



P E N N S Y L V A N I A LANDOWNER

VOLUME VII • NUMBER 4

NOVEMBER 1994

THE CANDIDATES

...who's your best bet for protecting private property rights?



Editor's Note

In an effort to apprise our membership of the viewpoints of specific political candidates relevant to private property rights and environmental balance, PLA asked the Pennsylvania gubernatorial and senatorial candidates of the two major political parties to respond to the following cover letter and questionnaire on pages 2 and 3.



As promised, Representatives Ridge and Santorum have responded specifically to the straight-forward questions raised in PLA letters of inquiry and those responses have been printed here in their entirety. Despite repeated assurances from various office and campaign staff personnel that specific responses to the questions raised in our letter would be sent in time for publication in this issue of the *Landowner*, neither Senator Wofford nor Lt. Governor Singel have done so by our publication deadline.

Mr. Singel's staff did fax a copy of his 8-page environmental plan and in effect asked PLA to determine the answers from that document. The plan does not directly address any of the specific questions posed to gubernatorial candidates and does not even mention private property rights. Senator Wofford's complete lack of response speaks for itself.

October 3, 1994

Dear Senatorial/Gubernatorial Candidate:

Over the course of the past 25 years, environmental regulations affecting the use of private property have escalated to new heights. Today, landowners, both large and small, find themselves being victimized by a regulatory process and bureaucratic red tape of phenomenal proportions.

Regulations governing wetlands, endangered species, natural heritage identification, and scenic river designations, are just a sample of regulatory initiatives where unelected bureaucrats have promulgated regulations either denying or dramatically curtailing the use and development of private property with little or no debate by our elected members of Congress or the General Assembly. Wetlands, for instance, are not even mentioned in the federal Clean Water Act or Pennsylvania Clean Streams Law.

Furthermore, property owners find themselves unable to utilize property they have worked hard to pay for, and on which they continue to pay tax, because of regulations enforced by unelected, largely unaccountable bureaucrats. Many of these regulatory incursions have greater impact on a landowner's use, value and enjoyment of his property than do legal and compensated takings under the Eminent Domain Code, but regulatory takings, purported to be for public purposes, rarely result in compensation for the landowner.

Today, more than 500 property rights groups representing landowners of all types exist to help educate our legislators and the general public about what has become a national tragedy...the loss of freedom to own and use property as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to our Constitution.

Property owners throughout the Commonwealth are looking for political leaders who will take the initiative in restoring common sense and balance to environmental regulations. Therefore, to assist us in educating our members, we ask you to provide answers to the following questions.

Sincerely,

Rhonda McAttee, Executive Director
Pennsylvania Landowners' Association



CANDIDATES



TOM RIDGE

1. Do you believe that environmental regulations have gone too far? If so, what are your plans to restore balance to the current regulatory program in Pennsylvania? If not, what new environmental initiatives will you promote?

The problems with environmental regulations are manifold. Regulations are mandated without the use of good science and sound risk analysis; promulgated without the up-front input from the regulated entities they will effect; often designed to be more stringent than federal requirements; and then implemented without a strategy to assist or enable compliance.

As governor, my priority will be to re-establish balance and fairness to environmental regulation. The Ridge Administration will regulate only where there is a "compelling public interest." We will ensure that regulations are consistent with federal requirements and developed using risk-based assessments and with meaningful input from all affected parties. Finally, no new regulation or requirement will be implemented without a well thought out compliance assistance plan.

2. The Environmental Quality Board (EQB) adopts new regulations, at its discretion, for the Department of Environmental Resources (DER). It is viewed by many as an elitist body which is unresponsive to the interests of ordinary citizens and property owners in Pennsylvania. Do you think the EQB environmental rulemaking process should remain in place?

In general, reform of our environmental regulatory process, as I have outlined above, is essential to restoring balance and fairness to environmental regulation. Legitimate objections to the actions of the EQB would probably be less critical if the DER regulatory process itself functioned better.

At the same time, however, I believe that the time has come when we must reexamine the role of the EQB, its place in the regulatory system, and whether the Board is any longer necessary. My administration will undertake this review as part of my overall efforts to restructure the DER.

3. The DER is the primary agency in Pennsylvania responsible for developing and enforcing environmental regulations. Do you feel the Department is currently operating in a manner which aims to protect our environment while recognizing and respecting private property rights? If not, what plans do you have for the future of the Department?

Like most Pennsylvanians, I value our treasured lands and natural resources and want to see them maintained for future generations. Pennsylvania's Department of Environmental Resources, however, has become a job-crushing, community-harassing regulatory nightmare.

