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Preface

This report presents the proceedings of the Regional Summit: A Region At Risk held November 13, 1996 at the Harrisburg Area Community College.

It includes the statements presented by each of the speakers, subject to the availability of those remarks, the deliberations at each of the Summit's break-out sessions, and the resolutions adopted at the Plenary Session concluding the day. It also is worthy of attention to review the registration list of those attending.

"What does regionalism have to offer" clearly is of great interest in South Central Pennsylvania. A registration of just under 300 (to respect the capacity limit at HACC) was over-subscribed by another 50 percent. Through the efforts of the Susquehanna Conference and under the auspices and the facilities made available at the Franklin and Marshall College, a workshop was held several weeks later to share the Summit's deliberations with that overflow.

The media coverage before, during and after the Summit was and continues to be most generous and reflects that interest and energy.

In various of the counties, under the direct auspices of the county government or municipalities in the respective county, individual Summits have been and are being convened. The deliberations characterize a "work in progress."

Consistent with one of the Action Resolutions adopted at the November 13 Summit, the South Central Assembly for Effective Governance has been established. Its address is c/o the Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg, the Institute of State and Regional Affairs, Middletown, PA 17057; telephone (717) 948-6178. Information about participating in Assembly activities can be directed to the Institute office.

In the meantime, mark your calendar: Regional Summit II of A Region At Risk is scheduled for March 10, 1998 at Gettysburg College.
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Section I:
Introductory Statement

South Central Pennsylvania
A Region at Risk

South Central Pennsylvania--Adams, Cumberland, Dauphin, Franklin, Lancaster, Lebanon, Perry and York Counties; the cities of Harrisburg, Lancaster, Lebanon, and York; the boroughs of Carlisle, Chambersburg, Gettysburg, Hanover, New Bloomfield, and Shippensburg; and townships large and small, urban and rural, too numerous to list--all makeup the region that is at risk. That region (Region 6) delineated by the Pennsylvania State Planning Board thirty years ago (1966) on the basis of a two-year regional reconnaissance study of the Commonwealth, was the subject of a Regional Summit on Wednesday, November 13, 1996, at the Harrisburg Area Community Conference Center.

Much has been said, much has been written, but even more has been experienced over that thirty year period that brings forward the characterization: A Region at Risk.

Strong views are held about its places having a quality of life that brings people, investment, development and a social, cultural and economic vitality to South Central Pennsylvania that has been and is most attractive. But it also is eroding.

A long-time elected public official who has served in the state legislature, county government and currently holds the Office of Mayor of the City of Harrisburg said several years ago: "Unless we do something about those factors that diminish what we value so highly in this region, those qualities will be gone not long after the start of the next century."

Attempts to undergird the strengths and minimize, if not erase, any negatives have largely been confined to selective individual municipal endeavors with some multi-municipal and multi-county public and private arrangements. A multi-county Capital Region Planning and Economic Development Commission, established to address the results of Hurricane Agnes in 1972, failed to survive that decade. Uneasiness among its members and an inability to communicate the opportunity that was presented to share a common agenda saw its demise. The Chairman of the Cumberland County Board of Commissioners has observed: "we must explore the possibilities."

- The years have seen a sense of well-being continue but is viewed as less certain.
- What people value in terms of home, work, education, health, and recreation are there but are increasingly viewed as less certain.
- The facilities and services that make for a well-rounded and satisfying community life are less often there and when provided are available at something other than the most cost-effective way.
- Equity issues have come about out of that experience which sees a
concentration of locally undesired land uses (LULU) on the one hand and/or desired community attributes made available on the other hand in a mutually exclusive way and lacking a regional recognition, understanding, or measure of support.

It is this increasing sense of A Region at Risk that brought a number of organizations, public and private, and individuals together in convening a Regional Summit, November 13, 1996.

That Regional Summit featured:

- An overview plenary session which commented in a highlighted way on what makes up the South Central Region of Pennsylvania;
- Why it has a special meaning and opportunity as a place to be, to live and to prosper; and
- How state and local government and the private sector and their interaction have a central role in the definition of that meaning and opportunity.

That session set the stage for presentations and discussions that followed and that focused on:

Transportation
- The importance of transportation in the South Central Region;
- The fact that the issues rarely can be resolved by actions of the individual municipality;
- The interaction between home and work and life’s daily activities and the relative ease or difficulty in light of available transportation;
- The linkage between cultural and historic preservation, economic development, land use and growth management; and
- The provision and timing of transportation facilities and services and improvements.

Attention was directed to the place of road, rail and air transportation in community and economic development mindful of the admonition: if you build it, they will come.

Land Use and Growth Management
Its growing recognition is seen in a variety of endeavors including:

- County Comprehensive Plans adopted in Adams, Cumberland, Dauphin, Lancaster and York counties in recent years;
- City Comprehensive Plans adopted in Lancaster and being updated in Harrisburg; and
- Local visioning experiences accomplished in the Chambersburg Forward Vision and Hanover 2000, respectively.

All of the foregoing look to a regional interaction of some measure in their close-in multi-
municipal surrounding but with a wide-ranging understanding and experience about what it takes to get there, how to go about doing it, and what happens in light of its determinations. An information clearing house would be a stroke of genius here and could provide a documented referencing close to home about how to get something done. From the Summit’s deliberations, region-wide leadership might follow; multi-municipal arrangements as well as meaningful individual municipal actions could emerge from a more mutual-understanding and less threatening configuration of development.

**Economic Development**
- Further the understanding of the dynamics of economic development;
- Recognize that there is something other than an adversarial relationship between economic development and community development; and
- Note that economic development on a regional basis minimizes the equity issues that otherwise come about in that there is a sharing of costs and benefits.

**Infrastructure**
- The eternal struggle of "catching up" and "keeping up" in the provision of municipal services;
- Keying requisite facilities and services to community development and needs with an understanding of the planning and management of change;
- Looking for the most cost-effective ways for providing what should be provided in a timely fashion; and
- Taking human services into account in dealing with the shape, substance and functioning of the community.

**Finance and Cost**
- Government as an entrepreneur;
- How to pay for what is demanded of government including its equitable sharing among users; and
- Overcoming the fragmentation of local government in the provision of facilities and services that leap municipal boundary lines but deal with common needs and issues.

Those plenary sessions were given further accent and color from a national perspective in the remarks of John DeGrove, Director, Joint Center for Environment & Urban Problems, Florida Atlantic University/Florida International University.

Break-out sessions that examined particulars as might apply to each of the foregoing presentations and discussions followed and were directed to achieving a resulting consensus and Action Agenda, presented in Sections III of these Proceedings.

As the new millenium approaches, this eight county area of South Central Pennsylvania is a region at risk. Despite its many strengths, its vulnerabilities warrant attention.

Metropolitan regions will become the dominant economic, social and environmental actors of the next century. More than ever, the economies, societies, and environments of all the communities in this multi-county region are intertwined.
The Regional Summit held November 13, 1996, as the reader of these proceedings will determine, provided and energy and sense of public purpose that has brought the South Central Assembly for Effective Governance into place. Its charge and Board of Directors, presented in Section VI of these proceedings, implement the resolutions adopted at the Regional Summit and provide the organizational focus for the continuity of attention essential to addressing the agenda that has been set forth.

Irving Hand
Up-dated September 28, 1997
Regional Summit Steering Committee

Honorable Nancy Besch
Cumberland County Commissioner
Carlisle Court House
Carlisle, Pa 17013
(717) 240-6150  240-6448 (Fax)

Mr. Michael Brenner, President
Brenner Motors
P.O. Box 1955
Harrisburg, PA 17105
(717) 232-4271

Mr. Robert Edwards
Executive Vice President
PA State Association of Boroughs
2941 North Front Street
Harrisburg, PA 17110
(717) 236-9526  236-8164 (Fax)

Honorable Betty Eiceman
Mayor
The City of Lebanon
City Hall, 400 South 8th Street
Lebanon, PA 17042
(717) 273-6711

Honorable G. Warren Elliott
Chairman
Franklin County Board of Commissioners
Chambersburg, PA 17201
(717) 261-3810  267-3438 (Fax)

Ms. Barbara Groce, President
Capital Region Chamber of Commerce
114 Walnut Street, P.O. Box 969
Harrisburg, PA 17101
(717) 232-4121  232-4364 (Fax)

Honorable Frank Haas, Jr.
Esquire; President
Harrisburg School Board
McNees, Wallace & Nurick
100 Pine Street, P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108
(717) 237-5318  237-5300 (Fax)

Mr. Irving Hand, Professor Emeritus
Penn State Harrisburg
Capitol Campus
Middletown, PA 17057
(717) 948-6178

Mr. William A. Hawkins, Chair
Harrisburg Area Transportation Study
240 North 3rd Street - Suite 900
Harrisburg, PA 17101
(717) 238-2970

Honorable Terry Kauffman, Chair
Lancaster County Board of Commissioners
50 North Duke Street, P.O. Box 83480
Lancaster, PA 17608
(717) 299-8302

Honorable Mark K. Keller, Chair
Perry County Commissioners
Veterans Memorial Building, P.O. Box 37
New Bloomfield, PA 17068
(717)582-8984 Ext. 10  582-7069 (Fax)

Mr. George H. Klaus, Jr. Director
Education and Technical Services
PA State Association of Boroughs
2941 North Front Street
Harrisburg, PA 17110
(717) 236-9526  236-8164 (Fax)
Honorable Sally Klein  
Dauphin County Commissioner  
Dauphin County Courthouse  
Front and Market Streets, P.O. Box 1295  
Harrisburg, PA 17108  
(717) 255-2740  257-1604 (Fax)

Honorable Francis Linn  
The Mayor  
The Borough of Gettysburg  
Borough Hall, 59 E. High Street  
Gettysburg, PA 17325  
(717) 334-1160  334-7258 (Fax)

Mr. Peter Loedding, President  
CREDC  
214 Senate Avenue  
Camp Hill, PA 17011  
(717) 761-2000  761-4561 (Fax)

Mr. Walter Lyon  
Susquehanna Conference  
20 Clifton Road  
Camp Hill, PA 17011  
(717) 761-5518  761-1514 (Fax)

Mr. Joseph McCarthy, President  
Susquehanna Conference  
237 North Middlesex Road  
Carlisle, PA 17013  
(717) 243-0621

Honorable Robert Minnich, President  
York Board of Commissioners  
1 West Marketway, 4th Floor  
York, PA 17401  
(717) 771-9303  771-9804 (Fax)

Honorable Robert P. Morris  
The Mayor  
The Borough of Chambersburg, Borough Hall  
100 South Second Street  
Chambersburg, PA 17201  
(717) 264-5151

Honorable Harold F. Mowery, Jr; Member  
Senate of Pennsylvania  
P.O. Box 31  
Main Capitol Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
(717) 255-8524

Honorable Anthony Petrucci  
Honorable County Commissioner  
Dauphin County Courthouse  
Front and Market Streets, P.O. Box 1295  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
(717) 255-2741  257-1604 (Fax)

Honorable Stephen R. Reed  
The Mayor  
The City of Harrisburg  
202 City Government Center  
10 North 2nd Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1678  
(717) 255-3040  255-3036 (Fax)

Honorable Herbert Robb  
The Mayor  
The Borough of New Bloomfield  
P.O. Box 35  
New Bloomfield, Pa 17068  
(717) 585-4756

Honorable Charles Robertson  
The Mayor  
The City of York  
50 W. King Street  
York, PA 17405  
(717) 849-2221  849-2345 (Fax)

Mr. David Shankweiler, Publisher  
Central Penn Business Journal  
409 South Second Street  
Suite 3-D  
Harrisburg, PA 17104  
(717) 236-4300
David Smith, President
David A. Smith Printing, Inc.
742 South 22nd Street
Harrisburg, PA 17104
(717) 234-3133 234-3583 (Fax)

Honorable Harry Stokes, Chair
Adams County Board of Commissioners
111-117 Baltimore Street
Gettysburg, PA 17325
(717) 334-6781 334-2091 (Fax)

Honorable Janice Stork
The Mayor
The City of Lancaster
P.O. Box 1599
Lancaster, PA 17602
(717) 291-4722

Honorable P. Michael Sturla, Member
House of Representatives
P.O. Box 202020
Main Capitol Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120-2020
(717) 787-3555 787-0861 (Fax)

Honorable Rose Marie Swanger, Chair
Lebanon County Board of Commissioners
Room 297, Municipal Building
400 South Eighth Street
Lebanon, Pa 17042
(717) 274-2801 Ext. 2202
274-8094 (Fax)

Honorable Kirk Wilson
The Mayor
The Borough of Carlisle
Borough Hall
53 West South Street
Carlisle, PA 17013
(717) 249-4422
Regional Summit Agenda

A Region at Risk
Regional Summit I
November 13, 1996

8:30- 9:00 a.m.  Registration
Coffee and Refreshments - Lobby, 1st floor

9:00- 9:45 a.m.  Welcoming Remarks - Pine Suite, 1st floor
- Tom Ridge, Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
- Stephen R. Reed, Mayor, City of Harrisburg
- Nancy Besch, Chair, Cumberland County Board of Commissioners
- Dr. John Bruhn, Provost and Dean, Penn State Harrisburg
- Dr. Mary Fifiield, President, Harrisburg Area Community College
- Professor Irving Hand, Penn State Harrisburg

9:45-10:15 a.m.  Overview of South Central Pennsylvania Region - Pine Suite
- Francis Haas, Jr., Esquire
McNees, Wallace & Nurick

10:15-10:30 a.m.  Break
Coffee and Refreshments - Lobby, 1st floor

10:30-10:55 a.m.  Transportation - Pine Suite
- Terry Kauffman, Chairman
Lancaster County Board of Commissioners

10:55-11:20 a.m.  Community and Economic Development - Pine Suite
- Robert G. Benko, Executive Deputy Secretary
Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development

11:20-11:45 a.m.  Land use and Growth Management - Pine Suite
- Reed J. Dunn, Jr., Executive Director
York County Planning Commission

11:45-12:10 p.m.  Municipal Infrastructure and Services - Pine Suite
- G. Warren Haggerty, Jr.
Hamilton Partners, and former Mayor of Reading

12:10-12:30 p.m.  Finance and Local Government - Pine Suite
- Stephen R. Reed, Mayor
City of Harrisburg

12:30- 1:05 p.m.  Lunch - Birch Suite and Aspen Lounge
1:05- 1:15 p.m.  Mark Schweiker, Lt. Governor  Commonwealth of PA

1:15- 1:45 p.m.  Keynote Speaker - *Birch Suite, 2nd floor*  - John DeGrove, Director, Joint Center for Environment and Urban Problems, Florida Atlantic University/Florida International University

2:00- 3:30 p.m.  Break-Out Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Suite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community &amp; Ec Dev</td>
<td>Gold Star</td>
<td>Lodgepole Pine Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community &amp; Ec Dev</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Lodgepole Pine Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community &amp; Ec Dev</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Lodgepole Pine Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Pumpkin</td>
<td>Willow Oak Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Chestnut Oak Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Hot Pink</td>
<td>Oriental Spruce Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Dark Blue</td>
<td>Room 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Struct Reg Com &amp; Act</td>
<td>Hot Orange</td>
<td>Red Maple Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Study Commission</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>Silver Maple Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Silver Star</td>
<td>Hall of Tech, Rm 126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3:40- 4:30 p.m.  Plenary Session - *Pine Suite*

- Report from Break-Out Sessions
- Discussion and Action Agenda
- Closing Remarks
Professor Irving Hand, Chairman, Harrisburg Business Development Executive Council
Executive Summary
(Drawn from Articles in the Harrisburg Patriot-News)

REGIONAL SUMMIT: Starting Point for Dialogue; Mid-State leaders gather to discuss problems, solutions

by John Luciew
November 14, 1996

The most telling item to come out of yesterday’s eight county Region At Risk Summit was the fact that there are more municipalities in the region - 318 - than there were conference attendees, who numbered 260.

All day long, the government, academic and business leaders stared at graphs, charts and slides, and listened to speeches - all bemoaning the redundancy, ineffectiveness and inefficiency of such and outdated, fractured and duplicitous system.

They joked about the sheer number of government entities. They scoffed at the costs. They shook their heads at what they seemed to agree was the absurdity of trying to compete in a global economy while remaining divided by arbitrary boundaries.

"The world has changed radically in the last century," said program co-organizer Francis B. Haas Jr. "Only our local government structure hasn’t changed significantly in 100 years."

Yet, during the entire eight-hour session, no municipality leader offered to erase his or her community’s borders from the heavily lined regional map.

Of course, no one expected such a thing to happen. Something so monumental could take years.

But, at least now there’s hope that some of the boundaries that divide Adams, Cumberland, Dauphin, Franklin, Lancaster, Lebanon, Perry and York counties eventually will come down, said some conference attendees.

Or at least, maybe there will be more cooperation beyond township, borough and even county limits.

"I absolutely believe in the 21st century we’re going to have fewer municipalities," said Lancaster County Commission Chairman Terry L. Kauffman. "Some will be forced to merge. Others will be voluntary. But it’s going to happen."

Dauphin County has already set up a grant program hoping to encourage some of its 60 municipalities to look into merging. In a recent meeting with township supervisors, Kauffman bluntly told them "Some of us probably shouldn’t be here next year."

Spearheading such change takes a measure of courage, he said.
"You've got to have an attitude to cross the boundaries," said Kauffman. "You've got to be willing to stand up and say 'We've got to do this.'"

In the end, it might just come down to financial and political pressure.

Yesterday, the government leaders were told to "cooperate or die." They were shown how the population is growing and the farm land is shrinking. How every time 1,000 more people come in, another 11,000 acres of land is cut up and divided for homes, shops and highways.

"The Neanderthals of the townships are getting an eye-opener here," said Dauphin County Commissioner Anthony M. Petrucci. "Being parochial is not where it's at. The economic pressures and the fiscal stresses are going to override those sentiments."

Among the accomplishments yesterday, the group agreed to call for a study commission to lay bare the facts of how much money, time and resources regionalization could save.

Whatever happens, officials said the summit will be remembered as a good first step.

"I think this will mobilize attention on the need to do something," said Donald R. McCallin, Hampden Twp. Commissioner. "Somebody is going to have to give for the good of the whole. But it's going to be difficult to do."

"I see this opening a dialogue," added George A. Tjiattas, planning commission chairman from Dillsburg. "Nothing begins without a beginning."
REGIONAL SUMMIT: Neighbors Seek Solutions; Ridge: Courage Needed to Protect Region’s Land

by Garry Lenton
November 14, 1996

The courage to do away with traditional boundaries and challenge traditional approaches will be needed to save a "Region At Risk," Gov. Tom Ridge told 260 public officials and business leaders from eight midstate counties yesterday.

Ridge pledged to help local communities establish programs to slow the spread of sprawl development that is destroying more than 24,000 acres of farmland a year in Adams, Cumberland, Dauphin, Franklin, Lancaster, Lebanon, Perry and York counties.

Since 1950, the state has lost farmland equal to the states of Connecticut and Rhode Island.

"The environmental debate of the next century will be about how we use our land," said Ridge, speaking to the "Region At Risk" conference at Harrisburg Area Community College.

Concern over the region’s failure to cope with uncoordinated, sprawl development attracted community leaders, developers and educators. Organizers turned away 200 other people for lack of room. A second conference is scheduled for Dec. 9 at Franklin & Marshall College in Lancaster.

Participants closed the conference by voting on a series of resolutions, including one asking the Legislature to create a study commission a cost of about $1 million.

The South Central Pennsylvania Government Study Commission would be charged with examining how government works and how effective it is at delivering vital services such as police and transportation.

The general notion yesterday was that Pennsylvania’s fractured local government system is not very efficient.

Conference leaders, including Ridge, said the vast number of municipal government bodies, including school districts and local authorities, makes it harder for the state to compete for new industry and jobs.

