced by Senator Musto (Senate Bill 1471) to provide \$1 billion through a bond issue to help control discharges and alleviate overflows of combined storm and sanitary sewer systems. A combined total of four task force meetings were held: one in 2000 and three in the following year. The meetings addressed the issues of asset management guidelines and design standards for wastewater systems.

In February 2002 the Committee published a report from the special task force on the problems of infiltration. The report contained 12 recommendations aimed at utilities, municipal government, state government and the federal government.

In September 2002, in cooperation with DEP, the Committee co-sponsored a technical symposium on addressing infiltration and inflow problems. Over 230 participants, including contractors, engineers, and local, state and federal government representatives attended the two-day convention. Many of the recommendations offered by the Committee's report issued earlier that year were discussed.

Combined Sewer Overflows

Combined sewer systems are sewers that are designed to collect rainwater runoff, domestic sewage, and industrial wastewater in the same pipe. Most of the time, combined sewer systems transport all of their wastewater to a sewage treatment plant, where it is treated and discharged to a water body. During periods of heavy rainfall, however, the wastewater volume in a combined sewer system can exceed capacity of the sewer system or treatment plant. For this reason, combined sewer systems are designed to overflow occasionally and discharge excess wastewater directly to nearby streams, rivers, or other water bodies. These overflows, called combined sewer overflows (CSOs), contain not only rainwater but also untreated human and industrial waste, toxic materials, and debris.

In 2001, the Committee held three public hearings in Nanticoke (Luzerne), Pittsburgh (Allegheny) and Oil City (Venango). The focus of the hearings was Senate Bill 150 that was introduced by Senator Musto. The proposed legislation would establish a CSO grant program through a voter-approved \$1 billion bond issue to be administered by PENNVEST. Committee members heard testimony from DEP, local officials and engineers. According to DEP, Pennsylvania led the nation in the number of combined sewer overflows (CSOs), with 152 communities identified as having 1,569 discharge points. The EPA estimated a minimum cost of \$4 billion to solve Pennsylvania's CSO problems.

At the end of the year, the Committee's report on CSO's contained eight recommendations – chief among them was a call for legislation that would provide state-secured bond funding for upgrades and capital improvements to sewer systems plagued with CSO's.

Legislative Sewage Management and Treatment Task Force

In November 2005, House Resolution 88, introduced by Chairman Hutchinson, directed the Committee to continue to investigate infrastructure management issues. The resolution created a wastewater task force of legislators and a 22-member advisory committee to study infrastructure issues. The task force held its first meeting in Hershey, Pennsylvania on September 12, 2006 followed by three more meetings in 2007. The task force reviewed federal and state financing options for sewage treatment and collection systems in Pennsylvania.

In 2008, in response to the federal government reducing financial support for water quality improvements by nearly half-a-billion dollars, a new Pennsylvania Sustainable Water Infrastructure Task Force (SWITF) was created by Executive Order 2008-02. In order to eliminate redundancy and duplication of effort, the SWITF and the Legislative Sewage Task Force voluntarily coordinated their respective task forces and activities.

In May 2008, the SWITF and the Sewage Task Force sponsored a series of eight public input meetings to examine ideas about the best way to fix and fund aging and deteriorating public water systems. Together, SWITF and Committee staff conducted extensive outreach and research to better understand the complexities of infrastructure financing.

On July 9, 2008, legislation introduced by Senator Musto (Senate Bill 1341) was signed into law as Act 64 of 2008. The legislation called for a voter referendum on a \$400 million bond issue for construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of drinking water supplies and sewage treatment systems. Over 2.8 million voters, or 62 percent, voted in favor of borrowing the money.

On November 2, 2008, the SWITF issued its report that measures the unmet financial needs of the state's deteriorating water and sewer infrastructure needs. The report found the Commonwealth's drinking water and wastewater systems face \$36.5 billion in capital repairs and upgrades over the next 20 years.

WASTE MANAGEMENT AND RECYCLING

Managing the Disposal of Waste Streams: Act 101 of 1988

As recently as the mid-1970s, Pennsylvania had more than 1,200 landfills. In many cases, these "town dumps" were simply open pits or abandoned mines or quarries. Before the state began regulating waste disposal, public health was put at risk by solid and liquid waste, often containing toxic material, disposed of in rivers, burned in open pits, or dumped into unlined landfills. When Pennsylvania began developing regulations to reduce landfill pollution in the early 1980s many facilities closed, unable to comply. By the late 1980s, Pennsylvania's landfills had dwindled to 100; new landfill permits were few and far between. Disposal prices went from \$15 per ton to \$120 per ton in some parts of the state and talk was of the great garbage crisis. Public opposition to new mega-landfills and incinerators created a political climate for waste reduction and recycling policies to advance.

In 1988 one of the most important and influential pieces of legislation to ever affect Pennsylvania's environment was signed by Governor Robert Casey on July 28. Pennsylvania's Municipal Waste Planning, Recycling and Waste Reduction Act (Act 101 of 1988), completely revised the state's approach to waste management. It was the culmination of an intense year-long legislative debate. Committee members Senator Musto and Rep. George played prominent roles in drafting and guiding the enabling legislation (Senate Bill 528) through the political process

It began the era of sorting recyclables out of the waste stream. It has been called the "Magna Carta of Pennsylvania environmental law" for its wide impact and the precedent it set in government, both in Pennsylvania and nationwide.