Pennsylvania needs environmental partners, not environmental police. As governor, a major priority of my Administration will be to create a new environmental partnership that protects our environment without bringing Pennsylvania's economy to its knees. My commitment is to a balanced environmental program.

I have proposed a major overhaul of the DER. As a first step, I have called for dividing DER into two cabinet-level departments; one department to regulate and another to oversee our state parks and forests.

Meaningful reform, however, must go further to address the serious attitudinal and operational problems affecting DER. I have proposed establishing a new Office of Pollution Prevention to work with Pennsylvanians to help them understand and comply with our environmental laws. While we will be no less strict with willful violators of our environmental laws, greater emphasis must be placed on helping those wanting to comply to do so.

In addition to the regulatory changes that I have already outlined, I will impose decision-making deadlines for permit application reviews and actions; end the use of "underground" regulations, rules and guidelines that are being enforced against Pennsylvanians but cannot be enforced against the agency; and require more consistent enforcement by regional offices to ensure our environmental laws are applied evenly across the state.

4. Do you believe any current environmental regulations have the effect of "taking private property without compensation" i.e. resulting in inverse condemnation? If so, what would you do as Governor to uphold the Constitution which guarantees "...nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation?"

I believe strongly in the fundamental principle of private property. While in Congress, I authored comprehensive wetlands reform legislation that included, among other reforms, the requirement of compensation when a wetland "taking" occurred. The rights of private property owners must be protected in any government regulatory scheme. In the Ridge Administration, they will.

5. As a public servant for the past several years, what legislation, which has been enacted or which you have strongly advocated, can you identify to demonstrate to private property owners that you are truly concerned with protecting private property rights?

As I noted, while serving in Congress, I authored federal legislation to establish a comprehensive wetlands regulation protection program. My legislation would more clearly define wetlands, provide incentives for their protection and restoration, and would streamline the regulatory process.

At the same time, my legislation provided strong protections for private property rights by requiring compensation when a wetlands "taking" occurs.

6. The Keystone Recreation Park and Conservation Act of 1993 provides for a continuing yearly appropriation of up to 15% of the annual Realty Transfer Tax Collections for noble sounding "conservation and recreation" purposes. The General Assembly has abrogated its responsibility to control of expenditures of taxpayers' money to unaccountable bureaucrats. Would you support amendments to the Key 93 Act to require the General Assembly to again exercise its responsibility for these annual appropriations so that there will be fiscal accountability?

The Keystone Recreation, Park and Conservation Fund program, or Key '93 as it is more commonly known, is a \$50 million bond issue that was approved by the voters of Pennsylvania. The vast majority of

RESPONSE



the Key '93 monies will provide needed funds for capital improvements to our state parks, state forests, historical sites, zoos and libraries.

Given the nature of the projects covered under Key '93, i.e. capital expenditures particularly in our parks and forests, I believe that the bond issue was an appropriate approach for meeting these needs.

7. Would you advocate and vigorously support amendments to the Costs Act to increase the \$10,000 cap on the recovery amount to \$25,000 to begin to level the playing field for ordinary citizens when they become involved in litigation initiated by state regulatory agencies?

Yes.

RICK SANTORUM

1. Do you believe that environmental regulations "have gone too far?" If so, what are your plans to restore balance to the current regulatory program? If not, what new environmental initiatives will you promote?

Yes. Some environmental regulations have caused real injury to workers and landowners in many parts of our country and our state. For example, logging restrictions both in the Pacific Northwest and in Pennsylvania's Allegheny National Forest are threatening economic devastation to many working families. Also, confusing and often contradictory wetlands legislation has left farmers and land developers uncertain about how to proceed with the land that they own. Many environmental regulations cost Pennsylvania industries billions of dollars a year. I plan to continue my steadfast support for positions which will protect the property rights of landowners including support for the Private Property Rights Act and the Hayes-Ridge Wetlands Reform Act.

2. Currently, four federal regulatory agencies, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Soil Conservation Service, have input regarding the issuance of any regulated land use activity. This often results in conflicting information and answers given to private property own-

ers. Additionally, EPA has veto power over the issuance of any Corp permit. Do you support the continuance of EPA's veto power over Corp permit decisions and multiple agency involvement regarding these decisions? If so, please explain.

No, that is why I have co-sponsored H.R. 1330, the Ridge/Hayes Comprehensive Wetlands Reform Act. This legislation, introduced by Tom Ridge and Jimmy Hayes, would eliminate the EPA's veto power over land use permits and streamline the process. The bill puts sole responsibility for granting permits with the Army Corp of Engineers.