They also cost taxpayers money by resulting in wide-spread duplication of services.

Within a 10-mile radius of Harrisburg’s Market Square, there are 22 police chiefs making an estimated $880,000 a year and serving 225,000 people. By comparison, New York City’s police commissioner is paid $133,000 to govern a force of 38,000 and a population of an estimated 7 million.

Transportation is another problem that must be approached regionally. Mass transportation
must be coupled with compatible land uses planning to ensure that people will use it, said
Francis Haas, president of the Harrisburg School Board and a member of the conference
steering committee.

"We have to learn to go outside our normal boundaries," said Terry Kauffman, a Lancaster
County commissioner. "We have to take some risks."

Those risks, Kauffman said, may mean supporting the merger of municipalities or police
departments or other services. Ridge cited the possible merger of West Fairview borough
and East Pennsboro Twp. as a possible sign of things to come.

"It's going to take courage to challenge the traditional approach to traditional problems,"
Ridge said. "Change is necessary."

Just how difficult the process will be became clear when delegates tried to vote on the
conference's resolutions. Kauffman led a minority contingent that opposed involving the
legislature and spending $1 million on a study commission.

Kauffman argued that the steering committee should smooth the way by local level first.
His amended resolution did not draw enough support to pass, however.

The next step in the process, Harrisburg Stephen R. Reed said, is the formation of the
regional study commission. After that, he said, the commission should consider creating
government bodies to establish consistent land-use standards; a regional asset district where
revenues for specific purposes, such as transportation, are shared among several
municipalities; and encourage the consolidation of duplicated costs, such as police and fire
services.

"Clearly, we can do better than having 318 municipalities" Reed said. "If the taxpayers knew
how much extra money is spent of duplication...there would be a revolt."
REGIONAL SUMMIT: TOPICWATCH: A regional approach to land use

by Mike Feeley
November 14, 1997

The 260 community leaders who attended the South Central Pennsylvania Summit: "A Region At Risk" were divided into groups to discuss common problems faced by governing bodies in the eight-county region.

Those panelists were then asked to list those concerns - and, if possible, any solutions - for review by the entire audience. Following are highlights of those discussions:

Finance
Panelists felt problems with municipal financing include the need for tax reform, unfunded federal and state mandates, the lack of regional sales tax and the need to expand the tax bases.

Among the suggestions include eliminating nuisance taxes and reducing real estate taxes while reevaluating the need for a local income tax. Also, they called for abolishing unfunded mandates while reviewing or eliminating tax-exempt status for certain organizations.

Land Use
The loss of prime farmland and open space, the decline of community with the onset of suburban sprawl and the absence of state-level land-use planning leadership were the problems identified.

They suggested more money be spent in land preservation programs while selecting designated areas in counties for growth. They also suggested "high-density" areas for residential growth as well as calling for state leadership in land-use planning.

Transportation
The panel identified the lack of funding, the need improve existing transportation systems, a greater mass transit presence in the region among the greatest transportation concerns. No immediate solutions were offered.

Community and Economic Development
Among the myriad of problems facing development in the region, as listed by panelists, included the cost of doing business in the region, the lack of regional land use, the lack of government cooperation, inadequate public transportation, growing crime and fragmented, outdated local units of government.

They suggested focus groups and town meetings to seek input from citizens and make them aware of problems caused by the issues addressed. Also, they asked that municipalities look at issues such as regional police and encouraged a greater presence from local legislators.
Municipal Service
They said the lack of public support for regionalization of services such as police departments, stagnating tax basis, the lack of long-range planning and inadequate transportation systems were among the chief concerns.

They suggested informing the public of the costs of "fragmented" public services and said incentives should be given to communities or counties that participate in regional cooperation efforts.

Land use summit quotes

"Every day we compete in a global economy, where geographic borders have become undeniably artificial. Yet, despite the possibilities of the information age, we tend to limit ourselves to living and thinking within outdated boundaries, just because somebody said: "It's always been done that way"."
- Gov. Tom Ridge

"If the general public was aware of the cost of doing business in the present climate, there might be more of a movement to action. Perhaps, even a tax-payer revolt."
- Nancy Besch, Cumberland County Commissioner chair

"The Neanderthals of the townships are getting an eye-opener here. Being parochial is not where it's at. The economic pressures and the fiscal stresses are going to override those sentiments."
- Anthony M. Petrucci, Dauphin County commissioner

"It's not something we want to force on anyone. It has to happen naturally. The financial end will force it to happen...The dollars will be the driving force."
- JoEllen Litz, Lebanon County commissioner

"The world has changed radically in the last century. Only our local government structure hasn't changed significantly in this hundred years...Even criminal activity and organization have been regionalized, nationalized, even internationalized."
- Frank Haas, a Harrisburg attorney and summit planner

"Clearly, we can do better than having 318 municipalities. If the taxpayers know how much extra money is spent on duplication...there would be a revolt."
- Harrisburg Mayor Stephen R. Reed

"I think this will mobilize attention on the need to do something. Somebody is going to have to give for the good of the whole. But it's going to be difficult to do."
- Donald McCallin, Hampden Twp. commissioner

"I absolutely believe in the 21st century we're going to have fewer municipalities. Some will be forced to merge. Others will be voluntary. But it's going to happen."
- Terry L. Kauffman, Lancaster County commissioner
REGIONAL SUMMIT: Just the First Step; Now, leaders begin Journey to solve problems together.

by Mike Feeley and John Luciew; Staff writer Garry Lenton contributed to this report. November 7, 1996

Leaders from the eight-county region talked of common problems brought on by unchecked development and disjointed leadership.

Now, they begin the much harder task of seeking common solutions together.

While it was lauded by more than one attendee as a "historic occasion," last Wednesday's summit of 260 leaders from Adams, Cumberland, Dauphin Franklin, Lancaster, Lebanon, Perry and York counties at Harrisburg Area Community College is really just the beginning.

Whether any constructive progress comes of it remains to be seen.

Concerns over the region's failure to cope with uncoordinated development and the high price that failure is exacting on the midstate is what drew people together. Leaders such as Mayor Stephen R. Reed and Cumberland County Commissioner Nancy Besch sounded the alarm of a "taxpayer revolt" at the cost of municipal, school and county governments.

Planners of the event say the job now is to keep leaders focused and maintain momentum of the summit in order to mount a regionalized attack on the problems.

A 31-member steering committee - made up of representatives from the eight counties - will meet Dec. 12 to discuss plans to push the agenda. And a second conference has been scheduled for Dec. 9 at Franklin & Marshall College in Lancaster.

Development is destroying more than 24,000 acres of farmland a year in the eight-county region. Planners agree it will take more than meetings to tackle the problems brought on by such sprawl.

"It takes political leadership. It takes vision. It takes courage. It takes the facts," said Frank Haas, a Harrisburg attorney who helped coordinate the event. "It takes convincing the public that there's a need to be met. It takes all of these things all going forward at the same time."

Participants closed Wednesday's conference by voting on a series of resolutions, including a much-debated one that asks the Legislature to create a commission to study how government here works and could be improved.

The study commission would cost about $1 million - half paid by the state, half by communities in the region. If it flies.

Lancaster County Commissioner Terry L. Kauffman was one who opposed the idea. He
preferred to start with a grass roots outreach program to get citizens and municipalities on board instead of the typical ivory tower approach used by government. That's just one example of the disagreements that could threaten regionalization every step of the way.

Dauphin County Commissioner Anthony M. Petrucci was another who left the conference disappointed.

He said regional leaders missed a golden opportunity to launch real change in the way government does business. And he's not excited about another study commission.

"Just doing a study is less than what most people would like to have happen," said Petrucci. "I think the summit turned out too timid."

So Petrucci quietly advanced his own plan during the conference that would, instead, ask the Legislature to create a regional asset district for the eight-county area, a new regional government structure similar to the one approved for Allegheny County.

"The Legislature has done this kind of thing already, so we would be able to tap into that experience," he said.

A new regional governing authority, which would be made up of county and municipal officials, could be at the center of efforts to take over Harrisburg International and Capital City airports and spearhead projects like light-rail service, Petrucci said.

The regional asset district bill also would give the option to levy sales or income taxes and, perhaps, reduce the reliance on property taxes, he said.

One of the most encouraging things to come out of the so-called "Region At Risk" conference was Gov. Tom Ridge's pledge of support, said Irving Hand, professor of urban planning at Penn State Harrisburg and former executive director of the state planning board.

Ridge said his administration would stand behind a regional effort to combat sprawl. He called on local officials to muster the courage to find new ways to overcome traditional problems, saying their success could be a model for the rest of the state.

While Ridge attended, there were noticeably few state legislators at the conference, throwing a question on how the summit's main goal - the state-sanctioned commission - will be received when it comes up for a vote before the Legislature.

Another challenge will be convincing the region's 318 municipalities to share their power, even consolidate.

"I suspect some [officials] are uneasy," Hand said. "Change causes anxiety. That's not to be unexpected."
Section II
Statements:
Remarks by Governor Tom Ridge
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Thank you and congratulations on opening the doors to this collaborative effort. This regional summit is an important step forward in your effort to address central Pennsylvania's challenges. For while you have entitled this summit A Region at Risk, I believe that by working together, South Central Pennsylvania will become a tremendous "Region of Opportunity."

You have already taken the first step. Just look around this room--hundreds of individuals ready to work--ready to meet the 21st century in your communities by exploring the potential of regional cooperation.

I believe that one thing has brought you together today: globalization. No city, no town, and no municipality can aspire individually to be part of a world economy anymore. We live--we all live--in a world economy, a world economy that is mobile. The day of living and working in the same municipality, or in the same county, is no longer a necessity. Nor, in many instances, is it a reality. As that dynamic has changed, so too has the fact that the success of our jobs, our economy, and even our government programs depends upon the make-up of an entire region.

It is a fact. Every day, we compete in a global economy, where geographic borders have become undeniably artificial. Yet, despite the possibilities of the information age, we tend to limit ourselves to living and thinking within out-dated boundaries, just because somebody said: "It has always been done that way."

Consider for a moment some of the issues you will discuss at this conference: issues of land use and economic development; crime and environmental protection; education; and quality of life. These challenges weave a common thread throughout our state. Yet, while the solutions, from region to region, are not always spun from the same spool of yarn, they are not isolated by boundaries real or imagined.

The issues you will focus on today already rely on a variety of partnerships that are all interrelated. They are issues in which all Pennsylvanians are stakeholders. Some of these issues are driven largely at the state level, some at the local level.

I know you will have a lively discussion today on land use planning. Keep in mind that in Pennsylvania, land use planning is largely directed at the local level. But that should not prevent neighboring municipalities from considering the regional impact of their planning codes. Each municipality is part of the regional economy. And what happens in that regional economy has a fiscal impact on the municipalities and counties. It can also have an impact on your demand for services.

Remember, the strength of the whole is only as strong as the sum of its parts.
happens in Harrisburg does have an impact on Lancaster, York, Carlisle, and Lebanon. If a new manufacturing plant moves to Lancaster, it will employ people who will live in all of the surrounding counties. That company's location decision will have an impact on land use. Will they use pristine and precious farmlands or will they choose an old industrial site for reuse? Moving goods to and from market and moving people to and from that place of work will have an effect on traffic flow and congestion between counties, towns, and municipalities. And as that plant succeeds, as well as others like it, more and more people are attracted to the tremendous quality of life found in your region. But of course, the more people who live there, the more government services you will be expected to provide.

In the dynamic nature of today's world, we are all connected. Over the last 40 years, the playing field has changed. Regional cooperation just makes sense. Municipalities working together can increase efficiency and effectiveness. Working together pools resources that you might otherwise not have when local governments go at it alone.

Pennsylvania has the second largest number of governments in the nation. If you add all the municipal authorities and school districts in, we boost our rank to number one. And you all know, first hand, the challenges that presents at times in making government perform at its best for all the people it serves.

Competition is tougher. The demand for services is greater. Funding sources are limited.

That is why so many regions have broken down the walls of artificial political and geographic boundaries. Whether you are talking about emergency services, like fire, police and ambulance or parks and recreation; school districts; code enforcement; or economic development, many local governments have found that the need to work together has never been greater. That is why we see municipalities in the Lehigh Valley, southwest, northeast, southeast, and northwest all involved in intergovernmental cooperation. What are they finding? Collaborative efforts build strength they need to stand tall in the arena of global competition.

I am very pleased to see that South Central Pennsylvania has also begun to address its challenges and opportunities from that larger perspective.

Your state legislative caucus is an important player in this process. Your county commissioners meet on a regional basis to discuss county issues. I understand that the municipal officials are meeting county by county, or in some cases, as a region. And there are several regional organizations represented here today, such as community action agencies, economic development agencies and other interests. That's a great start, a start that recognizes a more regional approach is practical and makes good business sense.

Think about it. There is more available talent. More available resources. Services can be provided in a more efficient and effective manner. And that means more benefits—more stability—for the entire region. It just makes sense to seek partnerships with each other, just
as you partner with the Commonwealth.

In that regard, I am here to tell you, the Commonwealth is willing to partner with you today in your efforts. A successful regional will take commitment and investment on both of our parts. It is through the looking glass of partnership that my administration has sought to revolutionize the way state government operates and interacts with all of its constituents—from individual citizens to local governments. If we are going to compete, if we are going to compete and win, we must ensure that government programs and those they are meant for are well-connected.

That is why we combined the departments of Community Affairs and Commerce into one streamlined agency. Just as this regional forum hopes to identify and better link your vital resources for the betterment of your communities, the new Department of Community and Economic Development (DECD) recognizes that the resources involved with community development and economic development have a common goal and must be developed together.

Why? Because community development and economic development do go hand in hand. Jobs for Pennsylvanians and better communities for Pennsylvanians means a higher quality of life for Pennsylvanians. Now, we have a state agency that concentrates, not on being an agency, but provides a cohesive and integrated delivery of services. With the Center for Local Government Services, your eight county region has a new resource to build a regional partnership between state and local governments. The Center will help advance the idea of regional cooperation. In fact, I understand that two municipalities in this region—West Fairview Borough and East Pennsboro Township in Cumberland County—have already contacted the center for assistance as they begin discussions on possible consolidation.

The Center and the rest of the Department is a resource that is better linked, better equipped, and better able to help you build strong communities, communities with economic strength, a good physical infrastructure, and a solid social foundation.

In fact, through the Center for Local Government Services, there are services and technical assistance ready to help advance the idea of intergovernmental cooperation. Funding is available as well, without legislation, through the Shared Municipal Services Program. Within the rest of DCED, there are planning grants and project grants where intergovernmental cooperation and regional prioritization enhances the competitiveness of applications.

You will also find a competitive partner at the Department of Environmental Protection. It is a totally different agency than the one we had two years ago. It's mission has been better focused. We have adjusted the attitude. Our dedication to the protection and preservation of the environment has not changed. But we have eliminated the job-crushing, community harassing, regulatory nightmare of the past. Now, environmental policies and regulations are carried out in a user-friendly manner that reaches out to your communities—that treats you like partners—that includes you and empowers you in making environmental decisions.
We have done that with more money for soil conservation districts so that we can think about watersheds, county-wide. We have done it with a state-wide geographic information system so that we can better share information with one another. And we have done that with Pennsylvania’s new industrial site reuse program.

With it, we’ve given the tools to local communities to make smart choices about land use decisions. Nobody wants to see farmlands and green fields given up to suburban sprawl or industrial development. Not when there is land that has already been developed, land that stands empty and vacant, and land that already has the benefits of location and infrastructure that can be used again.

I am proud of the fact that state government is now able to work with local communities to clean up these sites and make them usable again. Since May 1995, 130 sites have participated in this program. And we have completed cleanups at 35 of those sites. Clean ups that put abandoned sites back into productive use. Clean ups that allow existing businesses to continue operations. Clean ups that now, for the first time in years, give hope to "land-locked" cities with potential industrial sites to show employers seeking to locate here or expand. And that is important, for the environmental debate of the next century will not be about regulatory requirements, but how we use the land.

It is important that we work as partners if we are to put Pennsylvania on the road toward an entire commonwealth filled with opportunity.

For any region of our state, that opportunity begins with jobs. But we need rich soil and plenty of nutrients if we are going to retain and create the jobs we want to see grow. That is why I cut taxes by over $500 million. That is why I pursued the legislature to reduce your costs and the costs of our employers with workers’ compensation reform. That is why every day we work to reduce the burden of what I call "the other tax," regulation.

Welfare reform. Education reforms. Crime control. Your legislative delegation and I worked hard to tackled all of these issues so that the state could be a better partner. Your partner in pursuit of the highest quality of life—the best jobs—and the most competitive, job-friendly player in an economy that reaches around the world.

South Central Pennsylvania is a player in that market place. And as you continue to foster the idea of regional cooperation, your pooled resources and the identification of best practices can only mean that your place on the world stage, and the security it brings home, will grow.

All the components are right here. Access to markets—easy access by plane, train, and automobile. World-class workers make world-class products. And booming hospitality and tourism industry guarantees a constant flow of visitors to this part of the state.

None of these issues are separate or distinct. Each plays a critical part of a delicately balanced equation. They are ready to be nurtured and enhanced by the other. They have
the ability to draw upon the others’ strengths. And when they do, when South Central Pennsylvania commits itself to cut the path toward cooperation and growth, the opportunities you seek will be achieved. That makes it sound pretty easy. But anytime you embark upon something so new, it is going to take the courage to challenge the traditional approaches to traditional problems.

Change is not easy. Change never is. But sometimes, change is necessary. And that is why you are here today: to challenge the process; to explore alternatives; and to seek ways to do things better. You have committed to look at yourself as others view you, as a region of Pennsylvania, not as individual counties and municipalities, but as a region. I know that is not easy. I know that there are appropriate heartstrings attached to local identities. But think about the power of matching those identities up with one another. It is like a good marriage. Each individual remains who they are, but are strengthened by what, together, they become.

In that effort, the Commonwealth will be your partner, your counselor, and your friend. Regional cooperation begins with intergovernmental communication. State government does not have all the answers. Those are for you to decide. But state government will be an ally who shares your vision for a quality of life that is second to none for the people of this region.

So as you meet today, use your time wisely today. Identify your strengths, your weakness, your opportunities, and your threats. Take time to develop your regional strategies, identify your priorities. Reach for opportunities, envision the future, foster collaboration, and plan each win--no matter how big or small. Because each win moves you forward. Each win gives you a voice in the future, rather than having the future forced upon you.

In that effort, I look forward to working with you. By linking your work with our work, working together, we can combine our efforts, our vision, to develop a stronger Pennsylvania. We will create opportunities for our citizens, healthier communities for our children, and a commonwealth that is truly a leader among states and competitor among nations.

Thank you.
Remarks by Mayor Stephen R. Reed
City of Harrisburg

Good morning ladies and gentlemen and welcome to the first ever regional summit for the eight county area of South Central Pennsylvania.

Today we shall examine needs and issues, including matters related to economic development, transportation, infrastructure, land use, local government and finance. For the first time ever, we shall consider these items on a broad regional basis. They are matters common to us all.

In our eight counties, we have 318 different municipalities, 313 different municipal or county authorities and a plethora of different boards and commissions with varying degrees of authority. To suggest that this represents an extraordinary degree of fragmentation would be to state the obvious.

Many of today's problems and costs are a result of this fragmentation and the duplication it spawns. For the benefit of our taxpayers and for the future of our region and all its assets and attributes, the challenge before us is to use our resources more efficiently, to address regional needs and issues on a regional basis, rather than piecemeal or not at all, and to provide a basis and structure on which such efforts can be carried out in the future.

Out of a sense of enlightened self-interest, we have many reasons to take a better course. In today's proceedings, they shall be more fully discussed.