Because Pennsylvania's recycling program continued to be a work in progress, the Committee has held a range of events to examine recycling in Pennsylvania. For example, the Committee held a number of public hearings revisiting Act 101 during 1995 and 1996. According to the testimony, the major concern was the reauthorization of the recycling fees that would sunset in 1998. The \$2 per ton fee on municipal waste disposal had been an integral part of Act 101 because it supports grants for local recycling programs.

On April 11, 2002, the Committee held a hearing on reauthorization of the state's recycling fee in McKee's Rocks (Allegheny). A \$2 recycling fee that landfills and resource recovery centers must pay for each ton of solid waste would be extended indefinitely under a measure in the legislature. Act 101 of 1988 required the fee originally contained a "sunset" expiration date of 1999 that was later extended to 2003.

The Committee held a public hearing in Harrisburg on April 23, 2009. The purpose of the hearing was to review the state's recycling efforts, assess the recycling infrastructure and markets, and obtain suggestions for program improvement. The testimony suggested that Act 101 needed to support more waste reduction and minimization strategies, such as composting, and the act should address special wastes such as electronics.

In 2017, almost 30 years since Act 101 was passed, the Committee conducted a public hearing to review the state's history of recycling. Eight presenters provided Committee members with information on past performances and projected on future challenges. Since 1988, Act 101 has been amended 15 times and consensus of the presentation was that the act will continue to require updating in order to stay current with economic and social challenges.

Waste Tires

An estimated 242 million scrap tires are generated each year in the United States. In Pennsylvania, in the early 1990s, 12 million scrap tires were generated each year with 36 million tires already stockpiled. These large tire piles created fire hazards and heavy mosquito infestation throughout the Commonwealth. During the past 25 years, the Committee has held a number of public hearings examining waste tire disposal in Pennsylvania.

The direction of the Committee typically ebbs and flows with the shifting membership during each session. Each new member brings with them issues and topics that might fit within

the purview of the Committee. For example, a new perspective began to take root in 1994 when Committee member Rep. Argall requested the Committee examine waste tire management in Pennsylvania.

To explore options for dealing with scrap tires, the Committee held the first of a series of meetings in 1994 and 1995, with legislators and staff, regulatory agencies, and business and environmental organizations. In conjunction with the meetings, Committee members and staff also toured waste tire recycling and processing facilities and conducted listening/fact-finding tours into the proper management of waste tires.

The Committee's efforts resulted in the development of legislation to reduce or eliminate stockpiled tires in Pennsylvania while enhancing the markets for waste tires. The legislation, House Bill 1929, introduced on June 27, 1995, by Argall accomplished this by creating an investment tax credit program for facilities that reuse or recycle waste tires and a grant program for the cleanup of scrap tire piles.

Environmental issues had often ridden dramatic events into the public mind and public law. When industrial debris in Cleveland's Cuyahoga River caught fire and oil from an offshore blowout blighted Santa Barbara's beaches in 1969, the incidents became national symbols and ginned up the environmental movement. In March 1996, a mountain of waste tires caught fire under Interstate 95 in northeast Philadelphia, causing millions of dollars in damage to the elevated highway. A half-mile section of the busy highway was closed for several days while work crews performed emergency repairs.

The Philly I-95 fire dominated the General Assembly's attention for the next several months. The Committee sponsored a series of roundtable discussions on the problem of waste tire piles in Pennsylvania and the "Waste Tire Recycling Act (Act 190) was signed into law in December 1996.

Throughout 1997, the Committee took an active role in monitoring the progress of the act. And, in December, the Committee held a public hearing to review the progress that had been made over the previous year. Members learned that substantial progress had been made: about 45 percent of the 36 million waste tires that were in known stockpiles had been removed.

Continuing its monitoring of waste tire issues, in October 1999, the Committee held a public hearing to discuss the possibilities of using crumb rubber technology within state agencies. The Committee heard from the DEP, the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and a number of stakeholders. Testimony suggested that the greatest deterrent to the use of crumb rubber in highway construction is the high initial cost and the lack of consistent performance that seems to be associated with climate as well as many other variables.

Although remarkable progress had been made in addressing larger, priority waste tire stockpiles, there were still thousands of smaller stockpiles scattered throughout the state. As a result, House Bill 754 was introduced by Rep. Argall to continue the progress of Act 190. It would require DEP to maintain a list of tire stockpiles of between 1,500 and 10,000. The measure (Act 111 of 2002) focused on smaller piles of waste tires.

Over the next ten years the Committee held a number of public hearings (in 2003, 2007 and 2011) and various on-site inspection tours to review the development of recycled tire markets in Pennsylvania. At the public hearings, end users, processors, suppliers, business consultants and agency representatives presented testimony.

The Committee toured the Starr tire pile (Columbia County) in 2005. It was Pennsylvania's largest scrap tire pile with an estimated six million tires. By late 2008, the last of the tires were being trucked away to be recycled. Argall was in attendance as trucks left the site. In later years, Committee tours included tire recycling facilities in Chambersburg, Franklin County and in Braddock, Allegheny County.

In May 2007 the Committee and the Pennsylvania Recycling Markets Center hosted a Pennsylvania Recycled Tire Economic Development Forum. The forum promoted the development of recycled tire markets in Pennsylvania and the mid-Atlantic region.

The Committee's efforts in the past have helped raise awareness and visibility of the state's waste tire market development programs.

Electronic Waste Recycling: The Covered Device Recycling Act

In the early 2000s, there was growing concern regarding heavy metals and other toxic compounds present in discarded consumer electronics such as TVs, computer monitors and laptops. As early as 2003, states began to enact so called "e-waste" recycling laws that required consumers to recycle certain electronics, rather than continuing to include them in their residential waste.

In 2007, the Committee conducted a public hearing on the issue, held a roundtable discussion with stakeholders, examined systems in place in other states, and sponsored an e-waste simulation exercise using systems in operation in other states to get a feel for what might work in Pennsylvania. In 2008, the Committee released a report making recommendations on how Pennsylvania should handle e-waste recycling. The report, "E-Waste Recycling Programs and Policy Options", recommended that the Commonwealth employ a manufacturer-responsible system that would combine the best features of existing systems.

In early 2009, Committee Chair Rep. Hutchinson introduced legislation (House Bill 409) requiring manufacturers to adopt and implement a recovery plan. It was just one of several e-waste bills introduced during the legislative session.

In 2010, Pennsylvania joined a growing number of states by enacting Act 108, known as the Covered Device Recycling Act (CDRA). The CDRA places requirements on consumers, retailers, recycling facilities and manufacturers for the life cycle of certain "covered devices," including computers, monitors, tablets, televisions and e-readers. Under the law, these devices and others, most containing lead and other toxic materials, are directed away from commercial landfills and into electronic recycling facilities.

Within several years of its enactment, stakeholders began to experience significant growing pains from the new policy. Shifts in technology made electronic devices lighter, complicating the weight-based formula used to determine a manufacturer's recycling responsibility. Additionally, a lack of recycling infrastructure, coupled with the disposal ban, overwhelmed municipal recycling outlets and increased the amount of e-waste in illegal dump sites. Participating recyclers, unable to charge a fee for e-waste, began withdrawing from the marketplace due to a lack of profitability. It became increasingly clear that amendments to the CDRA were needed to alleviate the mounting pressure.

On March 31, 2016, the Committee held a public hearing at the State Capitol to review the CDRA and some of the problems identified by stakeholders. The Committee heard from various testifiers including Rep. Chris Ross (R-Chester), prime sponsor of Act 108 of 2010. Despite their diverse backgrounds, the testifiers confirmed that a comprehensive amendment is needed to correct market imbalances.

In 2017, the Committee's staff helped several lawmakers develop e-waste legislation and provided them with personalized research on the topic.

The Committee expects that the CDRA will again receive attention in the upcoming Legislative Session, given that the issues surrounding e-waste are ongoing. The Committee plans to engage legislative leaders on this issue and provide them with the information necessary to formulate a comprehensive amendment that appeals to all stakeholders involved.

FOREST RESOURCES

Legislative Forestry Task Force

States play a crucial role in the management of forest resources and Pennsylvania is no exception. Pennsylvania has over 17 million acres of forest land (58 percent of the state's land area). In addition to their contribution to timber, recreation and tourism earnings, forests provide diverse habitat, protective cover, filters for air contaminants, systems of groundwater recharge and filtration, protection for surface water quality and barriers against soil erosion.

However, the state's forests have faced significant challenges. Overabundance of white-tailed deer, drought, invasive species and increased residential development have impacted forest resources. In light of these threats and the importance of forests, in 1993, the Committee held three public hearings to study the benefits forests provide, and analyze and consider new response strategies and recommendations. The Committee also participated in several listening/fact-finding tours to observe forest regeneration problems; old-growth stands of trees; and wood and pulp processing plants.

In January 1994, the Committee issued a report on forest management to the General Assembly. The report contained a number of recommendations including: The General Assembly should consider a concurrent resolution establishing a forestry task force to further investigate the issues of forest resources management in Pennsylvania.

Following the Committee's recommendation, House Resolution 263 was introduced by Committee member Rep. Tom Fee, and cosponsored by Rep. Hutchinson, in March 1994, and

Senate Resolution 113 was introduced by Committee member Senator Roger Madigan in April 1994 establishing a Legislative Forestry Task Force, with staff assistance from the Committee. Senator Madigan led the task force and he was joined by Senator Musto, Representative Gary Haluska (D-Cambria), and Representative Jim Lynch (R-Warren). In addition, the task force had the active participation of an 18-member advisory committee representing a diversity of interests and experiences related to forest use and management.

The Legislative Forestry Task Force was established to protect the environmental quality, public health, and economic benefits that healthy forests provide to Pennsylvania. Since 1994, the task force has been re-formed and continued its work through a series of legislative resolutions enacted in succeeding legislative sessions. In addition to re-establishing the task force, the resolutions list the forestry-related issues that the task force is to study during that session.