We do not think and act on a regional basis. The consequence has been higher costs, the incremental intrusion of new or expanded problems into our lives, and a diminished capacity to compete, as a region, in the rapidly changing global economy. The consequence has been the loss of over 24,000 acres of farmlands every year, thus eroding the largest industry in our state and a bedrock part of our region's economy.

The consequence has become massive demand for more highways and infrastructure, while leaving social and economic costs and losses in the wake of unplanned sprawl. The very character and quality of our region are at stake if we fail to have the wisdom to think and act in collective ways.

Whether we shall enter the 21st Century still using the practices and structure of 100 years ago or whether we shall overcome what has traditionally separated us to effectively chart the future are the questions which shall be answered today and in the actions that we direct be taken in the days ahead.

It is our hope that this time and place shall one day be viewed as the starting point for a splendid new chapter in the history of our region.
Remarks of Francis B. Haas, Jr., Esquire
McNees, Wallace & Nurick
and President, Harrisburg School Board

Overview of South Central Pennsylvania Region

Dr. Degrove, Dr. Bruhn, Dr. Fifield, Commissioner Besch, Mayor Reed and all of the other honorable people here, far too many for individual acknowledgements, even though present are senators, representatives, mayors, commissioners, supervisors, and lawyers:

We will be talking today about planning, among other things, so I have planned my remarks to take exactly 29 and one-half minutes, that is, if you don't interrupt me frequently with bursts of sustained applause. I think you will be able to resist that urge.

The opinions I will express do not necessarily represent the views of those who planned this program. For what it is worth, though, I have been thinking about and studying these issues for more than a decade and I care very much about what happens to South Central Pennsylvania, my home and the home of most of you. Each one of us sleeps in one of the cities, boroughs or townships of this region, or at least we should sleep in just one, but only a few of us work in the municipality where we sleep. Most of us shop throughout the region, in the sprawling malls, in Ephrata and Biglerville and Oberlin, in the commercial strips along the principal highways fanning out from our population centers, and only occasionally downtown where we live. Nearly all of us seek entertainment and culture in or near our magnificent river, from that creaking old ferry at Millersburg to the dam at Holtwood; in the streams, parks and mountains of the region, at Pine Grove and Caledonia, Clark Valley and Bear Valley, Big Spring and Colonel Denning, in Hershey, at Strasburg, on City Island, at Long Park, at Pinchot Lake; at the movie theaters in the malls, at the Fulton Opera House, the Forum, the Strand-Capital, Mt. Gretna, Allenberry and Little Buffalo; and at HACC, Capital Campus, York College, York Campus, Wilson, Dickinson, Gettysburg, F&M, Lebanon Valley, Millersville, Shippensburg and Elizabethtown.

We contemplate our historical roots at Wheatland, at Cornwall, at the Cloisters, and at the magnificent capitol building in Harrisburg. And we remind ourselves of the sacrifices that made us what we are on Seminary Ridge, in the Wheatfield, at Little Round Top, and the Bloody Angle.

In fact, our community is not where we sleep. Our neighborhood is where we sleep. Our community is this eight county region.

I am honored to be able to give an overview of our region, as I see it, to this auspicious gathering of distinguished people. This much brain power and practical local government experience has not been assembled together in one room since Benjamin Franklin sat all alone in his little study and dreamed up a lot of the things that improved the quality of life in colonial Philadelphia. Then he went out and made them happen.

In these eight counties of South Central Pennsylvania, I do not think we are governing
ourselves nearly as well as we can or as well as we must if we are to be competitive and to thrive, not just survive, in the decades ahead. Nor do I think anyone else is going to do much to help us. Again it was old Ben who said: "God helps them that help themselves."

Ben was the most distinguished Pennsylvanian, in my judgment, who has yet appeared among us. When he died in 1790, other than perhaps the revered Washington, he was the most respected American and may still be. We need to emulate his spirit, his dedication, his practicality, and, perhaps above all, his vision and his courage.

In 1989, I began urging these 8 counties and 318 municipalities to take a good, hard look at the ways in which they were governing themselves. Many have said that my views are quixotic, that I have been advocating changes that were far too radical to be either necessary, practical, or even possible. In fact, I have never advocated anything, except that we all take a look at how we are doing things, gather all the facts, and then decide whether there are not some ways in which we can do better.

We may find that relatively minor changes will make our governmental structure function much more effectively and economically or we may conclude that we need significant restructuring. Faced clearly with the facts, people have a remarkable way of responding constructively in their own best interests. It is the concept on which democracy is based.

The best form and shape of change is not foreordained. Enhanced county powers in some areas may be best. Perhaps some services should be administered throughout metropolitan areas. Some rules and planning decisions should be made on a regional basis or sub-regional basis. Some powers should remain at the local, even the neighborhood, level. No one, after all, wants to throw out the baby with the bath water.

There are many useful examples for us to study in this country and in Canada, including Nashville, Indianapolis, Minneapolis-St.Paul, and metropolitan Toronto, which began this process more than 50 years ago. We may even have the imagination and courage to come up with something new.

If we do not make some changes now, we will just be postponing the inevitable and bequeathing to our children problems which will be much more difficult to fix as each year goes by. We are behind much of the rest of the country in facing up to these issues.

Traditional town and neighborhood cohesiveness and pride are not on the chopping block. Steelton and Red Lion and Annville and Pillow and Ickesburg and Columbia and Littlestown will not cease to exist. Does anyone doubt that throughout this entire world South Central Pennsylvania's best known town is Hershey? Is Hershey any less Hershey because it is only a post office? What is at stake is the vigor and competitiveness of our regional economy, improved, and more economical local governmental services and the health of the environment in which we live our lives.
I was one of those who was active in the movement to change the structure of Harrisburg's city government to the so-called "strong mayor" form in 1969 and I was the first city solicitor under the new form of government in the early '70s. Twenty-seven years later, we in Harrisburg now know what a strong mayor really is. But perhaps of greater significance, we also now know how important the structure of government can be. Leadership can only function effectively if the structure within which it operates allows it and encourages it.

Then, beginning in the mid-1970s as a director and general counsel of Harristown Development Corporation, I was deeply involved for more than 20 years in the effort to reconstruct downtown Harrisburg.

For ten years I was solicitor of Dauphin County's Industrial Development Authority and the Harrisburg Area Industrial Development Corporation, now CREDC, the Capital Region Economic Development Corporation. I was solicitor of HAIDE when Olmsted Air Force Base closed with the loss of 11,000 jobs for this region. The region then got together behind HAIDC to make constructive, region enhancing value of the former military base for airport, educational and industrial use.

As Harrisburg city solicitor in 1971, I organized the Capital Area Transit Authority or CAT, a cooperative, multi-county regional effort, and negotiated its first cost sharing formula. Sadly though, in the ensuing years, mass transit as an alternative to the private automobile has not made much, if any, progress and probably has regressed. I think we need strong, regional, multi-model transportation planning, done by our region for our region. In the years ahead we will need an effective regional mass transit system providing a convenient and efficient alternative to the private automobile, utilizing all of the resources and ingenuity we can muster.

Our host today, Harrisburg Area Community College, Pennsylvania's first community college, was established in 1964. That remarkable regional effort involved the agreement of 64 school districts in 3 counties, Dauphin, Cumberland and Perry, to pool resources and talent to begin one of the great success stories in Pennsylvania education. Those 64 districts are now 22 after consolidations. The college began in the Harrisburg-Hershey-Carlisle area, but is now a truly regional institution, with branches in Lancaster, Lebanon and Gettysburg. I had the honor to be its solicitor from the start of the college until my retirement at the end of 1995.

This college is a prime example of what people can do when they work together to solve their problems and meet community needs. HACC exists because of the strong leadership of some very determined people of vision and courage who went out on the hustings and convinced 64 school districts to join together to start this college. It can be done.

Please look at the map, which shows each one of the 8 counties and 318 separate municipal subdivisions in our region--cities, boroughs and townships. There are also 313 municipal authorities in our region. Some municipalities have none. Some have three or four.

These 313 municipal authorities finance or operate, or both, various traditional municipal
services, such as sewage collection and disposal, solid waste processing, including incineration, and the like. In our region, in addition, there are about 40 other public, or quasi-public authorities or corporations, performing functions which have become public functions, such as housing authorities, redevelopment authorities, both county and municipality, industrial development authorities, industrial development corporations, and transit authorities, all involved to one degree or another in the management of public resources for public purposes, some operating exclusively within municipal boundaries, many straddling municipal lines.

Not shown on this map are the 66 school districts which straddle municipal boundaries throughout the region.

The eight counties are Adams, Cumberland, Dauphin, Franklin, Lancaster, Lebanon, Perry and York. These eight counties lie generally south and east of the arc of the Appalachians, straddling some of the mountain ridges, but the general orientation of the four northern counties of Cumberland, Perry, Dauphin and Lebanon is to the south of the mountains.

The southern boundary, although geographically, economically and socially artificial, is nevertheless a very real political boundary, the border between two states, established by Mr. Mason and Mr. Dixon to resolve a century of conflict between the heirs of William Penn and Lord Calvert. Is it perhaps remarkable that a purely political boundary should be a straight line?

The eastern boundaries are likewise quite arbitrary political lines, but nevertheless fairly real in terms of the orientation of the life of the people. Lebanon and Lancaster counties are generally more culturally compatible with central than with eastern Pennsylvania.

The major population centers developed historically from east to west, in the valleys between the mountain ridges, as the population of the country moved westward. One line goes from Lebanon, through Harrisburg, to Carlisle and on to Chambersburg.

The other goes from Lancaster to York, then on through Gettysburg to the west.

Congestion proceeds unevenly, but inexorably, from Lancaster County in the east, to the more sparsely inhabited areas of western Perry, Cumberland, Adams and Franklin counties, and now also from the south into southern York, Adams, Franklin and Lancaster counties. The congestion in some areas approaches gridlock. I think we are all in the path of this developing congestion, with inadequate defenses.

Nearly 12 million people live in Pennsylvania. About 1.6 million live in the eight counties of South Central Pennsylvania, our region.

The 12 million people of Pennsylvania live in 2,572 municipalities--cities, boroughs and townships--overlaid by 67 counties. Each, in a sense, has its own "sovereign" government with its own power and responsibility within its own borders.
Structurally, these municipalities are governed by different laws for first class cities, second class cities, and cities of the second class A, of which there is one each. Then there are third class cities, boroughs, incorporated towns (of which there is just one), first class townships, and second class townships. Then it is all further complicated by a general municipal law, a general township law, and two different optional charter or home rule laws. In our region there are townships bigger than boroughs. There are boroughs bigger than cities. There are many townships bigger than boroughs and cities. The grounds upon which these distinctions were laid down have long since vanished. The laws governing the structure and powers of Pennsylvania's eight classes of counties simply boggle the mind. I will spare you a listing of those.

Then we have school districts of the first class, first class A, second class, third class and fourth class. At least these have the logic of clear-cut population differences, but that is about it.

Few states come even close to our local governmental fragmentation. Among our nearest competitors is Illinois, which with a population of about 10 million people, has but one-fourth the number of general purpose municipal governmental units. Dr. Degroove's Florida, with now 14 million people, has 400 local governmental units.

In the 23 contiguous municipalities within 10 airline miles of Market Square in Harrisburg, with a population of about 250,000, there are 22 chiefs of police, following one consolidation a few years ago. A couple of other municipalities under financial duress are exploring consolidation. If the average salary of these chiefs is $40,000, we are paying more than $880,000 a year for the chief of police of a city of 250,000 people. Each of these municipalities, unless they are so tiny as not to have hardly any public services, also has a public works department, a business department, maybe a planner, usually a zoning hearing board, maybe a fire department, but more likely, volunteers, a sanitation department, streets department, and so on and on.

The historical pattern in Pennsylvania and in our region of many small local governmental units and of artificially constricted cities and larger boroughs and townships, duplicative and competitive, is doubly bad. These 318 separate municipalities compete for tax ratables and are weak in dealing with sophisticated and well-financed developers and other commercial and industrial interests. This may satisfy parochial or short-term objectives but can be disastrous for the region and themselves in the long run.

On the other hand, commercial and industrial interests seeking sites for major developments, which might be very advantageous to the entire region, find the proliferation of local units of government with whom they must deal to be absolutely forbidding. I will hazard a guess that nearly everyone in this room has had the experience of conversing with a newcomer to this area from some other part of the country who is first confused and then appalled at our fragmented local governmental structure.

Planning for major public project siting and development, including waste disposal facilities, airports, parks and major commercial and industrial projects having broad regional
implications, to the extent that it exists at all, is competitive and often ineffective, practically and politically. Important regional considerations play second fiddle if they are even in the orchestra.

In 1987, Willard Rouse said, during a panel discussion on development at West Chester University:

To think naively that we can stop growth is a mistake. ... The devastation that will occur unless we become realistically sophisticated and in fact place upon governments, the townships of this county, the responsibility to come together and plan the future of this county will be horrifying. ... The parochial nature of our township system will in fact lead to the rape of this county.

The 2,572 separate municipal subdivisions in Pennsylvania, including our own 318, have remained basically unchanged for more than a century, while everything else in the world has changed radically. The officials of artificially constricted municipalities wrestle helplessly with problems which can only be dealt with sensibly and rationally on a regional basis.

No one knows exactly how many people are employed, full time, part time, temporary or otherwise, by these 8 counties, 318 municipalities, 313 municipal authorities, 40 other authorities and quasi-public corporations, and 66 school districts. Their budgets do not have this information. Accurate figures can only be obtained by going directly to each municipality, laboriously digging through municipal records, and asking the right questions of the right people. Using the best data I could find, however, I have concluded that it is more than 70,000. This includes the employees of 66 school districts and their 66 superintendents, at an average salary close to $100,000 a year. We need to know all the facts.

We do know that there are more than 1,500 municipal council-persons, commissioners and supervisors, 318 mayors, or equivalents, at least 1,500 municipal authority and other authority board members, and more than three times the number of chiefs of police than in all of the United Kingdom which has a population of 60 million people, and just 100 independent police districts. We have 1.6 million people living in 318 municipalities, most of which have independent police departments. There is one joint police department of several municipalities in York County, now a two municipality consolidation in Cumberland County, and some sharing agreements. Some are served by the state police, for which we all pay the bill. Some have only one police officer and he may have a two-way radio.

The world has changed radically in the last century. Only our local government structure has not changed significantly in this hundred years. The inefficiency in the delivery of services and the waste of money is staggering, although in just this one hundred years the telephone, the automobile, the airplane, radio, television, the computer, satellites, and now facsimile transmission and the internet have obliterated artificial boundaries everywhere, as business and banking activity and organization, even criminal activity and organization, have been regionalized, nationalized, and even internationalized. We have meetings in Carlisle, York and Harrisburg before lunch and do business in between on the car phone, or we stay...
home and do our work in front of a screen.

Change in long established ways of thinking and doing things is always difficult. I paraphrase a little what one of America’s most respected and profound thinkers had to say about change. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. was speaking about rules of law. What he said is applicable to change in our context or in any context.

It is revolting to have no better reason for a municipal governmental structure than that it was laid down in the time of Henry IV. It is still more revolting if the grounds upon which it was laid down have vanished long since, and this structure simply persists from blind imitation of the past.

Our municipal governmental structure may not have been laid down in the time of Henry IV, but it was laid down more than a century ago, for historical reasons which may have made sense then, but have long since vanished.

It has been said "History at its best is a struggle against anachronism." I think we are losing the struggle.

It is a new world. Our competition is now Japan and the other Pacific Rim countries, Western Europe, Latin America, China, Russia, and the rest of the world. We have GATT and NAFTA. Trade barriers are crumbling whether governments like it or not. Public policy is not always the public’s policy. But that is not the half of it. We compete every day with Virginia and Indiana and Massachusetts and Idaho, not to mention the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh areas, the Lehigh Valley, the coal regions, the rest of Pennsylvania, and even Erie. Many of our competitors have strong, unitary, or coordinated governmental structures providing important support and assistance to their private sector economies. The fragmented local governmental structure in our region will be a serious disadvantage in the years ahead.

Three or four years ago I made this point in a talk I gave at a meeting of the Pennsylvania League of Cities. After that talk, the mayor of one of the principal municipalities of the Lehigh Valley came up to me and said, "I have been preaching regional approaches to regional problems in the Lehigh Valley for years with virtually no success. If you can make significant progress before we do, you will beat our brains out."

Our mission is not to beat anyone’s brains out, but to find better ways to preserve, improve and enhance the "quality of life" of the people in this region, by which I think we mean a physical environment which is comfortable and stimulating; good jobs and decent housing; good quality air and water, facilities for recreation, entertainment and culture, and trees and grass; good local governmental services, including police and fire protection, solid waste collection and disposal, sewage disposal; efficient and convenient mass transit; well-planned and maintained streets and highways; public recreation facilities, essential social services, and quality educational opportunities; and all of these essentially local governmental services efficiently delivered at reasonable cost. The efficiency, effectiveness, and economy with which these local governmental services are provided is vital to the quality of life to which
we aspire.

In our eight county community we cannot achieve these objectives during the rest of this century and into the next with 8 county governments, 318 separate municipal governments, 313 municipal authorities, 40 other public authorities and corporations, and 66 school districts all operating for the most part in the same old ways in a brand new world. We need broad public recognition of the problem, strong, wise, visionary and courageous leadership; and the will to get the job done.

The prospect of change frightens people. There is a natural desire to keep things as they are, perhaps to keep things as they were, or even to keep things as we wish they had been.

After the Founding Fathers, including our Ben, produced that remarkable charter for change, the Constitution of the United States in September of 1787 in Philadelphia, the battle for ratification ensued. Advocating ratification of the new constitution, James Madison lamented in the first of the Federalist papers that one of the most obdurate roadblocks to the creation of a national government, albeit within a federal system, was the resistance of office holders and others in the thirteen "sovereign" states under the Articles of Confederation, fearful of losing prerogatives and prestige, or as he put, somewhat more elegantly, fearful of a "diminution of the power, emoluments and consequences of the offices they hold under the state-establishments." This factor was not a valid reason to resist change in 1787. It is not valid today. We cannot afford it.

When the structural deficiencies in Pennsylvania's public education system became manifest in the late 1950s and early 1960s and the cost-benefit ratio seriously out of balance, the legislature finally had to mandate school district reorganization, resulting in the consolidation of the more than 2,000 remaining school districts into about 500.

Nothing is perfect, perhaps even close. Significant flaws in school district reorganization have become manifest. Some were built into the process, as when nearly all of the city districts with their unique problems were basically left to fend for themselves within the constrictions of municipal borders, desegregation orders, and shrinking tax bases, with the resulting acceleration of the flight to the suburbs and the exurbs, debilitating to the cities and suffocating to the open land surrounding them. But the basic structural changes wrought by school district reorganization were essential.

Without state involvement and assistance, it cannot be done. The legislature cannot and should not do it alone. We have to do it, but we cannot do it unless the legislature gives us the tools. We do not want a mandate. We want encouragement and assistance to enable us to conduct a thorough study of the facts and issues involved. Then we will want the legislature to listen to what we think we should do about our own future.

In the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the people conferred upon their legislature virtually unlimited power to create, abolish, reorganize and empower local governmental entities. There is no reason why the legislature should not be amenable to our wishes. We can take our future into our own hands and maybe teach some other people some lessons at the
same time. The legislature should welcome the opportunity to help create a laboratory for the study of very significant issues in the back yard of the state capital.

A draft of legislation for the establishment of a South Central Pennsylvania governmental study commission act was included in your conference material. It calls for a commission, financed with at least $1 million, half from the state and half from the eight counties. The local share comes to about 30 cents a person. How much is our future worth?

The commission should be professionally staffed and should collect all the facts, solicit input from all of our citizens and from experts from the state and throughout the nation, hold public hearings throughout the region, and make specific recommendations for action.