The Legislative Forestry Task Force has addressed a wide variety of forest management issues such as fragmentation of forest landscapes, markets for forest products, regulatory barriers, education and outreach to forest landowners, road bonding, forest regeneration, insects and diseases, and many others.

The task force brought together key staff from state agencies, and forest resource stakeholders to explore issues of mutual interest and concern. The discussions helped to focus attention on key issues and shared challenges facing the forest and forest products industry and allow participants to compare notes on methods, tools, benchmarking results, and best management practices. In addition, the task force meetings provided a means for exchanging views, solving common problems, and promoting the acceptance and implementation of government forestry standards.

At the end of every two-year legislative session the Committee would issue a report detailing the issues contained in that session's resolution. The recommendations were designed to help inform and guide the legislature in decision making and policy implementation. Over the years, the task force has been successful in achieving change in a number of areas.

For example, a recommendation from the 1999 report is in force today. Act 33 of 2001 (introduced by Senator Madigan) regulates road bonding and sets out the responsibility of local governments to follow PennDOT's requirements and procedures and perform appropriate engineering studies.

In 2002, the task force was successful in having legislation enacted to provide dedicated funding for long-term forestry research. A recommendation in the task force's 2001 report, Act 165 of 2002 (introduced by Rep. Haluska) requires DCNR to use up to five percent of the funds it receives from stumpage sales each year for forestry research. This provision provides about \$1.5 million a year in research funding.

A provision found in Act 235 of 2004 regarding "clean and green" properties and their uses, is a result of a recommendation of the task force. The act incorporates a recommendation found in the task force's 2003 report to allow for additional leasing agreements on clean and

green forestland that do not change the non-developed use of the land, and where proceeds from the leases are devoted to offsetting costs of land management and associated tax payments.

Prescribed Fire

Prescribed fire is the skilled application of fire to existing vegetative fuels under planned and controlled conditions. In Pennsylvania it has been used on a limited basis because of liability issues. A 2006 presentation to the Forestry Task Force on prescribed burning and the Committee's December 2007 report recommending that legislation be developed to regulate prescribed burning practices provided a starting point for a series of informal roundtable discussions. The discussions were intended to address some of the concerns regarding prescribed burning, and provide input into possible legislation.

The legislation (House bill 262) was introduced by Rep. Haluska, who was a long-time member of the Forestry Task Force. The legislation passed both the House and Senate unanimously and on July 14, 2009, the governor signed into law the Prescribed Burning Practices Act, Act 17 of 2009. The law regulates the prescribed burning of state-owned lands. The act encouraged the continued use of prescribed burning for fuel reduction, ecological, forest, wildlife and grassland management purposes. The Act has been lauded by other states as a model template for prescribed burning legislation.

RECREATION AND TOURISM **Pennsylvania's State Park System**

Pennsylvania is proud to be one of only seven states in the nation to offer free admission to all 116 of its state parks. The state park system offers miles of trails and scenic lakes where visitors can fish, swim, bike, hunt, boat, hike or simply spend time outdoors in the beauty of nature. Parks staff are charged with maintaining and managing more than 280,000 acres of park lands and waters for the enjoyment of its visitors, and there are state parks in 62 of Pennsylvania's 67 counties.

However, over the years, funding shortages created a backlog of maintenance needs estimated at \$90 million. Addressing the first Governor's Conference on Recreation, Parks and Leisure in 1990, then-Chairman Lincoln stated "Management without money is what we've been doing over the last 10 years."

In response to this funding shortfall, the General Assembly passed the "Keystone Recreation, Park and Conservation Fund Act", (Act 50 of 1993) to provide funding for state parks. With passage of Act 50, DER received \$17 million for maintenance projects. In 1994, the Committee continued its commitment to Pennsylvania's state parks. On October 25, 1994, the Committee held a public hearing to address legislative proposals to create independent agencies for the state parks and forests; maintenance needs in state parks; and funding alternatives.

Because of the Committees initial hearing on state parks and the interest in obtaining additional funds for state parks, Committee staff released a research monograph (a precursor to the Green Papers) titled, Entrance Fees: A Supplemental Resource for State Parks, in April 1995.

The monograph examined park entrance fees in other states and discussed the advantages and disadvantages of initiating entrance fees in Pennsylvania's parks.

In May 1995, the Committee held a second hearing to review state park issues and to develop recommendations to better maintain the park system. The hearings focused on funding for state parks. While everyone at the hearings supported additional funding for state parks, there were differing views on how to generate new funds.

On March 26, 2012, the Committee's Environmental Issues Forum featured DCNR Secretary Richard Allan. Secretary Allan provided an update on the department's operations and programs, and focused on the importance of state parks and forests.

The Committee has worked to improve realization and understanding of the complexities of managing Pennsylvania's state park system and looks forward to working with the department and stakeholders in the future.

Pennsylvania's Heritage Areas

It was in 1989 that the Pennsylvania Heritage Parks Program began. It had humble origins in three limited, grass roots planning projects to preserve and interpret specific industrial sites that are unique to a particular region of Pennsylvania. It is a multi-faceted regional strategy guided by five interrelated goals including economic development; partnerships; cultural conservation; recreation and open spaces; and education and interpretation.

On June 2, 1997, the Committee invited Mr. August Carlino, the executive director of the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation and president of the Pennsylvania Heritage Park Association, to deliver a presentation on the role of heritage areas in protecting the state's cultural and natural systems. Heritage areas are about the eras of steel and iron-making, coal mining, the oil boom, canal and railroad building, the blazing of early roads and highways and life on the frontier.

On February 17, 1998, the Committee held a public hearing in Hamburg, Berks County and in March, two more hearings (Titusville and Harrisburg). The three hearings examined strategies for promoting heritage parks and the need for additional funding.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the Committee issued a report making recommendations on how to strengthen the heritage park system including increasing the funding for the Heritage Parks Program to \$5 million and to expand the interagency task force that governs the program.

Beginning in 2000 and continuing into 2002, the Committee followed up on the report by touring all 11 of the regions comprising the states Heritage Parks Program. Committee members and staff toured heritage regions, with particular interest in the role the parks and programs were playing in economic development, community building, historical preservation and tourism, recreation and education. With the Committee's help, funding for heritage and other parks was increased from \$4.35 million to \$5.45 million in the 2002-2003 budget.

On August 23, 2016, the Committee traveled to Carbon County for a tour of the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor. The tour began at the Lehigh Gap Nature Center followed by a meeting discussing the economic and environmental significance of the development of the D&L Heritage Corridor.

The Committee will continue its commitment to Pennsylvania's Heritage Areas Program, specifically their potential as a tool for economic development.

Abandoned Turnpike

Pennsylvania's "Abandoned Turnpike" meanders for 13-miles from rural Fulton County to Bedford County. Built in the late 1930s, the stretch featured two tunnels; one under Rays Hill for roughly two-thirds of a mile, the other under Sideling Hill for 1.3 miles. By the 1960s, turnpike traffic was 30 times its capacity. Due to engineering decisions, in 1968 a new section of road was built bypassing the two tunnels rendering the old section useless.

Beginning in 2015, the Committee has been closely involved with the proposed "Abandoned Turnpike" Pike2Bike proposal. Access to the site is still officially limited by the Southern Alleghenies Conservancy, the nonprofit that maintains it.

Recognizing its recreational potential, on April 24, 2015, the Committee conducted an on-site tour of the abandoned stretch of highway. The tour was designed to introduce lawmakers to a stretch of road that was once part of the original Pennsylvania Turnpike. Legislators met with local officials to discuss plans for converting the roadway and tunnels into a recreational hiking and biking trail. All agreed that turning the old highway into a public hiking and biking trail would require tremendous support at all levels of government.

To increase awareness of the potential economic benefits that the Abandoned Turnpike could provide to region, a second "bike" tour was held in October 2016. DCNR Secretary Cindy Adams Dunn and PennDOT Secretary Leslie Richards were among the participants in the 8-mile bike ride.

ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Cogeneration

Over a century of coal mining left Pennsylvania with new mountain ridges of coal refuse. Known as "bony pile" in western Pennsylvania and "gob pile" in the east, they became the center of a huge recycling effort and burgeoning industry in the early 1990s – cogeneration. Traditionally, power plants have been fueled by quality coal. But modern cogeneration plants can burn the waste from early coal production at high temperatures to produce power.

Pennsylvania has served as a leader in the coal refuse industry since Congress passed the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act. By 1996, it had become widespread in Pennsylvania.

There were 15 cogeneration plants in Pennsylvania that were fueled by waste coal. Those cogeneration facilities were providing environmental and energy benefits by using the coal “wastes” that have marred the landscape for generations.

On April 17, 1996, the Committee held a public hearing to assess the current status of the cogeneration facilities and to look at future energy and environmental issues concerning this segment of the power industry. With the passage of Act 138 of 1996, the “Electricity Generation Customer Choice and Competition Act”, the restructuring of the electric utility industry began in Pennsylvania. With the restructuring of the electric utility industry, independent power producers (IPP) faced an uncertain future.

The Committee recognized the important role that waste coal-fueled IPPs serve in providing both economic and environmental benefits to Pennsylvania. Specifically, in March of 1997, the Committee issued its report to the General Assembly that identified, and emphasized the need to recognize, the environmental benefits provided by these IPP facilities, including “improved water quality, land reclamation, and the elimination of health and safety hazards.” Using innovative technology, cogeneration power plants are able to generate up to 10 percent of the state’s total electricity generation from abandoned coal piles, which are a primary source of AMD. Over 200 million tons of coal refuse have been recycled and over 7,000 acres of abandoned coal lands have been remediated since the 1970s.

The Committee report further recognized the economic benefits that these waste coal-fueled facilities provide to the local and state economy by providing high-quality jobs, especially in depressed communities.

Perhaps most importantly in this context, the Committee report included a statement that the “Joint Legislative Conservation Committee supports the recent findings and recommendations of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission that says the environmental benefits provided by the waste coal industry should be factored into any decision concerning the future of these facilities.”