In your conference material you also received drafts of proposed resolutions relating to the subject of this regional summit. At the end of the day these resolutions and others which may result from the day’s sessions will be brought before you for your consideration.

This is a wonderful area in which to live and work. We have a strong base of human resources, a healthy diversity, a rich history, bountiful agriculture, wondrous mountains and countryside, beautiful rivers, lakes and streams, and much economic and social stability. We are even blessed with the state capital, if you think that is a blessing. No other region of the state compares but we are in the early stages of an insidious disease. These attractive attributes are the very elements which draw people and development to our region, as the sweetest of flowers attracts butterflies and bees, but they can be destructive if we do not carefully, intelligently and democratically plan the future of our region.

The eight counties of South Central Pennsylvania comprise a natural, compatible, manageable region, and we can lead the state, perhaps even the nation, in dealing with these new challenges as we head into a new century. Time is short. Uncoordinated and unplanned growth accelerates and the cost of fragmented, inefficient and expensive local government aggravates us as the world changes radically before our eyes.

Ben Franklin warned us that "we must all hang together, or assuredly we shall hang separately." And, paraphrasing again, this time what another Franklin, Franklin Roosevelt, said in 1933: "About the only thing we have to fear, is fear of ourselves."

We have the unique opportunity to be a part of the beginning of a great adventure, to be present, if you will, at the creation. We can but start the journey, but every journey starts with the first step.

Thank you very much.
Remarks by Terry Kauffman
Chairman, Lancaster County Board of Commissioners

A Call for Regional Transportation Decision Making

Our transportation system provides vital links within this eight county region that allow the residents to travel about to work, school, recreation, church, businesses, medical facilities, friends, and family. Most of us are aware of these links within our individual counties, and even more so in our individual municipalities. Everyday we come into contact with persons who live in a different municipality, or a different county, or a different region of the state, or even a different state. The reason for this extended interaction is that transportation knows no boundary because human activity is oblivious to boundaries in our free society.

Just as human activity has a profound effect on the transportation system, so do the transportation investment and operating decisions have an effect on the people they serve. What I want to highlight this morning is the way we make those decisions and why our decision making methods are putting our region at risk. I want to conclude with a call for regional transportation decision making on those choices that have profound implications for us as a region.

I think most of us are very familiar with the condition of the transportation system back in our home communities. We are very aware of when pot holes appear, when signs or the stripe in the middle of the road are fading, or how long after a winter storm ends our road gets plowed. We may even know our local road master who takes care of maintaining our roads. These are routine maintenance operations that are ongoing to keep the system functioning in a safe and efficient manner.

What we are probably less familiar with is how the roads outside of our community evolved into a system and how that system is operated and used every day. Even more unfamiliar to us are other parts of the system like public transit, railroads and airports that indirectly, and sometimes directly, affect our daily lives. The final and most important part of the system is the individuals and organizations who make the critical decisions affecting this transportation system and ultimately us. This critical part is almost totally unknown to most people, except for the occasional reference to the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT).

So, I will begin with PennDOT and their vital role in this system. In our region we are served by a single district of PennDOT known as District 8. This is an advantage for us for it allows PennDOT to allocate within the eight county district personnel, equipment, and material resources on a logical, need basis. District 8 maintains and improves almost 5,400 miles of roads and more than 3,300 bridges. Some of the roads it maintains and improves carry more than 50,000 vehicles per day, traverse our entire region, and go beyond clear across the state to the next. I am referring to the Interstates and to some of the major U.S. and state routes like US15, US30, US222, US322, PA72, PA74 and PA283. So a decision about one these routes in another county has implications for an adjoining county.

Here is an example. Earlier this year, PennDOT concluded that its entire statewide
transportation improvement program, known as the Twelve Year Program, was over
programmed. So, they had to delay a lot of projects all across the state. One of those
projects was the completion of the US222 bypass around Reading in Berks County which
borders the northeastern part of Lancaster County. That is the part of the county where
I am from. So I am very familiar with this project and the effect of its delay. Obviously the
people in Berks County were very disappointed, especially since they had put their own
money into acquiring the right of way and completing the environmental studies. They were
not the only ones who were disappointed. So were we. US222 is an important route for
Berks County. It is also important to us because it provides us with a link to Reading,
Allentown, and 178 which takes us to northern New Jersey, New York and New England.
The delay means more years that trucks will be traveling on back roads, with a name like
"the road to nowhere", roads which are totally inadequate and dangerous for large, heavy
trucks.

In addition to the PennDOT decision making process with far reaching implications, there
is also a decision making process for priorities in the three metropolitan areas in our region,
Harrisburg, York and Lancaster. I am referring to the Metropolitan Planning Organizations
which almost no one has heard of. I am currently chairman of ours which is known as the
Lancaster Area Transportation Study Coordinating Committee, or LATS for short. PennDOT is a member of each of these MPO's. They have the responsibility for adopting a
program every two years which contains all the improvement projects which are funded with federal funds, or are regionally significant, or both. Their decision making is impacted by PennDOT's decisions on how much money it will allocate to each area in the state. This is known as financial constraint, a very appropriate term because we feel very constrained by the program that we adopted last month.

MPO's provide some degree of coordinated programming of improvements within their
metropolitan area. There are other improvements which are funded by developers,
 municipalities, and counties which are apart from this process. The coordination problem
occurs when decisions have to be made for facilities that serve several metropolitan areas.
A good example is the Amtrak line between Harrisburg and Philadelphia which serves three
metropolitan areas. The state is currently studying investment and operating alternatives
for this line which could provide faster and more frequent long distance commuter rail
service between Harrisburg, Lancaster, and Philadelphia. If a decision is made to buy new
equipment for this line, in which area's financially constrained program will the funding
appear? This is a very important question because each program is limited to a certain
dollar amount set by PennDOT. Funds for this equipment will supplant funding for other
critically needed projects. What this dilemma illustrates is the lack of a process to make
rational transportation decisions on a regional or multi-regional basis.

I will provide an illustration from the private sector. A few years ago Conrail developed an
intermodal facility in the Harrisburg area where highway trailers are hooked together to
form a train operated by both Conrail and the Norfolk Southern railroads. This is known
as the Triple Crown service and has been highly successful. The problem is that the trucks
are still traveling on our crowded highways to reach this facility. An analogous situation in
the public sector was the decision of the Port of Philadelphia to set up inland 'ports' where small shipments are consolidated into containers which are then trucked to the port in Philadelphia for shipment overseas. In our county, we see many trucks carry fruit in containers that have been unloaded from ships at the port in Wilmington, Delaware.

Trucks have increased significantly in numbers all across the state, in part due to the deregulation of both motor carriers and railroads more than 15 years ago. This trend is placing a severe strain on our already burdened highway system. It is also making companies examine and compare the highway system in different areas within Pennsylvania and in our neighboring states when they are making decisions as to where to locate new facilities or where to expand or close existing facilities. Recently, one of our major manufacturers was offered by an Atlantic Coast state a brand new interchange on I95 if they would locate a new facility there. The decision a few years ago by Nestle to locate a major distribution center on I78 west of Allentown was prompted by the completion of that highway in the early 1990's around Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton.

The point I am trying to make is that our region is competing in both a national and global economy. We do not have the necessary governmental structure and process to make the critical transportation investment decisions that are necessary for us to compete effectively. We are at risk today economically because our transportation system is inferior to the systems in our neighboring states.

We need a governance process that allows us to talk about regional transportation decision making. To create this process, we must modify existing institutions to create a structure that can deal with the interrelated issues of land use, transportation and air quality on a regional basis. Only when we deal effectively with these interrelated regional issues will we be able to reduce the economic risk to our region. Our development pattern for the past 50 years has been to spread out, build on cheap land in a form and location that can only be served by highway transportation, and then later address the effects of this pattern on our diminishing farmland, the inadequate infrastructure, especially roads, the ever increasing dependance on the auto, and the worsening air quality.

These issues are complex because they are so interrelated. It is not just a matter of attracting development. There is also a locational question which applies directly to how we use land. In our region, we have been using land at a tremendous rate as our developments have sprawled across the land scape in search of a congestion free location. With our proximity to the Boston-Washington megalopolis, there is no such thing as being totally congestion free. This entire corridor is congested. But, we are linked to it because of proximity and because it is a major market for the goods and products we produce. Our ability to produce these products, especially the agricultural ones, will be severely hampered if we do not manage our growth in a much more intelligent manner.

In our county, we have been taking steps in the past few years to do that with the adoption and implementation of our Growth Management Plan. We developed this plan cooperatively with our municipalities and they are now implementing it with the adoption of Urban Growth Boundaries. These boundaries have been drawn around our existing city and
boroughs where development already exists, and where the infrastructure and services are located to support that development. The boundaries encompass enough open land to allow for sufficient space to accommodate the expected development in the next 20 years. Every five years, the boundaries, recent development activity, and remaining developable land will be reviewed. As a result, the boundaries can be adjusted to either increase or decrease the amount of developable land within them.

This plan will only succeed if we can also make the necessary investments in our infrastructure, especially in our transportation system. A local intermunicipal committee in our county is presently looking at various alternatives for increasing local funding for transportation improvements recognizing that PennDOT will not be able to fund all of the needed improvements. This additional funding will help us. It certainly will not replace the need for regional transportation decisions.

Therefore, I call upon the counties, the MPO's, PennDOT and the Department of Commerce to work together to address this need for regional governance of transportation decision making. This effort could be in the form of a task force that would examine these issues and make recommendations to the Governor. I especially urge PennDOT to take the lead role in this effort because these issues are at the core of their mission. A year ago, Pennsylvania adopted a Transportation Policy Plan whose theme is to move Pennsylvania forward to the 21st Century. The Plan identifies seven goal categories critical to this initiative. They are:

- Mobility, travel and transportation;
- Economic development, productivity and employment;
- Environment and livability;
- Funding and finance;
- Planning, programming, and decision-making;
- Stakeholder involvement, communication, and coordination; and
- Organization and institutional.

I see much relevance between these goal categories and my remarks this morning which is why I believe PennDOT should take the lead on creating the needed structure. I challenge you in your break-out sessions this afternoon to further define these issues, how they could be addressed by a new regional governance structure, what that structure might be, and how the effort to form that structure could begin.

Thank you for your attention and good luck to you in the remainder of this summit.
Remarks by Robert G. Benko, Executive Deputy Secretary
Department of Community and Economic Development

Community and Economic Development

Good morning and thank you for the kind introduction. Let me begin by saying that I am pleased to be taking part in the dynamic and forward thinking events of today. I applaud all of you here for actively addressing the important and laudable objectives of regional cooperation.

I am a planner by training and profession. In preparing for today, I spent a lot of time reflecting on my past experiences, some thirty plus years, considering the Commonwealth’s growth and development history in relation to where we are today and where we want to be as we approach the twenty-first century.

I am a native of South Central Pennsylvania, having spent my youth and college years in Cumberland and Lancaster counties and in my professional career I have logged many hours in our state capital. I have witnessed South Central Pennsylvania’s transformations over the last several decades. Transformations that have presented opportunities, but also challenges.

The new Department of Community and Economic Development has a role to play in facilitating the successful navigation of these challenges and ensuring the health and vitality of this region.

I have heard the Commonwealth referred to as the "County of Pennsylvania," a reference to the several virtual economic regions that comprise our keystone state. Standing alone, Pennsylvania has the 20th largest economy of the world. A tremendous show of strength that is due in large part to our equally tremendous amount of diversity--economic, cultural, and geographic.

Diversity of economy, culture, and geography is an asset that is shared by this south central region of Pennsylvania. But diversity equates to complexity and complex systems represent a challenge.

That is why, as we move toward a new century, it is essential that at a minimum there be a shared vision of the future of this region of where you want to be which is the first step toward securing your competitive position.

Today, the South Central Pennsylvania region is the Commonwealth’s engine of growth. This region enjoys low unemployment, low cost of living, high quality of life, and family-sustaining jobs.

In the last two years alone, the Department has partnered with local economic development providers in successful efforts to create and retain jobs in the region including: Frito-Lay in York County; Sid-Tool and AMP, Inc. in Lebanon County; and Champion Road Machinery in Franklin County.
One does not have to look far to see the benefits of growth to this area. But, thus far, this growth has been mostly unbridled. The benefits of prosperity are apparent, but so too are its consequences--traffic congestion, dormant former industrial sites, and boarded up shops in our once vibrant town centers. And although there are indications that some of the cities within the region are rebounding after years of stagnant economies, clearly the emphasis continues to be on developing our suburban resources and converting farmland to high priced housing developments, strip malls, and parking lots.

As The Patriot-News has so clearly documented in its series of articles leading up to this conference, some of the consequences of the region's current prosperity may challenge its future quality of life.

Last winter the Department commissioned PHH Fantus, a corporate site location consultant firm, to do a benchmarking assessment of Pennsylvania.

The Commonwealth had not significantly modified its approach to economic and community development in many years and we wanted to determine our position relative to our competitor states--notably North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, and Kentucky--so that we could most effectively decide where to concentrate our efforts in reshaping our approach to community and economic development.

Fantus provided us with numerous findings and recommendations. One of them stands out as particularly significant here today: the importance of quality of life to the future economic well-being of the Commonwealth.

According to the Fantus study, quality of life is an important factor in the business location and selection process. A negative image of a location's quality of life, whether erroneous or justified, can eliminate a community in the early stages of screening. It can also be a dominant swing factor for a company in the final stage of location selection where many other factors are essentially equal.

Quality of life can be especially important to businesses that require staff that are highly mobile, both because of demand for these individuals in the marketplace and due to their sophistication. A prime example are senior technical people sought after by high-tech companies. These are the types of companies that are creating the industries of tomorrow. And they are the types of companies we want in Pennsylvania because they are the catalysts of future job growth in the 21st Century.

Over 200 CEO's interviewed for the Fantus study gave Pennsylvania high marks for its quality of life and a number of executives referred to Pennsylvania's high quality of life as one of our best kept secrets. According to the Fantus report, Pennsylvania clearly leads our six competitor states on quality of life issues but the Commonwealth compares much less favorably on another important indicator pertinent to this gathering today, one that could easily threaten this region's economic viability thereby giving new meaning to the theme of this conference, "A Region at Risk."
I am speaking about the concern expressed in the Fantus study in regard to the proliferation of local political subdivisions in this and other regions of the Commonwealth.

According to Fantus: "This phenomenon definitely has a negative effect on economic development, ranging from business' resentment of the multiplicity of taxing authorities to which they must pay money, to impeding communications about investment prospects."

In acknowledging the long standing traditions of the numerous jurisdictions in Pennsylvania, Fantus recommended that if actual consolidation is not feasible, at a minimum, there must be better communication mechanisms developed and a more regionally based economic and community development delivery system installed to help alleviate the negative effects that the fragmentation of jurisdictions has on economic and community development.

Unless the problem of fragmentation is effectively addressed, it is likely that many of the factors that threaten the south central region's quality-of-life will continue and intensify and the region will fail to secure its future well being.

Fantus made other important recommendations, such as the need for urgent improvements in our business climate, streamlining our approach to economic and community development, a commitment to make business retention a priority, and the development of more flexible and competitive community and economic development tools.

We used the Fantus study and recommendations, along with recommendations from the Governor's Keystone Committee and the IMPACCT Commission, to map out a new development strategy for Pennsylvania that addresses economic and community issues, including quality of life and fragmentation of authority.

The Ridge Administration's Development Strategy, a copy of which is available here today in summary form, is designed to move Pennsylvania into the top ten in job creation and give our communities world-class status. We are doing this by changing the direction of the Department and focusing more on capacity-building functions in collaboration with our regional service providers. Clearly this requires a long term commitment which Governor Ridge has already made on behalf of the Commonwealth.

That is one reason why we were very pleasantly surprised when Site Selection magazine's October edition named Pennsylvania the biggest up-and-comer in its annual business rankings for 1996. Site Selection magazine called it the "Quaker state business earthquake" as Pennsylvania zoomed up to number 14 in its overall state ranking after being unranked for several years.

Of all the Northeastern states, only New York, which was ranked 23rd, came close to Pennsylvania. Four of Pennsylvania's six competitor states from the Fantus study were among the top ten, thereby showing two things: (1) our competition is very tough; (2) we have made progress; and (3) we still have a ways to go and a long-term commitment to this strategy is definitely warranted.
There can be no doubt that the dramatic improvement in Pennsylvania’s competitive economic position is a direct result of the improvements made by the Governor in cooperation with the General Assembly in reducing the cost of doing business, notably cutting taxes, streamlining government, and reducing workers’ compensation premiums.

To the Governor, it was clear from the outset that Pennsylvania needed a new approach to job growth and healthy communities—a highly focused approach that recognizes that vibrant communities are an essential ingredient in a world-class economy, and an approach that also recognizes the need to enhance the competitive abilities of local development efforts.

Equally clear was the need to add to the state’s economic development arsenal new incentive-based, flexible, job creation tools so that the Commonwealth and its communities could successfully meet the changing needs of businesses.

Through the merger of the Departments Commerce and Community Affairs, Pennsylvania is once again a leader in innovative community development strategies.

For example, our new Center for Local Government Services, with legislative authority to utilize the resources of each and every agency under the Governor’s jurisdiction to address specific local problems and concerns, is an innovation that is unmatched by any other state in the nation.

With the merger, Pennsylvania now mirrors the 26 other states that have recognized that community and economic development are inextricably linked. By consolidating both functions, policy fragmentation has been eliminated and opportunities for cooperative initiatives increased.

As part of our new development strategy, we have repositioned our financial resources to function in a comprehensive and coordinated manner focusing simultaneously on economic and community development opportunities, particularly as they relate to the revitalization of existing communities. Here, too, we have realized some early success.

Just last week, we were able to announce the headquarters relocation of a banking institution and 125 new jobs to the Enterprise Zone in Norristown, a community in which the downtown was recently devastated by a fire. The project also involved the relocation of an out-of-state advanced manufacturing facility, including 400 new jobs, to the suburban campus-like corporate center location vacated by the bank.

One project depended on the other to make both a reality. As a result of the repositioning of our community and economic development functions in the DCED, we were able to put together the necessary assistance package for both projects within the 24-hour deadline that was extended to us.

This is not an isolated example. We are making every effort to link our community development and economic development resources to create jobs and contribute to the revitalization of distressed communities.
In this region, we have the potential to do much the same. There are Enterprise Zones in Lancaster, York, Shippensburg, Lebanon, and the New Baldwin Corridor here in Dauphin County. The Department is working with the local service providers in this region on a daily basis to facilitate economic revitalization in these and other communities throughout the south central area.

In the months ahead, look for new initiatives from the Commonwealth designed to place even more emphasis on community economic renewal and revitalization.

I would like to return briefly to the Fantus study recommendation concerning the need to overcome the problems created by jurisdictional fragmentation which over the long term could threaten the future economic well-being of this region and indeed the entire Commonwealth.

Our development strategy addresses the negative effects of jurisdictional fragmentation by shifting to regionally based economic and community development delivery systems. We are forging regional partnerships and creating regional delivery mechanisms in collaboration with our regional service providers for several new administration-sponsored efforts, including the Commonwealth's Business Calling and Resource Network Initiative.

By way of example, let me say just a few words about the regional delivery system for the Business Calling and Resource Network Initiative which is an important component of our overall job retention and community economic stabilization strategy.

The Business Calling Program is designed to provide an effective and efficient response to the needs of existing businesses by strengthening partnerships between the state, local development professionals, and the corporate community within the south central region and nine other marketing regions throughout Pennsylvania.

We will use the Commonwealth's financial resources to forge these alliances and support local and regional job retention initiatives and strategies. This effort is intended to help ensure that the businesses now located in this region and throughout Pennsylvania remain here, because they are responsible for all the jobs that exist today.

On the other side of the coin is the Business Resource Network—a state-of-the-art Internet-based information system that will link the south central region to the other regions of the Commonwealth by providing immediate access to site information, program, and regulatory information, and demographic, economic and other data. It will provide an efficient and effective means to access, analyze and present in-depth information about this region's and Pennsylvania's economic and community assets.

The Department will provide multi-media computer hardware, software, and training to each region of the Commonwealth to facilitate the establishment of the regional networks. When fully implemented in 1997, Pennsylvania will be the only state to provide a comprehensive regionally based, interactive, information system that can be linked worldwide through the Internet. While we will consider that an accomplishment, equally important is the regional
collaboration involved in creating the delivery system for the Business Calling and Resource Network Initiative. We are now working Cooperatively with our regional service providers in cementing this relationship.

This collaboration with our regional economic and community development partners is something that has not been done previously by the Department until now and, in addition to helping reduce the negative effects of jurisdictional fragmentation on the region, it is also beginning to erase the adversarial relationship that has developed between the Department and our stakeholders over many years.

Preliminary discussions between the Department and regional organizations in the south central region have already taken place and a regional meeting on the details of the Business Calling and Resource Network Initiative is scheduled here at the Community College on November 21.

The Business Calling and Resource Center Initiative is but one example of our regional emphasis on the delivery of services that is designed to reduce the consequences of jurisdictional fragmentation. We are also cooperating with our regional service partners in other initiatives that are new this year, including a new regional tourism initiative and in the area of international trade where we have created regional networks of export assistance providers.

In Philadelphia this evening, the Governor will announce the Commonwealth's new International Business Development Initiatives that are intended to increase participation of small and medium size businesses in international marketing as a hedge against domestic economic downturns. And as you might have already guessed, the central players in this strategy will once again be our regional export partner organizations.

As a department, we will continue to implement strategic measures that will strengthen the competitive position of the Commonwealth and secure the economic viability of its regions.

It seems clear from your attendance here today that there is also interest in examining the challenges that confront this south central region of Pennsylvania in the years ahead. Certainly you are not the first to do so; the national landscape is replete with similar efforts. Indeed, the southeastern and southwestern regions of the Commonwealth are also engaged in examining regional challenges and opportunities.

However, this meeting here today represents a necessary first step toward a shared vision of the future of the south central region which is an essential ingredient in securing your competitive position.

As a department, we have a role to play in helping you reach your objectives. Hopefully, our efforts to strengthen relationships with our regional partners in the delivery of new economic and community development assistance will contribute to your efforts.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate here today. We look forward to working with
you in the future in forging a stronger, more competitive, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Remarks of J. Reed Dunn, Executive Director
York County Planning Commission

Land Use and Growth Management in South Central Pennsylvania

Anyone who has resided in the South Central Pennsylvania area for any significant period of time in the last few decades can attest to the fact that we have been experiencing unprecedented growth. If we had at our disposal a series of land use maps for the region at five or ten year intervals we could see striking changes. Unfortunately, such maps do not exist. So we have to use some surrogate data in its place.

Population change gives us some indication of growth and economic development. By the same token, trends in agricultural land can tell us something about land conversion. The changes with respect to these items are striking.

Over the last several decades, we have had a steady pattern of population growth in all of the counties that make up the Capitol Region. The regional total went from 871 thousand in 1950 to one million and 550 thousand in 1990, an increase of 678,000 in forty years. More people live in the Capitol Region than in fifteen of the states.

To accommodate this growth and development, a great deal of farmland and open land was converted to more intense land uses: residential, commercial, industrial and others. The trends in loss of farmland were just as consistent as the growth of population throughout the Region. From 1950 to 1992, the total amount of farmland in the Region declined from about 2.2 million acres to about 1.5 million acres, a loss of roughly three quarters of a million acres.

We put these two pieces of information together and simple arithmetic tells us that for every 1,000 increase in population over the last four decades we lost about 1,100 acres of farmland. The patterns of urban sprawl are very wasteful of land. For instance, we know in York County that the development of the last 35 years consumed as much land as was required to accommodate the development of the previous 200 years.

So, what have we been doing in the Capitol Region to try and deal with the issues of land use and growth management?

To try and answer that question we can look at what the municipalities in the Region are doing with respect to their use or non-use of certain tools or actions that could be broadly described as development controls. The information that was used for this was taken from a recent survey compiled by the Department of Community and Economic Development and supplied by the individual municipalities. It is always possible in a survey of this sort that problems of interpretation will occur and result in some errors. By and large it is a good set of data.
Municipalities with Planning Commissions
It is a statement of the obvious that a very sizeable percentage of the municipalities in the Region have Planning Commissions. Actually 279 or 88 percent of the 318 municipalities have such entities. Those that do not include some very sparsely populated townships and some small boroughs with very limited development potential.

Municipalities with a Comprehensive Plan
A somewhat smaller number, 254 municipalities or about 80 percent of the total have Comprehensive Plans. The data does not tell us if these are recent plans and whether or not they were officially adopted or just a shelf document. It does suggest some fairly strong interest in planning on the part of municipal governments in the Region.

Municipalities with Zoning
Quite a number of the municipalities in the Region have adopted zoning ordinances, according to the survey data, a total of 240. The general observation is that the interest drops off from east to west and is less widespread in the areas experiencing the more moderate development pressures.

Municipalities with a Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance
These development controls are wide spread throughout the Region. In some of the counties, such as York, Cumberland and Dauphin, most of the municipalities have adopted their own local ordinance. In some of the other counties many of the localities have not adopted their own ordinance and come under the jurisdiction of the county ordinance.

Municipalities with Effective Agricultural Zoning Districts
Effective is the key word and was defined in the survey as containing provisions that would limit the amount of residential development in these districts. The use of this growth management control is most widespread in the southern portion of York County and in Lancaster County. The lack of any such controls throughout much of the rest of the region has serious implications for the loss of additional farmland.

Municipalities with Density Bonuses
This is certainly not a widespread tool with only thirteen municipalities having provisions for its use. It is also well to keep in mind that this only indicates where there are provisions for this tool. We have no information to indicate the extent to which it is being used.

Municipalities Using Impact Fees
This a great example of what can happen when a good idea is taken to the legislature and the special interests go to work on it. The provisions for using impact fees that found their way into the Municipalities Planning Code are so limited, cumbersome, and expensive to implement that not one jurisdiction in the region tried to do anything with them since their enactment in 1990.
Municipalities with a Moratorium
Let us not debate the point as to whether building moratoriums are or are not permissible under the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. A case could be made that a community ought to have the authority to call "time out" under certain conditions and limitations. A handful of communities have done just that.

Municipalities with an Official Map
The official map has some limited uses and a few municipalities have done something with it.

Municipalities with Performance Zoning
Performance zoning is another growth management tool has seen very limited utilization.

Municipalities with Planned Residential Development Provisions
There are seventy municipalities that have enacted PRD provisions. Use of these provisions is not very frequent if for no other reason than that the development of large tracts tends to be the exception rather than the rule.

Municipalities with Transfer of Development Rights
Only eight municipalities in the region have ordinance provisions for the transfer of development rights. That may be the good news. We know, for example, that seven of the eight municipalities that are in York County have never used those provisions. This is because the enabling provisions in the Municipalities Planning Code are very limited. Moreover the application of the provisions would be left to the chance circumstance of two developers getting together.

Based on this limited view of what we have been doing in this region in trying to manage growth, we might pose some questions regarding the effectiveness of the efforts, as follows:

Are we satisfied with the efforts that we have made in trying to manage growth in this region?

Are we maintaining or better yet improving the quality of life in the Region?

Are we effective in coordinating our planning and growth management efforts among the state, the counties and the municipalities?

This writer does not believe that we can answer any of those questions in the affirmative. In other words, no! What should we be doing and who should be doing it?

From the state we should have leadership and the filling of the void of state planning that has existed for many years. It is easy to question the state's planning and growth management priorities when appropriations for the State Planning Assistant Grants to municipalities are in the order of magnitude of $300,000 and another state agency can spend twice that sum for the environmental studies of a single highway proposal that nobody seriously thinks will get built. The planning activities of individual departments of state
government should be required to be consistent with County and Municipal Comprehensive Plans. As it is we have situations where communities are intimidated into adopting sewerage facility plans resulting in unneeded and unwanted systems that create development pressures where none existed. The result is loss of farmland and open space and more sprawl.

Another example is highway occupancy permits that are passed out without any consideration as to the impact on the local development pattern.

At the county and municipal level, better tools are needed and this speaks directly to the issue of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and the adequacy of its provisions to manage growth. It is gratifying that in September a "Land Use Issues Forum" was sponsored by the Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee and a lengthy agenda of issues and suggested legislative actions was compiled. To give some flavor of the concerns and with apologies to Jeff Foxworthy:

You know your Planning Code is not working if your county and municipal governing bodies can take action entirely inconsistent with their adopted Comprehensive Plans;

You know your Planning Code is not working if it has no provision for authorizing urban growth boundaries;

You know your Planning Code is not working if it fails to define relationships between County and Municipal Plans;

You know your Planning Code is not working if every municipality is required to provide for every type and category of land use; and

You knowing your Planning Code is not working if our planning and growth management efforts continue to promote sprawl and prevent the recycling of our existing urban centers.

It is neither fair nor accurate to place all of the burden for our land use and growth management concerns at the doorstep of the state. At the county and municipal level we should be doing more with the tools that we already have. The earlier analysis of the use or perhaps more accurately the non-use of the available development controls certainly support that contention. Probably the most disquieting was the information as to the use of effective agricultural zoning. The absence of this technique in many areas in the Region means that there are huge areas that can be chopped up into one-acre lots without limitation. This is your recipe for continued sprawl. Also at the local level, it is very hard to understand why we have been able to think and act regionally on such issues as law enforcement, sewerage facilities, solid waste, and transit at least in a limited way, but we cannot seem to project that same approach to issues of planning and zoning.

Recently this writer participated in a community workshop involving residents from several
municipalities in the southeastern part of York County. It was a problem identification/visioning process. It was interesting to see how frequently the topic of regional approaches to planning and zoning came up as an area of interest. Are the answers already out there but we are just not hearing them?

And finally, it needs to be pointed out that the planning practitioners need to become more direct and forthcoming. Too much of the planning advice that is going to our elected officials is coming from engineers, attorneys, architects, and developers. Our governing officials also need a perspective that can give a view of the long term consequences of land use actions from people that are trained in that area.

Is there light at the end of the tunnel? Perhaps. The initiative of the 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania is a step in the right direction, as is the Regional Summit. There is also an initiative in York where a group of private sector leaders called Better York are reaching out to their peers in other cities in the state to build a coalition to address matters of this sort. All of these actions would seem to have the common theme of building a broad constituency to impact these concerns.

Should we be worried? Yes indeed, because it does not seem to be getting any easier. In York County the development activity of the first four years of the 1990's as measured by building permit activity is more than twice the level of activity of the first four years of the 1980's.

This writer and others believe that there remains only a limited window of opportunity with respect to getting a handle on the tide of growth and land development that is sweeping across the Capitol Region. At some point, the pressures of growth will achieve a level of momentum so as to resist any type of management efforts. That time is getting close and the clock is ticking.
Remarks by Warren H. Haggerty
Hamilton Consulting, Inc.

Municipal Infrastructure and Services

I. Introductory Remarks
I want to begin my presentation by offering my most sincere congratulations on having this seminar in the first place. It is amazing that an eight county area with all its municipalities and institutions can come together to focus on areas of mutual and pressing concern such as those listed in the program.

I suppose I have been invited to be a presenter here because I now fit the criteria of having expertise. I am a former Mayor and I am more than 50 miles outside my hometown. If this conference were in Reading, I would just be the ex-Mayor.

In my hometown, we are happy if the City of Reading and the Borough of West Reading communicate on traffic control coordination during the peak outlet season, or if the folks in City Hall can engage in any prolonged discussion with the folks in the Court House without it degenerating into a finger pointing, name calling shouting match.

But I am truly delighted to be here to discuss with you the importance of regional thinking, regional planning, regional coordination, and regional vision. For no matter how vibrant or impacted, how affluent or modest, how new or mature our individual communities may be--whether we live in a city, a borough or a township, whether we reside in a new development or an historic district, whether we work at home, in a downtown office, a suburban shopping mall, or on a farm--the fact remains that no community is an island, no community is self sufficient, no community can develop or even exist without carefully considering how it fits into a larger regional dynamic.

When people ask for a compelling reason as to why regional cooperation, thinking, and action are so important, the response should be simple and straightforward. When the history of our time is written, the defining phenomenon of the latter years of the twentieth century will be the emergence of the global economy. Since regions will be the new units of economic competition, strategies for regional cooperation are essential. All the key resources on which we depend to produce our goods and services--such as labor force, transportation, infrastructure and environment--do not respect nor coincide with the corporate limits of individual municipalities; they are regional in scope.

A similar conference to today's proceedings, held last year in the greater Philadelphia area, summed up this phenomenon succinctly in its introductory materials when it stated that "Regional cooperation is not an issue of what we should do in the sense of 'wouldn't it be a nice thing if we all worked together,' but what we must do to succeed in a fiercely competitive world economy characterized by free trade, revolutionary breakthroughs in communications technology and global capital markets."

For local decision makers in both the private and public sectors, the requirement to engage
in strategic thinking and planning has become increasingly acute.

There is no doubt that for many communities the notion of growth is not nearly as popular as it was a few years ago and, in fact, many have come to fear and oppose it. But as long as we keep raising families, as long as we keep trying to improve our standard of living, and as long as we desire all of modern life’s conveniences, growth is inevitable.

It is a routine practice of business to attempt to project what it will look like in the future. There is no reason why communities can not do likewise.

If we accept the fact that growth is inevitable, we must likewise work hard to ensure that the growth we experience is desirable. In today’s world that means growth that promotes the preservation of environmental quality. I have heard it described this way and to me it makes a great deal of sense: a weed patch represents growth but it is wild unplanned and uncontrolled; a garden also represents growth but its planned, predictable and nurtured. Growth can be desirable if it develops according to a plan that balances the growth of the entire area’s social, economic, political, and man-made and natural environments.

Three broad goals and values should be intrinsic to our thinking and hopefully should inform our discussion:

1. It must be recognized that infrastructure development must be ongoing if we are to continue to provide jobs and livelihoods to the people of this region so that they may provide for their families.

2. The development of each community within the region must be well planned, orderly, and done within the framework of the larger regional initiative and vision.

3. Adequate consideration must be given to all possible impacts of growth so that everyone can recognize both the benefits and costs of particular actions and be afforded the opportunity to voice their opinions.

II. Infrastructure

My presentation today will attempt to focus on the particular challenges of planning, coordinating and funding the thread that holds this all together: infrastructure. By necessity, however, the presentation will veer off into many of the topics that are the subject of other portions of the conference, but the interrelatedness of all these topics really prevents any one area from being considered in a vacuum.

Let us take a moment to frame our definition of just what we mean when we use the term infrastructure. Of course, the term refers to roads, bridges, water, and sewer facilities. But in today’s world, we must expand our definition to include: housing, and in particular, affordable housing; cultural facilities; stadiums; and public assembly halls; airports; parking
facilities; telecommunication systems; landfills; public transit systems; hospitals; schools; playgrounds; open space; and other recreational facilities.

We must also further expand our definition to consider human service needs such as child care, public safety, employment, and job training initiatives. In short, just as infrastructure supports the physical make up of our communities, so too does infrastructure support the human element. Infrastructure, in a real sense, can be viewed as the support system for what we call an area’s quality of life.

The interrelationship of our communities human and physical needs then must be at the forefront of our thinking as we design how our communities will support that infrastructure currently in place and plan for that which we will need in the future.

A. American Development Patterns
As early as the 19th century, those who could afford to live where they wanted to began the outward push from the urban core to the periphery in search of open land. The United States Census Bureau made it official in 1990: America is now a suburban nation. No other country on earth, not even those that share many of America’s patterns of development, have deconcentrated so quickly, so relentlessly, or so thoroughly.

Not only have we spread out in terms of our residential patterns, but also in the distance we reside from our places of employment. According to recent census figures, the average American commuted nearly ten miles and spent over a half hour each way traveling to and from work. In larger metropolitan areas these figures are even higher.

I am certain that for many of you this news is not shocking at all. In fact, many of you probably live this experience every day and, if you do not personally experience it, I am sure you know many people who do.

Although I reside one county to the east of the area of Pennsylvania that is the subject of this conference, we share many of the benefits and concerns that are the focus of this regional summit. We all are fortunate to live in a growing, diverse, and dynamic part of the Commonwealth. Unfortunately, not all of Pennsylvania’s communities can make that claim. But with growth comes a new and unique set of challenges.

B. Local Government Capacity and Fragmentation
Let us face it, we are all concerned about how the region and our own communities are evolving or we would not be here today. No matter what position we hold, or how satisfied we are with the quality of life of our own community, there is that nagging feeling that things cannot keep going the way they have. The continued loss of farms and open space to sprawling development, the roads and bridges that continue to deteriorate from deferred maintenance, the once sturdy houses in neighborhoods many of us grew up in that are now showing their age -- even while the old neighborhood has undergone such a fundamental change that we barely recognize it any longer -- the overburdened sewage treatment facility, the threatened water table, the shuttered manufacturing plant, the vacant storefronts, the ever rising tax bill, all remind us
that we must do better if we wish to preserve our environment and quality of life for our children and grandchildren as well.

Anthony Downs has written persuasively on the need for greater and more importantly, workable, municipal interdependence in the face of today's enormous infrastructure challenges.

He suggests several mechanisms for overcoming local governance fragmentation in an effort to enhance planning of and financing for infrastructure maintenance and development including: voluntary cooperation among local governments; greater intervention of state government; joint public/private planning, promotion and development agencies; functionally specialized regional agencies; and federally required regional agencies.

Downs recognizes that despite the numerous regional challenges we face, there remains substantial support for continued fragmentation of local government. He, therefore, suggests a regional policy focus by embedding the fragmented land use powers of local governments in a broader framework established by state government, thereby leaving most of the powers in the hands of local government officials. But by placing those powers within the larger framework of a metropolitan area, coordination among communities may be enhanced.

The elements of the framework should include:

- Common goals for local planning and policies drafted by the state legislature;
- Uniform local government planning requirements, including comprehensive citizen participation;
- Initial preparation and any revision of land use plans by local governments;
- A single coordinating agency with powers to review local plans and suggest revisions while coordinating the plans of state government agencies with such locally adopted plans; and
- An evaluation and reporting procedure to produce periodic reports on the effectiveness of the system.

Some may interpret such a prescription as a weakening of local decision making, but in essence, it could actually enhance local decision making by coordinating growth planning and infrastructure development throughout the entire metropolitan area. The notion was expressed most succinctly in a story in the September, 1995 issue of Governing Magazine titled, "Cooperate or Die".

This is particularly important when we consider the enormous costs of building, supporting, and maintaining the incredible infrastructure that girds our modern life. It has been estimated, conservatively, that in order to merely maintain existing transportation facilities federal, state and local governments should be spending 40 percent more than they currently
are. And this figure relates only to transportation, it does not begin to take into account the requirements for upgrading water and wastewater plants or for the growing needs of the telecommunications infrastructure. Municipal spending on environmental concerns is expected to double within this decade.

For those of you that are involved in government at any level, I would simply ask you where you might begin to look for this type of revenue. For those of you in elected office, think about what your re-election strategy would be with figures like that hanging over your head.

C. Toward Practical Solutions

It used to be a fairly straightforward process to fund infrastructure. Utilize state and federal grants, float municipal bonds and tap other sources of local funds to finance the construction, expansion or rehabilitation of public facilities. However, due to shrinking government assistance programs, multiplying environmental considerations, escalating costs, and increasing tax payer discontent, it is not quite so straightforward any longer.