A final recommendation in the Committees report encouraged the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to continue to utilize the ash produced from these facilities to reclaim abandoned mine sites.

Coal Resources

Anthracite is a hard coal containing a high percentage of fixed carbon and a low percentage of volatile matter, such as sulfur and ash. Almost all of the U.S. supply of anthracite coals is located in five Northeastern Pennsylvania counties: Lackawanna, Luzerne, Carbon, Northumberland and Schuylkill. Like many other industries, the anthracite industry has experienced a serious downturn due to the use of other fossil fuels such as natural gas, fuel oil and other coals, such as bituminous and lignite.

In early 1998, the Committee held a series of public hearings to discuss the future of the coal industry, eastern Pennsylvania's anthracite region, and the use of coal in state owned facilities. Mining anthracite coal involves permits, water sampling, bonding, visits from state inspectors and working with the Mine Safety and Health Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor.

In 2005, the Committee held a public hearing to determine why there was a shortage of anthracite coal for heating. Anthracite is unique in that production is relatively consistent – between 2 million tons and 3 million tons per year. Of the anthracite mined, only a small percentage comes from underground; the rest of production is split between refuse coal processing and surface mining. While there are several hundred million tons of anthracite coal in reserves, the culprit was a lack of production due to the number of working anthracite mines steadily dwindling.

Because Pennsylvania's anthracite coal continues to be an important economic and environmental asset, the Committee scheduled a two-day review of the anthracite industry in 2010. On April 6, 2010, the Committee toured four coal-related sites in Schuylkill County. The tour included a planned passive treatment system for AMD, an underground coal mine, a reclamation project and a surface coal mining operation.

The following day, April 7, the Committee traveled to Mahanoy City to hold a public hearing on the future of anthracite coal mining in a competitive and changing energy market. Witnesses discussed current coal and waste use, supply, and demand in Pennsylvania; overall changes in the anthracite industry during the past decade; economic and environmental issues still facing the industry; bonding and reclamation; and the industry-wide impacts of the Federal Mine Safety Act.

More recently, in October 2018, the Committee held a public roundtable discussion in Coaldale, Schuylkill County, at the request of Senator Argall. The discussion centered on the past, present and future of anthracite coal industry in Pennsylvania. During the roundtable, industry officials provided members with information about the growth of anthracite coal, the challenges facing the industry and recommendations for the General Assembly to help support industry.

Coal Ash Moratorium

Coal combustion waste (CCW) – a residual waste left over from the burning of coal or culm in power plants – has the potential for beneficial reuse in the mining environment. Pennsylvania's cogeneration plants produce approximately five million tons of CCW each year. Most of it, 90 percent or more, is used for mine land reclamation projects.

In Pennsylvania, CCW has been used by mine operators to reclaim well over 100 mine sites in the bituminous fields in the western half of the state and in the eastern anthracite coal region.

Opponents questioned the long-term impact of the practice. They feared the materials would boost exposure to dioxin and heavy metals, such as arsenic and mercury. Advocates of CCW reclamation, including DEP, had insisted that placement of CCW into open stripping pits helps correct highly acidic mine water because of CCW's high alkalinity and does not leach high amounts of such toxic metals into area ground water.

On July 9, 2003, the Committee held a public hearing in Tamaqua, Schuylkill County. The hearing was held to discuss a proposed statewide moratorium on the use of coal ash in mine reclamation and was in response to concerns raised by local residents about the safety of coal ash and its possible negative effects on the water table and the environment.

Between 200 and 300 people attended the hearing and the Committee heard testimony from numerous individuals including representatives from DEP, the EPA, and the Army for a Clean Environment, a citizens' group in Tamaqua opposed to the use of coal ash.

The Committee issued a report to the General Assembly in February, 2004 with the following recommendations for consideration:

- The Committee does not recommend or support a statewide moratorium on the use of fly ash in coal mine reclamation projects.
- The Committee recommends continued research into the environmental effects of fly ash on soils and waters of the Commonwealth and the impact posed by trace elements contained in the material.
- As an added measure to the current regulatory program, the Committee recommends that a statewide, third party oversight subcommittee be established within the DEP's Mining Reclamation and Advisory Board or the Citizen's Advisory Council with a specific charge to oversee the state regulatory program.

Since the release of the Committee's report in February, 2004, the National Research Council (NRC) for the National Academy of Sciences, an advisory panel of prominent academics and scholars, met at the request of the U.S. Congress to examine the health, safety and environmental risks of the use of CCW in the reclamation of active and abandoned coal mines. In its 2006 report, *Managing Coal Combustion Residues in Mines*, the NRC concluded that filling mines with the residues of coal combustion is a viable way to dispose of these materials, provided they are placed so as to avoid adverse health and environmental effects.

According to the NRC report, the data indicate that adverse environmental impacts can occur when coal ash containing toxic chemicals has contact with water or when the residues are not properly covered. The report recommends that mine sites be designed so that movement of water through residues is minimized. The report also recommends a more robust program to monitor mine sites where coal residues have been placed.

Marcellus Shale Gas

Between 2008 and 2018, there has been no larger polarizing environmental issue in the Commonwealth than drilling for natural gas in the Marcellus Shale basin. While it has provided

many economic benefits during those years, there were also controversies over its environmental impacts. Development of Marcellus Shale rested largely with Pennsylvania's General Assembly.

Beginning in 2010, the Committee held several events involving Marcellus Shale. For example, on March 10, 2010, the Committee held a special roundtable meeting to learn more about the benefits and costs of natural gas extraction. The boom of natural gas extraction from the Marcellus Shale formation has been a windfall for Pennsylvania in terms of job growth and energy savings. However, concerns were raised on what impact the drilling will have on the state's watersheds, possibly polluting the water used by millions of state residents.

Later that month, the Committee, its chairman and a number of other legislators visited a brine treatment plant in Franklin, Pennsylvania to learn more about treatment of the water from the Marcellus Shale gas drilling sites around Pennsylvania. The plants accept wastewater from oil and gas drilling and other industrial activities. Among major gas-producing states, Pennsylvania was the only one that allowed the bulk of its well brine to be treated and discharged into rivers and streams. Other states required it to be injected into deep underground shafts.

In the fall of 2010, the Committee traveled to Towanda, Bradford County to observe an active natural gas well site to learn more about natural gas extraction and the natural gas industry. The onsite tour revolved around environmental protection practices such as stormwater management, spill prevention efforts and the use of tainted coal mine water to hydraulically fracture gas wells.

On June 2, 2011, the Committee traveled to Allegheny County to hold a public hearing on the economic and potential health impacts from gas drilling operations. Experts from around the state were invited to share their ideas and experiences working in the natural gas industry. Witnesses discussed the economic significance of the development of the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania. Also discussed during the hearing were concerns about the impact on community services posed by hundreds of new workers enlisted by natural gas operators, and what to do about chemical-laced water that drillers pump underground to frack the shale and release natural gas.

The Committee anticipates that the discussion over Marcellus Shale will be an on-going one. The Committee will continue to address the environmental and economic concerns facing the natural gas exploration and drilling in Pennsylvania.

BIODIVERSITY

Wild Resource Conservation Program

Biodiversity is the variety of species and the natural environment in which they occur. It includes all of the native plants and animals in Pennsylvania and the processes that sustain the ecosystem. Threats to biodiversity, which helps maintain healthy ecosystems, arise from a wide range of factors, such as habitat loss, invasive species and pollution.

Pennsylvania's Wild Resource Conservation Program was established in 1982 by legislation that had been introduced by Committee Chair Representative Harry Bittle (R-Franklin). The

mission and the goals of the program are to conduct and support research, conservation and education projects focused on preserving Pennsylvania's nongame wildlife species and native wild plants. The legislation that created the WRCP both prohibits it from receiving any general fund tax revenues and also established the first state income tax check off. Committee members Senator Mary Jo White, Senator Scott Hutchinson, Rep. Bittle and Rep. George were members of the program's board of directors.

The WRCP is relied upon for much of the non-game species research and education work, but it is in constant financial instability. The existing Tax Check-off donations were not generating the necessary funds. In 1990, the Committee began discussions for increasing funds for non-game programs. A number of options were examined including, allowing corporations to check-off part of their state tax refund. Another idea was drivers to donate \$1 when they purchase or renew a driver's license. The Committee issued a monograph recommending the legislature create a WRCP license plate.

In 1992, Act 174 authorized a special Wild Resource Conservation license plate. One year later, in 1993, in partnership with PennDOT, the WRCP issued the state's first specialty license plate featuring the saw-whet owl. Former director, Ralph Abele weighed in on the subject and pushed hard for a license plate that featured a fish. He was disappointed when it didn't. That was followed in 2000 with the river otter license plate, which is still available today.

Since 1982, the program has guided millions of dollars into hundreds of projects, including high-profile work such as reintroduction and recovery programs for bald eagles, osprey, river otters and fishers, and less-noticed efforts such as inventories of aquatic insects and native plants.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

Public Outreach

The Committee's monthly newsletter was first published in December 1977. It contained useful and concise articles on an assortment of environment-related issues. It was in a memo format and consisted of two pages. It was originally distributed only to legislators.

Like the Committee, the newsletter has evolved over the years. Geoff MacLaughlin helped take it from a simple newsletter to a more reader-friendly publication. In 2003, each photo could now be in color and the layout featured a more spread out display as well. In 2015, Mike Nerozzi took over editing the Committee's newsletter. The June 2015 issue debuted a new format – the one with the new masthead and layout which we are all so familiar. The premier online-only issue came out in January 2017. Nerozzi did a wonderful job adapting the newsletter format into an electronic publication. In the winter of 2017, Coleen Engvall joined Nerozzi on the editing team. With the departure of Nerozzi in early 2018, Engvall became the editor of the newsletter.

Over the years, the newsletter expanded its scope to provide more in-depth features, analysis and commentary. The newsletter is now distributed to all 253 members of the General Assembly and to more than 500 other recipients including business and industry, environmental organizations, government agencies, universities and the public. Although the newsletter has

shifted focus and design over the years, it has remained committed to providing relevant – and readable – information so lawmakers are informed on the issues.