We have already discussed the need for local governments to work collectively toward solving regional infrastructure problems from a planning perspective, but how might they implement such a vision in terms of practical infrastructure strategies?

The most common method of providing a regional utility service is through a single municipality or one leased from an authority. It is straightforward and usually involves only a simple contract and local ordinances granting rights-of-way in the participating jurisdictions. However, it is subject to continuing PUC regulations and review for services provided outside its boundaries and this can pose a particular problem in raising necessary revenues in a timely fashion when upgrades or expansions are required.

By changing from a lease back to an operating authority, the system is freed from such PUC regulation. The temptation to charge excessive rates can be mitigated in the financing documents through which all the authority’s revenues are pledged and which limits the use of surplus funds.

Variations on this theme include long term intermunicipal contracts and the creation of joint operating authorities which oversee plant operations and collection or distribution systems.

The more integrated the approach, the greater the economies of scale as more extensive interconnection of facilities occur and more efficient use of personnel is achieved. Particularly in areas such as the south central Pennsylvania region, to the extent that continued growth is anticipated, there is a compelling argument for creating a coordinated system that not only supports growth where it has occurred but also directs growth to those areas where it is anticipated while protecting those areas where further growth is not desired.

Another technique that is finding increasing favor among cash strapped governments is
partnering with the private sector. Although it appears to be a relatively new phenomenon, Frank Borges, former treasurer of Connecticut observes that, "The private sector's role in developing the infrastructure of the modern economy was greater in the U.S. than in any other industrial nation. It was not until the 1930's that government at all levels began to play a larger and eventually dominant role in public infrastructure and development."

Public/private partnerships include a range of options from outright sale of public infrastructure to various operational and maintenance scenarios whereby the physical asset remains in public ownership, but the personnel and management are handled by the private sector. As states and localities seek revenue sources outside their local tax or rate base to finance the ever expanding list of infrastructure needs, partnering with the private sector has become an increasingly attractive option.

III. Conclusions
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has over 2,500 local government units. It is at once Pennsylvania's strength and weakness. By keeping local government relatively small and fragmented, local decision makers are never far from the interests and citizens they serve. Yet at the same time, these small units of local government are ill equipped to individually meet the infrastructure challenges they face today.

While its vitally important that regional coalitions form to chart the future course of their communities, there is only so much that coalitions can accomplish on their own. Clearly the time has come for a meaningful dialogue with representatives of state government.

The difference between infrastructure planning, transportation planning, facilities planning, and economic development planning in Pennsylvania as compared to many other states is the lack of state participation in growth management in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania has delegated all planning and growth management responsibilities to local government. This lack of a coordinated framework for growth coupled with the already fragmented nature of local government has resulted in a haphazard approach to land use and development within relatively small geographic areas with no consideration of how such development and attendant facilities fit into the larger regional dynamic.

State government must become a full partner in this process. The report of The 1991-92 House Select Committee on Land Use and Growth Management is still a useful document in helping to frame an appropriate role for the Commonwealth in this regard.

As a result of considerable public input from citizens, elected officials, practitioners, and academics gathered through numerous public hearings, 65 concrete, common sense recommendations were made to the General Assembly. Among the more salient for the purposes of our discussion are:

- County comprehensive plans should outline the areas designated for conservation of important natural resources and growth or no growth, in relation to planned infrastructure, such as highways and sewers.
County plans should also contain criteria for approving and regulating proposed land uses which have a regional impact and significance.

- There is a need for inter-county, multi-jurisdictional and regional approaches, within and outside of counties, with respect to sewage facility and water resources planning. Counties should be given increased responsibility for developing sewage facility and water resource plans.

- Counties should be required to consult with municipalities and solicit comment from school districts on an ongoing basis, but especially during the process of preparing or updating a comprehensive plan in order to ascertain where growth is anticipated and where additional infrastructure may be needed.

- The Commonwealth should develop additional incentives to encourage greater local planning efforts, municipal and county cooperation, participation and adoption of growth management programs and multi-municipal planning.

- Additional funding by appropriate departments and agencies should be made available to support the preparation and updating of regional, county, and municipal sewer and water plans.

- The infrastructure and public services needed to support a particular level of development should be available before such development is approved. This will ensure that such development can be accommodated without undue burden on the existing infrastructure and public services.

- State agencies should review their infrastructure investment policies which promote redevelopment particularly in areas linked to employment centers, a mass transit network and water and sewer infrastructure.

- The Commonwealth should maintain and expand dedicated funding sources to preserve farmland within the state and should consider the adoption of a comprehensive urban revitalization plan to reduce the need to develop existing open areas and agricultural land.

- The Commonwealth should initiate an in-depth study of water resources examining the impact of current surface and groundwater withdrawals, critical groundwater areas, and well head and aquifer protection.
Greater consistency needs to be achieved between state statutes and programs dealing with storm water management, solid waste management, sewage treatment, and highway planning.

Municipalities should adopt comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances containing provisions requiring protection of identified natural and cultural resources including, genuine wetlands and aquifer recharge zones, woodlands, steep slopes, floodplains, and historic sites.

For although I have tried to speak to the issue of infrastructure, in the final analysis a community is more than bricks and mortar. Its a sense of being, a sense of belonging, and a sense of place. It is people and neighborhoods; it is institutions and history. It is where we live, where we work, and where we raise our families.

As we can see from the list of recommendations and from the discussions we have been engaged in today, the work before us is critical. It is not easy. The various challenges will not be solved over night. But let us resolve today that we will not leave here without the firm acknowledgment that this is the beginning of the effort, not the conclusion.

The people of South Central Pennsylvania and indeed the entire Commonwealth, deserve our best collective efforts to place the energy, the enthusiasm, the vision, and the leadership gathered here today to work for them, their communities, and their future.
Remarks by Mayor Stephen R. Reed  
City of Harrisburg  

Finance and Local Government

The Federal government is decreasing and downsizing the role it has played in the past 35 years. Regardless of whether anyone believes such should or should not occur, the reality is that this is occurring and will accelerate in the coming months and years.

In many instances, with decreased funding but with no reduction in mandated responsibilities or duties, traditional federal programs are being turned over to the states and the states, in many instances, are passing them on piece by piece to local government.

There cannot be any question that the mandatory functions of local government shall be broadened over the next 10 years. But, as we well know there has been no corresponding attachment of additional resources from higher levels of government.

This circumstance will exacerbate an already profound problem which is specific to Pennsylvania. We have over 2500 municipalities across the state with 318 of them in this 8 county region alone. We have thousands of municipal and county authorities with 313 in our area. Add to this the number of independent school districts and the 67 counties, and we have over 6,000 separate and distinct governmental bodies, each individually and separately acting on issues and matters which, for the most part, are in common with one another.

Rarely are there joint municipal operations of any kind and the degree of inter-municipal planning and action is almost non-existent.

Opportunities for efficiency and the chance for cost savings through economy of scale are totally lost in such a system. In redundant, duplicative, and fragmented ways, the delivery of services, and their administration stop and start every few miles as we pass from one municipality to another.

With the advent of strip malls and convenience stores, with the arrival years ago of cookie-cutter designed housing developments, along with the attendant clogged highways going to and from such places, we have lost in many areas of the region any identity or characteristic that would distinguish one municipality from another.

A once strong sense of neighborhood and community has sharply waned as we gave way to the banality of a new existence where the car is king and everything we do relates to driving here or there.

In the places remaining that are largely untouched by these trends, the clock is ticking. The sprawl is coming for you, too, and, with it, higher costs and higher taxes.
Now we lose over 24,000 acres of farmland each year to new development in this eight county region. That is an increase over what was lost in earlier years. Unchecked, this pace will grow larger, as will its costs.

With this trend over the past 30 years, we have turned once bucolic and quiet suburban settings into the latest congested areas. We have created enormous demand for new highways, wider highways, new bridges, and wider bridges. With what has been spent to address such demand just in the past five years and what will be spent in the next five years, we could fix every existing street and highway in every municipality and have a thriving mass transit system, including rail transit.

We confuse the word development as always meaning growth. There is no question there has been growth in the region but the pace of development has been far, far greater. Its effect has been to relocate existing residents and businesses from one place to another. In its wake, we have devalued real estate, abandoned buildings, created concentrated pockets of social and economic problems, and given rise to the unwanted growth of the slumlord industry. Cities and older boroughs and townships have been bled and this trend is now expanding to their peripheral communities and will eventually go beyond.

Infrastructure built to accommodate larger numbers of users now fall to fewer to sustain. All while massive new costs accrue for the creation of new facilities and utilities and infrastructure to keep pace with the sprawl as it moves forward.

The combination of these things, the costs of new infrastructure, highways, and bridges, the loss of agricultural and rural areas, and the protracted social an economic stresses left behind present challenges for which there will never be enough public funds to address. And as these challenges take-up more resources, there will be far less for other public functions in the future.

Four of the top six agriculturally producing counties in Pennsylvania are in this region. Their agrarian base is clearly at risk and is diminishing with each year. Agriculture, the number one industry in this state and a key part of this region’s economy, is threatened with it.

All of this intertwines with finance and local government. It is mistakenly believed that growth, in and of itself, pays for itself. It does not. The Urban Research and Development Corporation of Bethlehem, in its landmark analysis of real costs of unmanaged growth and using data from the financial records of local governments and school districts in the state, underscored the high cost of new expenses in places where sprawl devours the land.

The word ‘progress’ gets misused. What has been profitable for a few has turned out to be enormously expensive for most others and for their successors.

When the average commute goes from the present 20 minutes to 1 hour, as is projected to occur in the next 15 years, when the costs of living start exceeding the region’s average household income, when it becomes too expensive and too long for businesses to move...
people and goods across the road system, when the areas 15 miles out from the current edges of development are no longer countryside and look just like the megalopolis everywhere else, it will be much too late to act. By then the crises will be upon us and the leaders of today will deserve condemnation for having failed to act in the face of such clear warnings.

Our vision should be practical. Economics should be a guiding principal. In a region with hundreds of local governments, each with similar duties imposed by law, there is plenty of room to reduce costs in our common functions.

In Pennsylvania, we have more chiefs of police than in all of Europe. Within a 10 mile radius of my office, there are 24 municipalities, 22 of which have chiefs of police. The cost this represents is over $900,000 in salaries and benefits and that does not count the expense of 22 different offices, cars, and radios and record keeping.

This circumstance is repeated throughout the region in practically every municipal function that exists: police, fire, public works, tax collection, zoning, planning, administration, and the list goes on.

No private business would ever operate in such a way.

This system, subjected to business management principals commonly used by the private sector throughout the country, is ripe for major cost savings, greater efficiency and a far greater capacity to adequately address the issues and needs that exist in common.

An outgrowth of this summit should be an effort in earnest to identify the ways we can save our taxpayers money by attending to the common functions of local government in joint and cooperative ways.

Our fragmentation produces other effects as well. With so many different local governments, we do not have the ability nor structure to adequately support public facilities of a regional nature. To the extent such things presently exist in modest form, it is because of the inequitable burden placed on a few.

The regional asset district legislation adopted for Allegheny County has proven to be a success. So much so, that the Pennsylvania Economy League now recommends it be allowed in other parts of the state. By eliminating various nuisance taxes, the county and municipalities now share in a common new revenue pool that is bolstering their economy and providing citizens with new and thriving facilities. It is an idea that holds clear merit for this region.

Local government can be encouraged to be entrepreneurial when addressing public needs. Not every project need be a drain on municipal tax dollars when creativity is applied to identify offsetting revenues.

The summit planning committee asked that I cite some instances in Harrisburg and I will
mention several.

Harrisburg, as with every other municipality and county, is limited and restricted under the state tax code in terms of the types of taxes that can be assessed and the rates at which they can be applied.

Worse, the state tax code grants liberal tax-exemption allowances which have become a particular burden for cities and older towns where tax-exempts have settled and expanded over the years. In Harrisburg’s case, 41 percent of all real estate is exempt from any form of taxation under state law and that is down from when the majority of property was exempt. Legislation now pending in the General Assembly which will adversely affect every local government and would substantially liberalize the tax-exemption allowance by allowing many more to go off the tax rolls.

Once largely dependent on taxes to pay for each year’s budget, Harrisburg launched a series of major capital investments to create new revenue sources. One involves the burning of municipal solid waste. In the incineration process, heat is mixed with the supper-heated water and steam is generated. Some is sold for use in heating homes and businesses while part is used to co-generate electricity, which is sold to PP&L and used to light residential and commercial buildings.

Another project involves the burning of methane gas, a by-product of waste water treatment. Methane gas is naturally produced through the anaerobic digestive processing of sludge at our sewer plant. When burned, it generates electricity, which is also sold to PP&L and the heat from the burning process is captured to heat our plant buildings in winter.

New sludge processing techniques have been devised such that we can process greater quantities of sludge in less time, while producing less volume of sludge for ultimate disposal. The city plant, which receives waste water from 7 municipalities, now also takes in sludge volume shipped to us by other municipal sewer plants and area industries because it is cheaper for them to bring it to us than to process it themselves. The reason is simple: the Harrisburg plant is large enough to do these things cost-competitively and through technology, produces new revenues.

To date, the Harrisburg facilities have burned 3.5 million tons of trash, saved over 7 million cubic yards of landfill space, produced over 360 million kilowatts of electricity, generated over 8 billion pounds of steam, and eliminated the need for over 300 million gallons of foreign fuel oil.

There are other examples, such as the city’s law enforcement computer system, which is shared with 36 different municipal and county agencies in 2 counties. And there is the city parks system, where the city sponsors a large number of major special events attended by tens of thousands from throughout the region and for which private sponsors and advertising dollars have been secured. Profits from just two of the festivals pay for the fall and winter recreation program for thousands of city youth.
In brief, the 1996 city budget of $81 million, only 20.5 percent comes from taxes. The rest comes from non-tax sources. Regional or joint facilities have the potential of creating new revenues that serve to offset a larger reliance on taxes.

Finally, perhaps the most significant point to be made about finance and local government is the compelling need to establish land use standards and growth management on a regional basis.

This region will not compete effectively with other regions of other states nor even with foreign countries if we cannot save our cities, towns, and rural areas or if we cannot get control of the ever-rising costs of new demand for transportation and infrastructure.

In the absence of land use standards and growth management in this region, every local government and every local budget will continue to be subject to forces and factors and trends that we failed to control and the quality of life—the cost of living and doing business and the natural resources, amenities, and character of the region that we so cherish—shall be sharply diminished and ultimately lost.

To this point I suggest the following as courses of action:

- Formation and funding of the Regional Study Commission, creating the structure to effect land use standards and growth management;
- Establishment of a Regional Asset District; and
- Cutting the costs of commonly provided services by joint endeavor can be the basis for an action agenda that evolves from this summit.

The time for us to act is really overdue. Let us seize this moment. Let us seize this chance.

I salute each and all of you for being here today.
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nation's top two financial awards, the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award and the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting, making Harrisburg one of the only four out of 2,460 municipalities in the state to do so. Harrisburg is one of the few, if not the only Pennsylvania city to have undergone no tax increases since 1987.
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Section III:
Resolutions Adopted by the Regional Summit

I. Study Commission

A. That the Regional Summit:
   
1. Supports and urges the South Central delegation in the State Legislature to seek the enactment of legislation establishing and funding the South Central Pennsylvania Government Study commission, and
2. That said Commission be directed to study the structure and functioning of government in the region and how it addresses various functions and responsibilities including those considered at this Regional Summit.

B. Comments/"Stumbling Blocks" from Summit "break-out" session:

1. Cost of Study Commission.
2. Loss of local control & voter representation; conflicting local government interest.
3. Parochialism.
4. Another layer of bureaucracy.
5. One municipality subsidizing another (urban vs. suburban).
6. Passage by Legislature.

C. Action Step(s) recommended from Summit "break-out" session:

1. Public education and involvement (of) mass media, grassroots and stakeholders.
2. Cost-benefit understanding of how money spent; cost-effective nature of (Study) Commission.

D. ACTION AGENDA considerations for Steering Committee:

1. Review of position paper Frank Haas is preparing at a special meeting of Steering Committee scheduled for that purpose.
2. Determine any modification in draft legislation establishing Study Commission.
3. Schedule a meeting with Region’s delegation to State Legislature:  
a. To report on Regional Summit  
b. To discuss establishment of Study Commission
4. In light of outcome of foregoing, consider further activities for ACTION AGENDA.
IIa. Land Use & Growth Management

A. That the Regional Summit supports and encourages:

1. Communication and cooperation between and among municipalities, including counties, in the interest of addressing land use and growth management and other concerns from a mutually supportive local and regional perspective, and
2. Modernizing the Municipalities Planning Code in order to give counties more standing and municipalities additional tools to address the effects of the rapid growth now being experienced in south central Pennsylvania.

B. Comments/Problems expressed from several Summit "break-out" sessions:

1. Loss of prime farmland and open space; suburban sprawl.
2. Decline of real communities and sprawl.
3. Comprehensive regional watershed, wetland and flood plain protection.
4. Absence of state-level land use planning leadership.
5. Too many municipalities, officials and lack of education for officials.
7. Abandonment of towns and cities.

C. Action Step recommendation:

1. With respect to each of inter-governmental coordination:
   a. (Explore) ways to foster all governmental coordination
   b. (Seek) mandate from state government (encouraging/facilitating inter-governmental coordination).
IIb. Land Use and Growth Management

A. That the Regional Summit supports and encourages:

1. Communication and cooperation between and among municipalities, including counties, in the interest of addressing land use and growth management and other concerns from a mutually supportive local and regional perspective, and

2. Modernizing the Municipalities Planning Code in order to give counties more standing and municipalities additional tools to address the effects of the rapid growth now being experienced in south central Pennsylvania.

B. Comment/Problems...Community and Economic Development (One).

1. Lack of coordination of land use planning.
2. Lack of political leadership.
3. Lack of effective modes of transportation.
4. Too many political subdivisions.
5. Intolerance towards change.

C. Action Step recommendations:

1. With respect to lack of coordinated land use planning:
   a. Conduct focus group or similar town meeting events to solicit citizen input and create awareness (and understanding of issues, concerns and opportunities).
   b. Focus on youth education (and its vision of community and region).

2. With respect to lack of political leadership:
   a. Reward "risk taking".
   b. Adopt draft Resolutions I and II.
   c. Encourage (establishment) of a South Central PA Caucus in State Legislature.
IIc. Land Use and Growth Management

A. That the Regional Summit supports and encourages:

1. Supports and urges the South Central delegation in the State Legislature to seek the enactment of legislation establishing and funding the South Central Pennsylvania Government Study commission, and
2. That said Commission be directed to study the structure and functioning of government in the region and how it addresses various functions and responsibilities including those considered at this Regional Summit.

B. Comments/Problems ...Community and Economic Development (Two)

1. Cost of "doing business"; government regulations.
2. Lack of regional land use planning and effective zoning.
3. Coordinated transportation plan (and planning).
4. Need for regional governance.
5. Reliable well-trained work force.

C. Action Step recommendations:

1. With respect to cost of "doing business":
   a. Legislative redress to change laws; self-initiatives at local municipal level (i.e., police services, etc.).
   b. Establish commission to address duplication of services.
2. With respect to coordinated transportation plan:
   a. create mechanism for regional land use planning.
IIId. Land Use and Growth Management

A. That the regional summit supports and encourages:

1. Supports and urges the South Central delegation in the State Legislature to seek the enactment of legislation establishing and funding the South Central Pennsylvania Government Study commission, and

2. That said Commission be directed to study the structure and functioning of government in the region and how it addresses various functions and responsibilities including those considered at this Regional Summit.

B. Comments/Problems...Community and Economic Development (Three).
Ile. Land Use and Growth Management

A. That the regional summit supports and encourages:
   1. Supports and urges the delegation in the State Legislature to seek the enactment of legislation establishing and funding the South Central Pennsylvania Government Study commission, and
   2. That said Commission be directed to study the structure and functioning of government in the region and how it addresses various functions and responsibilities including those considered at this Regional Summit.

B. Comments/Problems...

   TRANSPORTATION
   1. Funding.
   2. Improvement of existing transportation system (in light of) current use and future growth.
   3. Coordination of land use and transportation planning.
   4. Transit oriented development.

C. Action Step recommendations:
   1. With respect to funding:
      a. More dollars.
      b. More flexibility (ine expenditure of funding).
   2. With respect to other considerations:
      a. Is it time for mass transit?
IIf. Land Use and Growth Management

A. That the regional summit supports and encourages:

1. Supports and urges the delegation in the State Legislature to seek the enactment of legislation establishing and funding the South Central Pennsylvania Government Study commission, and
2. That said Commission be directed to study the structure and functioning of government in the region and how it addresses various functions and responsibilities including those considered at this Regional Summit.

B. Comments/Problems....

FINANCE

1. Tax reform.
2. Unfunded mandates.
3a. Regional sales tax.
3b. Expand tax base.
3c. Davis-Bacon Act.

C. Action Step recommendations:

1. With respect to tax reform, seek enabling legislation to:
   a. Re-evaluate income tax rate.
   b. Regionalize tax (burden).
   c. Eliminate nuisance tax.
   d. Reduce (reliance on) property tax.

2. With respect to unfunded mandates:
   a. Abolish.
   b. (Establish) cost-sharing.
IIg. Land Use and Growth Management

A. That the regional summit supports and encourages:

1. Supports and urges the South Central delegation in the State Legislature to seek the enactment of legislation establishing and funding the South Central Pennsylvania Government Study commission, and
2. That said Commission be directed to study the structure and functioning of government in the region and how it addresses various functions and responsibilities including those considered at this Regional Summit.

B. Comments/Problems

MUNICIPAL SERVICES

1. Lack of public support for regionalization of the provision of services.
2. Equitable provision of services regardless of tax base and management capacity.
3. Stagnant tax base for small municipalities.
4. Lack of long-range planning.
5. Inequitable distribution of municipal income in proportion to impact of development.

C. Action Step recommendations:

1. With respect to lack of public support:
   a. Inform the public regarding costs of fragmentation.
2. Provide incentives for regional cooperation in state/federal/private grant (programs).
IIIh. Land Use and Growth Management

A. That the regional summit supports and encourages:

D. ACTION AGENDA considerations for Steering Committee:

The foregoing listing of comments and recommendations presents an imposing and wide-ranging array of considerations. Their disposition should be determined in light of decisions to be made concerning the continuing of the Steering Committee (see Resolution III), the activities of the Steering Committee (including Resolutions IV and V), and the budget and funding support for those activities.
III. Steering Committee

A. That the Regional Summit:

1. Urges the Steering Committee of the Regional Summit be expanded to include better representation of the regional community to establish itself as a continuing body so that the agenda discussed at this meeting and its ensuing recommendations and resolutions are monitored as to their respective consideration and action, and

2. Attention be directed to convening Regional Summit II in November 1997 with a timely agenda including a report on what has happened with respect to those recommendations and resolutions adopted at Regional Summit I.

B. Comments from "break-out" session Structuring Regional Communication and Action:

Focus of Steering Committee (should be):
1. Communication.
2. Establish a clear vision.
3. Collect information from general public (with respect to goals, problems, solutions).
4. Make people feel like regional citizens.

How Steering Committee Should Be Organized:
1. Include more stakeholders.
2. Identify leaders for various aspects of the process.
3. Form sub-committees with expertise and interest.
4. Representation (in) make-up of Steering Committee.

C. Action Step Recommendations:

1. Systematic agenda, with priorities.
2. Establish clearinghouse for ideas that (are working) in the Region.
3. Have a series of events for sustained interest and involvement.
4. Review solutions tried elsewhere.

D. ACTION AGENDA considerations for Steering Committee:

1. In light of determination made concerning Resolution I Study Commission, address attention to a more formal structuring of the Steering Committee including:
   a. Membership.
   b. Functions/activities.
   c. Budget/funding support.
IV. Clearinghouse

A. That the Regional Summit:

1. Supports and urges the establishment of the South Central Pennsylvania Regional Clearinghouse of information, and
2. That said Clearinghouse be established in association with the Institute of State and Regional Affairs at Penn State Harrisburg and in concert with the Department of Geography at Shippensburg State University and such other colleges and universities in the South Central Region as may express an interest, and
3. That the Clearinghouse compile and make available information dealing with the Region's physical, social, economic and fiscal substance, both existing and as may be projected in the planning and development of its respective units of government and the private sector.

B. Comments from Summit "break-out" sessions:

1. See discussion of other resolutions for comments that provide a rich agenda from which to draw the activities for a Regional Clearinghouse of Information.

C. Action Step recommendations:

1. See discussion of other resolutions for Action Steps recommendations to establish a Clearinghouse.

D. ACTION AGENDA consideration for Steering Committee:

1. Subject to disposition of other resolutions, budget and funding support.
V. Meetings and Workshops

A. That the Regional summit:

1. Urges the Steering Committee to convene such meetings and workshops under its sponsorship and/or in association with other organizations in the interest of implementing the recommendations of this Regional Summit.

B. Comments from Summit "break-out" sessions:

1. See discussion of other resolutions for comments that support this resolution.

C. Action Step recommendations:

1. See discussion of other resolutions for thoughts as to particular meetings and workshops.

D. ACTION AGENDA considerations for Steering Committee:

1. Encourage other organizations and units of government to convene meetings and workshops in the interest of enriching the understanding and consideration of the matters addressed by the Regional Summit (i.e., Dauphin County, Palmyra Borough, Susquehanna Conference).
2. In light of determinations made concerning Resolution I - IV, identify and convene timely meetings and workshops.
Section IV:
Participant Listing by County

**Adams County**
James Marvin Behm, Chief Appraiser
Adams County

William Cameron, P.E.
Pennoni Associates, Inc.

Thomas L. Collins, Commissioner
Adams County

Ellen T. Dayhoff, Administrator
Agriculture and Land Preservation Board
Adams County

Guy Donaldson
Adams County Planning Commission

Robert Duncan, Vice-Chairman
Latimore Township

Grady H. Edwards, Mayor
Carrol Valley Borough

John Eline, Borough Councilman
Gettysburg Borough

Cynthia A. Ford, President/Publisher
Gettysburg Times

Victor Frank, Member
Adams County Planning Commission

Michael Helms, Extension Agent
Penn State Cooperative Extension

Robert G. Johnson, Township Supervisor
Union Township

Dale R. King, Chairman
Latimore Township

Francis I. Linn, Mayor
Gettysburg Borough

Lex O. McMillan, III, Vice President
College Relations
Gettysburg College

Jeff Mollard, Director
Office for Aging, Inc.
Adams County

Walter L. Powell,
Historic Preservation Officer/Grants
Gettysburg Borough

Bicky J. Redman, Coordinator
Solid Waste/Recycling
Adams County

David R. Rice, President
Rice Fruit Company

Richard H. Schmoyer, Director
Planning and Development
Adams County

Charles Sterner, Borough Manager
Gettysburg Borough

Harry Stokes, Chair
Board of Commissioners
Adams County

Robert Thaele, Sr. Community Planner
Adams County

William Troxell, Councilman
Gettysburg Borough

Robert E. Wagner, President
The Insurance Group, Inc.

Thomas J. Weaver, County Commissioner
Adams County
Margaret M. Weaver, Executive Director
Adams County

John R. White, County Solicitor
Adams County

Mark Wilson, P.E.
Pennoni Associates, Inc.

**Berks County**
Warren Haggerty
Hamilton Partners

Ralph Rhode, Econ. Dev. Consultant
GPU Energy

**Cumberland County**
Brad Adcock, Comm. Relations Manager
Sprint

Robert L. Amman, Jr., Operations Manager
PA American Water Company

Carl R. Anderson, Director of Missions
Keystone Baptist Associates

Dennis Wayne Auwer
Environmental Planning

Nancy Besch, Commissioner
Cumberland County

Ken Bishop, Chair
Transportation
Cumberland County

Bruce Bistline, Jr., Member
Middlesex Township Planning Commission

John E. Bradley, Township Manager
Hampden Township

John H. Broujos, Esq., Partner
Broujos, Gilroy and Houst

Eric R. Clancy, Vice President
Dauphin Deposit Bank

Michael Colop, Garrison Commander
U.S. Army Carlisle Barrack

Jill A. Connolly, General Manager
Carlisle Plaza Mall

Kevin Corcoran, Director
Entrepreneurial
CREDC

Timothy Raymond Costanza, Mayor
Shippensburg Borough

Thomas Davidson, District Coordinator
Congressman Bill Goodling

Jack Detweiler, President
CM Detweiler, Inc.

Fred D. Dillner,
Land Preservation Committee Member
Cumberland County

Rose Spataro Dillner, Member
Cumberland County Planning Commission

Thomas E. Enderlein, Executive Director
Institute of Public Policy
Shippensburg University

Robert Eppley, Township Supervisor
Middlesex Township

Steven J. Fishman, CEO
Carlisle Productions

Cheryn Fogarty, AICP
Planning Consultant

William C. Forrey,
Assistant to the President
The RBA Group
Dorsey Fry, Chair
Cumberland County Planning Commission

Charlie Gerow, Vice-Chair Planning
Cumberland County

Charlotte Glauser, Co-President
League of Women Voters

Irving Hand, Principal Emeritus
Delta Development Group

Mildred Hand, State Legislative Chair
National Council of Jewish Churches

Tony Harber, General Manager
Radisson Penn Harris Hotel

Curt Harris, Legislative Assistant
Representative Albert Masland

Jim Hoefler, Associate Professor
of Political Science
Dickinson College

Kathy G. Holtry, Chair
Middlesex Township Planning Commission

Chuck Johnston, Director
Business Development
PA American Water Company

Clifford L. Jones, Advisor

Earl R. Keller, Commissioner
Cumberland County

Edward F. Kessler, Member
Middlesex Township Planning Commission

Carol L. Kilko, Director
Economic Development
CREDC

Mary C. Lehman, Director
Shippensburg Area Chamber of Commerce

Peter A. Loeding, President
CREDC

Walter Lyon, Vice-President
Susquehanna Conference

Ann Durr Lyon, Professor of Sociology
Human Services Consultant

Chris Maxwell, Vice President
Outcomes Research
Healthcare Research Affiliate

Donald R. McCallin, Commissioner
Hampden Township

Joseph McCarthy, President
Susquehanna Conference

Nancy P. McCarthy, Member
Susqhenanna Conference

John W. McDermott, Councilman
Mechanicsburg Borough

Paul Mertel, Senior Data Analyst
Healthcare Research Affiliate

Edward M. Messner, President
Greater W. Shore Chamber of Commerce

Richard M. Miller, Chairman
Susqhenanna Township

Greig W. Mitchell, Vice President
Administration and Finance
Shippensburg University

Donald H. Mowery, President
R.S. Mowery and Sons, Inc.

Marcia L. Myers, Commissioner
Cumberland County

Terry Rickert, Supervisor
South Middletown Township
Nick O. Rowe, Regional Manager
PA American Water Company

Blaine L. Shatto, Chair
Board of Supervisors
North Middleton Township

Isabell Stathas, Commissioner
Hampden Township

John Ward, Chief Clerk
Cumberland County

Donna F. Wenger, Assistant Director
PA Blue Shield

Kirk Wilson, Mayor
Carlisle Borough

Barbara Wilson, Supervisor
Township Manager
South Middletown Township

Paul L. Zeigler, President
Zeigler and Zimmerman, PC

Dauphin County
Charles Bacas, Owner
Charles Bacas Consulting

Michael Thomas Behney, Director
Institute of State and Regional Affairs
Penn State Harrisburg

Robert G. Benko,
Executive Deputy Secretary
PA Department of Community and Economic Development

Anita D. Blackaby, Director
State Museum of PA

Anna Marie Breinich, Director
Community Planning
PA Environmental Council

Michael Brenner, President
Brenner Motors, Inc.

Senator David Brightbill
PA State Senate

John Bruhn, Provost
Penn State Harrisburg

Stephen R. Burke, CEO
Mellon Bank

Lois Caliri, Reporter
Central Penn Business Journal

James J. Carlin, Director of
Employee Relations
Hershey Entertainment

David Carver, President
York County Industrial Development

Beverly A. Cigler, Professor
Public Administration and Public Policy
Penn State Harrisburg

William Gregory Curley, Executive Director
Penn State Mont Alto

Dale Davenport, Editorial Page Editor
Patriot News Company

Marsha Miller Davis, Owner
Dasher, Inc.

O. Frank DeGarcia, President
City Council
City of Harrisburg

Senator Daniel S. Delp
PA State Senate

Robert J. Dietz, Executive Vice President
Gannett Fleming, Inc.
Nicholas M. Dininni, Community Development Director
Penna Power and Light Co.

David B. Disney, Partner
McNeese, Wallace & Nurick, Attys.

Elizabeth Dougherty, Partner
McNeese, Wallace & Nurick, Attys.

Robert Edwards, Vice President
PA State Association of Boroughs

C. McCollister Evarts, M.D., CEO,
Sr. VP for Health Services
Hershey Medical Center

James C. Everett, Executive Director
Susquehanna Housing

Stephen Fehr, Chief,
Planning Services Division
PA Department of Community and Economic Development

Mary Fifield, President
Harrisburg Area Community College

Kathleen Mary Fisher, Ph.D. Student
Penn State Harrisburg

Robert G. Garraty, Senior Project Associate
Penn State Harrisburg

John Paul Gaspich, Jr., Manager
KPMG Peat Marwick LLP

Ike Henry Gittlen, President
USWA Local Union 1688

Raymond L. Gover, Publisher
Patriot News Company

Valerie A. Grigg, Senior Urban Planner
City of Harrisburg

Barbara Y. Groce, President
Capital Region Chamber of Commerce

Francis B. Haas, Jr., Esq.
President, Harrisburg School District
McNeese, Wallace & Nurick, Attys.

Bob A. Hall, Supervisory Comm. Planner
Federal Highway Administration

William A. Hawkins, President
W. A. Hawkins Associates

John Raymond Heapes,
Senior Professor of Sociology/Human
Harrisburg Area Community College

Bob Heisse, City Editor
Patriot News Company

Norman P. Hetrick, Esq.
Eckert Seamans Cherin and Mellott

Gil Henry Hirschel, Planning Coordinator
Susquehanna River Basin

James Hoffer, Executive Director
Capitol Area Transit

Barry G. Hoffman, District Engineer
PennDOT

Jonathan Allen Johnson,
Senior Policy Analyst
Center for Rural PA

Jeffrey D. Keiser, Director Community
Derry Township

Larry M. King,
Deputy Secretary for Planning
PennDOT

John Kirkpatrick, Editor
Patriot News Company
Nicholas M. Dininni,
Community Development Director
Penna Power and Light Co.

David B. Disney, Partner
McNees, Wallace & Nurick, Attys.

Elizabeth Dougherty, Partner
McNees, Wallace & Nurick, Attys.

Robert Edwards, Vice President
PA State Association of Boroughs

C. McCollister Evarts, M.D., CEO,
Sr. VP for Health Services
Hershey Medical Center

James C. Everett, Executive Director
Susquehanna Housing

Stephen Fehr, Chief,
Planning Services Division
PA Department of Community and
Economic Development

Mary Fifield, President
Harrisburg Area Community College

Kathleen Mary Fisher, Ph.D. Student
Penn State Harrisburg

Robert G. Garraty, Senior Project
Associate
Penn State Harrisburg

John Paul Gaspich, Jr., Manager
KPMG Peat Marwick LLP

Ike Henry Gittlen, President
USWA Local Union 1688

Raymond L. Gover, Publisher
Patriot News Company

Valerie A. Grigg, Senior Urban Planner
City of Harrisburg

Barbara Y. Groce, President
Capital Region Chamber of Commerce

Francis B. Haas, Jr., Esq.
President, Harrisburg School District
McNees, Wallace & Nurick, Attys.

Bob A. Hall, Supervisory Comm. Planner
Federal Highway Administration

William A. Hawkins, President
W. A. Hawkins Associates

John Raymond Heapes,
Senior Professor of Sociology/Human
Harrisburg Area Community College

Bob Heisse, City Editor
Patriot News Company

Norman P. Hetrick, Esq.
Eckert Seamans Cherin and Mellott

Gil Henry Hirschel, Planning Coordinator
Susquehanna River Basin

James Hoffer, Executive Director
Capitol Area Transit

Barry G. Hoffman, District Engineer
PennDOT

Jonathan Allen Johnson,
Senior Policy Analyst
Center for Rural PA

Jeffrey D. Keiser, Director Community
Derry Township

Larry M. King,
Deputy Secretary for Planning
PennDOT

John Kirkpatrick, Editor
Patriot News Company
Beverly A. Portis, Executive Director  
Metro Arts of Capital Region

Enars Starks, Commissioner  
Swatara Township

Thomas L. Ralston, Sr., Mayor  
Mercersburg Borough

Robert D. Stets, General Counsel  
Milton Hershey School

Stephen R. Reed, Mayor  
City of Harrisburg

Jeb Stuart, Acting Director,  
Dauphin County Office of Economic Development

Tom Ridge, Governor  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Michael Sturla, Representative  
PA House of Representatives

David A. Schankweiler, Publisher  
Central Penn Business Journal

Robert Wayne Surridge, Assistant Provost for Outreach  
Penn State Harrisburg

Thomas B. Schmidt  
Pepper Hamilton and Scheetz, Attys.

James W. Szymborski,  
Associate Executive Director  
Tri County Regional Planning

Mark S. Schweiker, Lt. Governor  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Frank Tulli, Jr., Representative  
PA House of Representatives

Joseph E. Seibert, Senior Manager  
KPMG Peat Marwick LLP

Carol O. Vracarich,  
Acting Executive Director  
Harrisburg Areas Community College

Tom Sexton, Director  
Rails-to-Trails Conservation

Robert E. Watkins, Jr.,  
Administrative Director  
Alliance for Health Works

Tom Shaffer, Township Supervisor  
Upper Paxton Township

Gregory P. Wyatt, General Manager  
United Water of Pennsylvania

Russell L. Sheaffer, Commissioner  
Dauphin County

Suzanne Yenchko, Director  
AMP Incorporated

Robery Sitkowski, Staff Attorney  
City of Harrisburg

James Zeiters, Executive Director  
Tri County Regional Planning

William T. Smith, Council Member  
Paxtang Borough

Franklin County

David A. Smith, President/CEO  
David A. Smith Printing, Inc.