REFLECTING ON 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

Tony M. Guerrieri, Director

After 50 years, the Committee holds a unique position in Pennsylvania’s state government. Its staff and its work are almost universally regarded, not only as the standard for accurate and informed environmental policy analysis, but as balanced and nonpartisan. The words, “The Joint Legislative Conservation Committee...” have weighed decisively in many policy debates, both in the State Capitol and in local municipal buildings. In this sense, the agency has fulfilled the vision of the generations of Senators and Representatives who worked, first in 1968, to establish the agency, and later to build a respected legislative research and analysis service.

What is described in this retrospective of 50 years of service cannot reflect the entirety of the Committee’s contribution nor the myriad issues it has analyzed and reviewed since 1968. Nor can a few words truly pay tribute to the devoted staff of the Committee who have helped our legislative members explore new options in responding to the ever-evolving environmental needs of the Commonwealth. I want to express my gratitude both to the Committee’s staff, with whom it has been my great privilege to work, and to our legislative members (both past and present), whose unflinching help, encouragement and insights have led and supported our efforts.

Fifty Years of Service

In recognition of all of the chairmen, legislative members, executive directors and staff that have served the Committee from 1968 to today, thank you for your service.

Chairmen:

Over the years, the Committee has had the good fortune of having eight very talented and distinctly different chairmen:

Rep. William Wilt (1969-1970),
Rep. John Laudadio (1971-1976),
Rep. Russell Letterman (1977-1980),
Rep. Harry Bittle (1981-1982),
Senator William Lincoln (1983-1992),
Senator Raphael Musto (1993-1994),
Senator David Argall (1995-2000) and
Senator Scott Hutchinson (2001 to present).

Legislative Members:

Committee membership is fluid; since 1968, 119 legislators (hailing from all walks of life and the four corners of the Commonwealth) have served as members.

Alloway, Richard	Hawbaker, Elmer	Pratt, Ralph
Ammerman, Joseph	Hershey, Arthur	Quinn, Marguerite
Andrews, Thomas	Hill, Louis	Reibman, Jeanette
Argall, David	Hobbs, Frederick	Rhoades, James
Aument, Ryan	Holl, Edwin	Romanelli, James
Bartolotta, Camera	Hornaman, John	Saccone, Rick
Bastian, Bob	Hutchinson, Amos	Scarnati, Joseph
Belan, Albert	Hutchinson, Scott	Scheetz, Terry
Bennett, Reid	Johnson, Kenyatta	Sesler, William
Bittle, Harry	Kasunic, Richard	Shaffer, Timothy
Bloom, Stephen	Kavulich, Sid Michaels	Showers, John
Boyes, Karl	Kukovich, Allen	Slocum, William
Bradford, Matthew	Kury, Franklin	Smith, Matt
Brightbill, David	Kusse, Robert	Smith, Eugene
Brubaker, Mike	Laudadio, John	Solobay, Timothy
Brunner, John	Lemmond, Charles	Stairs, Jess
Bullock, Donna	Letterman, Russell	Stapleton, Patrick
Coleman, Jeff	Levdansky, David	Stefano, Patrick
Comitta, Carolyn	Lincoln, William	Stroup Stanley
Corman, Jake	Lloyd, James	Tilghman, Richard
Cutler, Bryan	Lynch, Jim	Tomlinson, Robert
Delp, Daniel	Madigan, Roger	Vitali, Greg
DeLuca, Anthony	Martin, Scott	Vogel, Elder
Dinniman, Andrew	Masser, Kurt	Wagner, Chelsa
Dombrowski, Bernard	McCarter, Stephen	Warren, Perry
Dwyer, Budd	Mellow, Robert	Waugh, Mike
Evankovich, Eli	Miller, Ron	Weber, Melissa
Fee, Thomas	Moore, William	Wentling, Parke
Ferlo, Jim	Mowery, Harold	White, Jesse
Fisher, Michael	Murray, Martin	White, Mary Jo
Frame, Richard	Musto, Raphael	Wiley, Sean
George, Camille	Needman, Michael	Wilt, Raymond
Gillette, Helen	O'Connell, Jr. Frank	Wilt, Roy
Gordner, John	Oesterling, Donald	Wilt, William
Greenwood, James	Peterson, John	Wonderling, Robert
Grucela, Richard	Petri, Scott	Wozniak, John
Hager, Henry	Petrone, Thomas	Wright, James
Harhai, Ted	Pippy, John	Yaw, Gene
Harhart, Julie	Platts, Todd	Yudichak, John
Harkins, Patrick	Porterfield, Eugene	

Executive Directors:

James Bashline
Ralph Abele
Peter Duncan
Larry Schweiger
Thomas Beauduy
Barb Reeher
Richard Fox
Craig Brooks
Tony Guerrieri

Committee Staff:

Beverly Yerger
Sarah Quenzer
John Schellenberg
Sharon McDermott
Paul Swartz

Benjamin Moyer
Lynn Mash
Patricia Buckley
Micah Gursky
Geoff MacLaughlin

Jason Gross
Denise Plummer
Mike Nerozzi
Coleen Engvall
Sakura Ung