Warren Elliott, Chairman

Derrick L. Span, President/CEO  
Urban League of Metro. Harrisburg

Franklin Co. Board of Directors
Pamela Gaudiose, Coordinator
Franklin Co. Reuse Committee

George Ray Hurd, Environmental Res.
Penn State Cooperative Extension

John L. Iuzzi, Civilian Executive Assistant
Letterkenny Army Depot

William McLaughlin, Councilman
Chambersburg Borough

Robert P. Morris, Mayor
Chambersburg Borough

Gary Jay Norris, Borough Planner
Chambersburg Borough

Cheryl S. Plummer, County Commissioner
Franklin County

James Peter Probst, Vice-President
Farmers & Merchants Trust

Dave Sciamanna, President
Chambersburg Chamber

Edwin H. Sponseller,
Superintendent of Schools
Chambersburg Area School District

John Fredrick Stenger, President
Johannie’s Restaurant & Hotel

Phil Tarquino, Planning Director
Franklin County

Robert L. Thomas, County Commissioner
Franklin County

Robert Zullinger, Chairman
Franklin County Reuse Committee

Lancaster County
Ronald T. Bailey, Planning Director
Lancaster County

Thomas T. Baldridge, Executive Director
The Lancaster Alliance

James R. Cowhey, Chief, Current Planning
Lancaster County

Raymond D’Augostino, Jr., Manager
Borough of Mount Joy Borough

Marsha DiBonaventuro,
Economic Development Administrator
City of Lancaster

Michael A. Domin, Principal Planner
Lancaster County

Ronald E. Ford
Lancaster County

Carolyn Hetrick, Council Member
Elizabethtown Borough

Eric Hinderliter, Director Housing &
Community Development
City of Lancaster

Paula Jackson, Chief Planner
City of Lancaster

Terry L. Kauffman, Chair,
Lancaster County Board of Commissioners

Timothea Kirchner, County Administrator
Lancaster County

Edward Joseph Kraus, Marketing Director
Red Rose Communication

Mark Lauriello, Director of
Civil Engineering
Rettew Associates, Inc.

Sandra Monck, Chief, Information
Services
Lancaster County
Doug Wellington Pfautz, Councilman
Elizabethtown Borough

Phyllis Elaine Stellfox
Lancaster County Economic Development

Janice C. Stork, Mayor
City of Lancaster

Robert T. Swartwood, Township Supervisor
West Lampeter Township

Paul Thibault, County Commissioner
Lancaster County

Daniel C. Witmer, Pres. & CEO
City of Lancaster

Lebanon County
Lyle F. Beahm
Palmyra Borough

Cherylann Beattie Bentz
City of Lebanon

Robert K. Bowman, Chair
City of Lebanon

Fredrick F. Carpenter, Planning Chairman
City of Lebanon

Betty J. Eiceman, Mayor
City of Lebanon

Mauree A. Gingrich, President
Palmyra Borough Council

Karen L. Koncle, Borough Manager
Palmyra Borough

Jo Ellen Litz, Commissioner

Richard L. Mazzocca, V.P.
Palmyra Borough Council

Winifred W. McGee, Extension Agent
Penn State Cooperative Extension

Robert A. McNary, President
Lebanon Valley Economic Lebanon

Kathy O'Hara, Community Dev. Administrator
City of Lebanon

Rose Marie Swanger, Chair,
Board of Commissioners
Lebanon County

David John Turner, Township Supervisor
South Londonderry Township

Stephan Vegoe, President
Lebanon Valley Chamber

Allen R. Yingst, President,
Board of Commissioners
Annville Township

Perry County
Mark K. Keller, Chair,
Board of Commissioners
Perry County

Barbara J. Leach, Council President
Newport Borough

Martha M. McDermond, Mayor
Newport Borough

Herbert Robb, Mayor
New Bloomfield Borough

Gary L. Stouffer, Member, Community & Industrial Development Authority
Perry County

Washington County
Gregg A. Schwotzer, President
Crossgates, Inc.
York County
Sandra L. Butt, President,
Chamber of Commerce
Hanover Borough

David L. Clouser, Township Manager
North Codorus Township

Mary E. Coble, Township Supervisor
Monaghan Township

Timothy Crosby, Principal
Crosby & Associates A.I. Hanover

J. Reed Dunn, Director
York County Planning Co.

Michael F. Fenton, Attorney
Michael F. Fenton, Esq.

Terry R. Gingerich, Township Supervisor
East Manchester Township

Margaret Hormel, Mayor
Hanover Borough

Eleanor H. Krick, Chair Planning
Hopewell Township

Eric R. Menzer, Director of
Economic Development
City of York

Robert Minnich, President,
Board of Commissioners
York County

Joseph Robert Musso, Planning Chairman
Weinstein Realty Advisors York

Charles H. Robertson, Mayor
City of York

April A. Showers, Director
Bureau Planning & Engineering
City of York

George A. Tjiattas, Planning Chairman
Dillsburg Borough

Thomas E. Ulmer, Business Development
DynkePRO

Paul V. VanNoord, Chair
Township Planning
Heidelberg Township

Thomas E. Waltimyer, Chair,
Dover Township Board of Supervisors

Florida
John DeGrove, Director
Joint Center for Environment and
Urban Problems
Florida Atlantic University/
Florida International University
Section V:
Listing of Regional Summit Background Papers

This listing of background papers was compiled to provide information about the subjects to be discussed at the Regional Summit. If you wish a copy of a particular document on the list, call Mike Behney or Diane Ollivier (717) 948-6178 with your request. A photocopy will be made, at cost, and mailed to you.

Building It Smarter, Managing It Better: Infrastructure Conference Report  
by Penelope Lemov, GOVERNMENT Magazine  

Defining & Measuring Quality of Life  
Michelle Gregory, AICP PAS Memo a publication of the American Planning Association  
August 1996; 4pp.

Growth Management & Wise Development  
by Ronald T. Bailey and Phyllis Stellfox, Lancaster County Department of Planning/Lancaster County Planning Commission  

Investing in Pennsylvania’s Transportation Infrastructure: A Report on the Future of Transportation in the Commonwealth, State Transportation Advisory Committee  

Joint Economic Development Districts and Zones  
by Marya Norris, Public Investment, American Planning Association  

Options For the 21st Century: Southcentral Pennsylvania  
by Dr. Beverly Cigler, Professor of Public Affairs, The Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg  
October 1996; ??pp.

Palm Beach County, Florida: Why Regional Planning Failed  
Fernando de Aragon, AICP Planner’s CASEBOOK, a publication of the American Institute of Certified Planners  
Spring 1996; 8pp.

PennDOT User’s Guide to Transportation Planning & Programming  

Planning and Regional Development: A Case Example of Pennsylvania  
by Dr. John E. Benhart, Shippensburg State University and Robert A. Meredith  
Region 6 (South Central Pennsylvania): A Regional Development Reconnaissance Report - Pennsylvania State Planning Board  
July 1965; 38 pp.

South Central Pennsylvania Government Study Commission Act, draft of proposed legislation  

South Central Pennsylvania Profile  
Susquehanna Conference, September 1996

Subdivide and Conquer: Concrete, Condos and the Second Conquest of the American West  
Jeff Gersh, The Americus Journal a publication of the Natural Resources Defense Council  
Fall 1996; 10 pp.

Summary of Land Use Issues Forum sponsored by Pennsylvania Joint Legislative Air and Water Pollution Control and Conservation Committee  

The Need for Land Development Policies: Metropolitan Transportation Planning Seminar  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
December 1971; 9 pp.

The New Urbanism Challenges Conventional Planning  
by William Fulton, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy Land Lines (newsletter)  

The Promise and Politics of Regional Tax-Base Sharing  
by the Honorable Myron Orfield, Public Investment, American Planning Association  

Zoning and the Comprehensive Plan  
Mark S. Dennison, ZONING News, a publication of the American Planning Association  
August 1996; 4 pp.
Section VI:
Region at Risk Summit organizers create non-profit corporation

The organizers of the highly successful "Region at Risk Summit: have incorporated as a non-profit corporation. By becoming a non-profit corporation, the group expects to be able to provide a more focused approach when exploring regional solutions to challenges common among the eight counties and local governments.

The November 13, 1996 Region at Risk Summit, organized by a group of elected officials and civic leaders, attracted more than 250 representatives from an eight-county area who approved a series of resolutions related to common regional interests and concerns.

In forming a board of directors for the new entity, the South Central Assembly for Effective Governance has expanded its leadership to include more representatives from each of the eight counties in the region - Adams, Cumberland, Dauphin, Franklin, Lancaster, Lebanon, Perry, and York.

The new corporation is chaired by Harrisburg Mayor Stephen R. Reed. Cumberland County Commission Chair Nancy Besch will serve as vice-chair; Adams County Commission Chair Harry Stokes, secretary; and Lebanon County Commission Chair Rose Marie Swanger, treasurer.
The board has scheduled the next Regional Summit for March, 1998, at Gettysburg College.

Resolutions approved at the November 1996 summit directed the organization to explore current land use and growth-management practices, and to establish a South Central Pennsylvania Clearing House of Information. Plans are also under way to establish a task force to undertake a non-governmental look at the structure and function of local governments. The task force will attempt to identify areas for improvements in efficiency and cost-savings by combining services and improving coordination.

Work of the South Central Assembly is being carried out by numerous committees. Persons interested in becoming involved should contact the Institute of State and Regional Affairs at Penn State Harrisburg, 948-6178.
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SOUTH CENTRAL ASSEMBLY FOR EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE
CORPORATE PURPOSE CLAUSE

The purpose of the Corporation is to enhance the quality of life of the citizens of South Central Pennsylvania by seeking ways to improve governance in the region, in order to make it more efficient, effective and economical; to undertake studies and analysis of the programs and services of counties, municipalities, governmental authorities and school districts in the region; to examine new and innovative ways to deliver local governmental services, including those concerning planning and land use; and to recommend improvements, including cooperation among governmental entities, sharing agreements, and, where appropriate, consolidation; and to take any other action which may lawfully be undertaken by the Corporation in furtherance of these objectives, including sponsoring public meetings, workshops and seminars, the publication of newsletters and reports, and supporting legislation deemed necessary to achieve such objectives; providing, however, that the purposes and activities of the Corporation shall at all times be only those permitted by organization approved by the Internal Revenue Service under Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1968.

The Corporation is organized exclusively for charitable, religious, education, and scientific purposes, including, for such purposes, the making of distributions to organizations that qualify as exempt organization under Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, or the corresponding section of any future federal tax code.

No part of the net earnings of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of, or be distributable to its members, trustees, officers, or other private persons, except that the Corporation shall be authorized and empowered to pay reasonable compensation for services rendered and to make payments and distributions in furtherance of the purposes set forth in Article Third hereof. No substantial part of the activities of the Corporation shall be the carrying on of propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and the Corporation shall not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distribution of statements) any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate for public office. Notwithstanding any other provision of these articles, the Corporation shall not carry on any other activities not permitted to be carried on (a) by a corporation exempt from federal income tax under Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, or the corresponding section of any future federal tax code, or (b) by a corporation, contributions to which are deductible under Section 170 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, or the corresponding section of any future federal tax code.

Upon the dissolution of the Corporation, its assets shall be distributed for one or more exempt purposes within the meaning of Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, or the corresponding section of the federal government, or to a state or local government, for a public purpose. Any such assets not so disposed of shall be disposed of by a Court of Competent jurisdiction of the county in which the principal office of the corporation is then located, exclusively for such purposes or to such organization or organizations, as said Court shall determine, which are organized and operated exclusively for such purposes.
SECTION VII:
Breakout Session Summaries

Overview

The following provides information on the format of the breakout sessions.

The participants were assigned to a breakout session, as fully as possible, responding to their first, second and third choices. The participants were asked to please respect that assignment and attend the assigned session.

Each breakout session had a facilitator and student assistant to help group discussion.

Each breakout session had a flip chart, marking pens, masking tape, and a supply of index cards for scoring nominal group processes.

The facilitators’ main role was to solicit information from the participants and the student assistants’ main role was to record information as directed by the facilitator on the flip chart.

The format for the first five sessions (Community and Economic Development, Finance, Land Use, Municipal Services and Transportation) was as follows:

1. Introduction:

   The facilitator introduced him/herself and the student assistant and welcomed the group participants. The facilitator began the nominal group process as soon as possible.

   a. Group participants identified themselves; and

   b. An individual was assigned by the facilitator to give the three minute report of the group’s findings to the plenary session.

2. Nominal Group Process:

   a. The facilitator asked the group to consider the three most serious problems facing South Central Pennsylvania in the category, e.g. Transportation;

   b. The facilitator asked the group to silently generate
ideas in writing;

c. The facilitator solicited round-robin feedback from group members on each idea without initiating extensive discussion;

d. The student assistant numbered and recorded each idea in a terse phrase on the flip chart;

e. After all ideas had been listed, the facilitator went back over each recorded idea for clarification;

f. Group members then voted on the top five priority ideas with the group decision being mathematically derived by rank-ordering or rating by the student assistant;

3. Methodology included

a. Group participants were provided five index cards each;

b. Group participants were asked to write the number 1 in the upper left hand corner on their first index card, the number 2 in the upper left hand corner on their second index card, etc. for all five index cards;

c. The number they wrote in the upper left hand corner represents the rank of their choice e.g. 1 = First Choice, 2 = Second Choice, etc.;

d. The participants were then asked to insert the number of their First Choice from the Flip Chart lists on the middle of their index card, their Second Choice from the Flip Chart lists on the middle of the next index card, etc. until they had voted on their top five choices;

e. Group participants handed in the five index cards to the student assistant;

f. The student assistant mathematically derived the rank-order using the following procedure:
1) The Nominal Group Scoring Sheet (NGSS) were used to compute the scores;

2) Each numbered item from the breakout session's flip charts was identified in the left hand column of the NGSS (1 through n);

3) Each index card was scanned for the item number (which is located in the middle of the index card);

4) The index card was scanned for the choice -1st through 5th - (which was located in the upper left hand corner of the index card);

5) A tick mark (\{\}) was then placed in the proper "Choice" column on the NGSS;

6) The number of tick marks was then multiplied by the appropriate number representing the "Choice" (5 = First Choice; 4 = Second Choice; 3 = Third Choice; 2 = Fourth Choice; and 1 = Fifth Choice) and then placed in the appropriate column on the right side of the NGSS;

7) The numbered columns were then added to determine the score for that particular item; and

8) The five highest numbers represented the five most pressing problems in this sub-field.

4. The finished product of this session of the breakout session was the five most serious problems perceived in this sub-field.

5. Action Steps Identification Process:
a. The facilitator then solicited from the group a list of action steps to begin to address the problems identified above which were recorded on the flip chart; and

b. There was a ten-minute rule for each problem area where the facilitator spent only ten minutes on each problem area with the goal of completing at least two problem areas.

6. Conclusion:

The individual assigned (in 1b) to give the report to the plenary session then recorded the top five most serious problems perceived in this sub-field and at least two action steps for the top two problem areas. This was reported to the plenary session on predesigned overheads distributed at the Conference. For example in the Break-Out session on transportation, it would be:
a. Problem 1*
   Action Step 1*
   Action Step 2*

b. Problem 2*
   Action Step 1*
   Action Step 2*

c. Problem 3*
   Action Step 1 (if time allows)
   Action Step 2 (if time allows), and so on

* = Minimum reported to Plenary Session

The format for the Structuring Regional Communication and Action Session was as follows:

1. Introduction:

   The facilitator introduced him/herself and the student assistant and welcomed the group participants. The facilitator began the focus group process as soon as possible.

   a. Group participants identified themselves; and

   b. An individual was assigned by the facilitator to give a three minute report of the group’s findings to the plenary session.

2. Identification of Focus Process:

   a. The facilitator asked the group to consider what should be the focus of the Steering Committee to implement the ideas coming out of the Regional Summit; and

   b. The student assistant recorded the main ideas on the flip chart.
3. Identification of Organization Process:
   
   a. The facilitator asked the group to consider how should the Steering Committee be organized to implement the ideas coming out of the Regional Summit; and
   
   b. The student assistant recorded the main ideas on the flip chart.

4. Identification of Action Steps Process:
   
   a. The facilitator asked the group to consider what action steps need to be taken to accomplish the establishment of a Steering Committee; and
   
   b. The student assistant recorded the main ideas on the flip chart.

5. Conclusion:
   
   The individual assigned (in b above) to give the report to the plenary session was instructed to provide the main points on predesigned overheads distributed at the Conference from the three areas above.

The format for the Study Commission Session was as follows:

1. Introduction:
   
   The facilitator introduced him/herself and the student assistant and welcomed the group participants. The facilitator began the focus group process as soon as possible.
   
   a. Group participants identified themselves; and
   
   b. An individual was assigned by the facilitator to give a three minute report of the group's findings to the plenary session.
2. Nominal Group Process:
   a. The facilitator asked the group to consider the five most serious stumbling blocks to the establishment and implementation of a Study Commission;
   b. The facilitator asked the group to silently generate ideas in writing;
   c. The facilitator solicited round-robin feedback from group members on each idea without initiating extensive discussion;
   d. The student assistant numbered and recorded each idea in a terse phrase on the flip chart;
   e. After all ideas were listed, the facilitator went back over each recorded idea for clarification;
   f. Group members then voted on the top five priority ideas with the group decision being mathematically derived by rank-ordering or rating by the student assistant;

3. Methodology was the same as explained above.
### Structuring Regional Communication and Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Category</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus of Steering Committee</td>
<td>A. Keep up communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Establish clear vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Collect information from general public (goals, problems, and solutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Make people feel like regional citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How should the Steering Committee be organized?</td>
<td>Include more stakeholders:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Identify leaders for various aspects of process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Form subcommittees with expertise and interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Make up Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Action steps for establishment of Steering Committee</td>
<td>A. Prioritize/Systematic Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Establish Clearinghouse for Ideas Worked in Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Have series of events for sustained interest and involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Review already tried solutions elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community & Economic Development (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of coordination of land use planning</td>
<td>A. Conduct focus groups or similar town meeting events to solicit citizen input and create awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Focus on youth education (vision).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of political leadership</td>
<td>A. Reward risk taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Adopt resolutions 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Encourage south central Pennsylvania caucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of efficient modes of transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Too many political sub-divisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (tie)</td>
<td>A. Intolerance towards change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Lack of adequate regional plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community & Economic Development (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of Local Government Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inadequate Transportation Linkage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Growing High Crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inadequate Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fragmented, Outdated Local Units of Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community & Economic Development (III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cost of doing business - government regulations</td>
<td>A. Legislature redress to change the laws, self-initiative at local municipal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Establish commission to address duplicative service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of regional land use planning and effective zoning</td>
<td>Create mechanism for regional planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinated transportation plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Need for regional governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reliable well-trained workforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of intergovernmental coordination</td>
<td>A. Ways to foster all governmental coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Mandate from state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Permit and funding tied to county comprehensive plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suburban sprawl - loss of farmland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Abandonment of towns and cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Municipalities planning code outdated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tax reform</td>
<td>A. Enabling legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Re-evaluate income tax rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Regionalize tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Eliminate nuisance tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Reduce property tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unfunded mandates</td>
<td>A. Abolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Cost sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expand tax base</td>
<td>Eliminate/evaluate tax exempt status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Municipal Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of public support for regionalization of service provision</td>
<td>A. Inform the public regarding costs of fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Put incentives for regional cooperation into state/federal/private/etc. grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Develop good models for regionalization and expose them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equitable provision of services regardless of tax base and management capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stagnant tax base for small municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of long-range planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inequitable distribution of municipal income in proportion to development impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Funding--More dollars and more flexibility | A. Examine how funding is allocated  
B. Change state regulations to allow for impact fees  
C. Re-prioritize allocations/distribution  
D. Examine alternative models Oregon  
E. Have set-asides; More flexibility on the ways in which funding can be used  
F. Need more dollars and examine ways to get it  
G. More public/private partnerships  
H. Allow "areas" to "self tax" |
| 2. Need improvement to existing transportation system due to current use and future growth |  |
| 3. Coordination of land use and transportation planning (tie) |  |
| 4. Transit oriented development (tie) |  |
| 5. Is it time for mass transit? |  |
## Study Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stumbling Blocks</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cost of study</td>
<td>A. Public education and involvement, mass media, and grass roots and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Loss of local control and voter representation, conflicting local government interests</td>
<td>B. Cost benefit understanding of how money is spent, cost effective nature of commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parochialism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Another layer of bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. One municipality subsidizing another (urban v. rural)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Passage by legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>