3. Do you support elevating EPA to Cabinet level status? If so, why?

Yes, but only with express safeguards that would require EPA regulators to examine the cost of environmental regulations. As you may know, legislation (H.R. 3425) is under consideration in the House of Representatives to establish a federal Department of the Environment. Final action, however, was delayed when the rule governing floor consideration of H.R. 3425 was defeated by a 191-227 vote. This unusual action was necessary, because supporters of the bill had blocked consideration of an important amendment to require EPA to examine the cost of environmental regulations.

I recognize the need for environmental protection and the important role of the EPA, and I would be inclined to vote in favor of this legislation. EPA regulations, however, cost American businesses, farmers and consumers billions of dollars a year, and the costs often far exceed any measurable benefit. It is my view that the new Department of the Environment must carefully examine the economic costs associated with their regulations. That is why I voted against the rule of H.R. 3425.

4. Do you believe any current environmental regulations have the effect of "taking private property without compensation" i.e. resulting in inverse condemnation? If so, what would you do as Senator to uphold the Constitution which guarantees "...nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation?"

Yes, including current regulations under the Endangered Species Act and wetlands regulations. Our founding fathers valued the right to own private property so highly that they crafted an amendment to the Constitution specifically to preserve the property rights of individual Americans against the interests of the government. I strongly support protection for private property rights, and I have cosponsored legislation such as the Private Property Rights Act (H.R. 561) and the Hayes/Ridge wetlands bill (H.R. 1330) to preserve the rights of property owners and restore balance in federal regulations. In addition, I have signed a discharge petition to bring H.R. 3875, the Private Property Owners Bill of Rights, up for a vote before the end of the legislative session. My record in support of private property rights is strong and I will continue to support private rights in the U.S. Senate.

5. As a public servant for the past several years, what legislation, which has been enacted or which you have strongly advocated, can you identify to demonstrate to private property owners that you are truly concerned with protecting private property rights?

I support H.R. 3875 which was introduced by Rep. Billy Tauzin (LA). The intent of H.R. 3875 is to prevent private property rights and applicable state laws from being superseded by federal regulations with a goal to prevent "takings." The legislation states "as new federal programs are proposed that would limit and restrict the use of private property to provide habitat for plants and animal species, the rights of private property owners must be recognized and respected." Accordingly, the bill outlines the process by which federal agencies must account for private property rights before issuing new regulations. Although this legislation has not yet been passed, I will continue to push for its passage in the U.S. Senate.

What is the SIERRA CLUB

Doing in Center County?

BY HENRY INGRAM, ESQ.

I can't help it but every time I hear the name "Sierra Club," my mind conjures up images of old John Muir, backpackers in plaid shirts, giant redwoods, Yosemite Park and way out West initiatives such as the California Desert Protection Bill (where about six million acres of land are to be forever "protected" against multiple use or even minimal development). You tend to forget that the Sierra Club has 550,000 members, a staff of 380, a \$43 million+ annual budget and a Political Action Committee which dished out over \$600,000 in political contributions in 1992. According to the editors of *Outside Magazine*,¹ the Sierra Club is really wired into Congressman George Miller (D-CA), Chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee and, now that Mo Udall is gone, the grand environmental Pooh-Bah in Congress (Al Gore may at one time have argued with that characterization of Mr. Miller but now Mr. Gore is only Vice President!). Although Miller is extremely powerful and definitely on the radical side of enviro-regulation, it is good to have him around just because if he is for something, it's almost a guarantee that landowners should be against it and you don't have to waste a lot of time reading draft legislation or watching the debates on C-SPAN to figure out if you should be for or against.

I was jarred back to reality the other day when I read that the Sierra Club had endorsed

Mark Singel for Governor. To Mr. Singel's possible credit, it was not a ringing endorsement but an endorsement nonetheless and I haven't heard that support from the Sierra Club was being rejected. I tried to overcome the sort of knee jerk reaction I experience when I learn about some new proposal of Congressman Miller but I have to admit it did get me to thinking.

First, I recalled that the Sierra Club was one of the ring-leaders in the attempt, organized secretly, to counter the Pennsylvania Wise Use Movement (read that to mean PLA and other like-minded organizations) which was reported to you in the April 1994 *Landowner*. Although we haven't heard too much about anti-Wise Use Movement recently, the self-proclaimed leaders of the Pennsylvania environmental community, including the Sierra Club, were at it again at the First Pennsylvania Environmental Congress held on October 2 and 3 at the State Capitol Building in Harrisburg.² The purpose of that get-together was declared as "Creating A Statewide Envi-

ronmental Agenda For The 1990's." Although it is not atypical for the self-proclaimed leaders of the environmental community to establish such overblown goals, you have to wonder about their timing. We're almost half way through the 1990's and they're just getting around to "setting the agenda." It's probably a good thing we don't get all the leadership, planning and vision that supporters of organizations like the Sierra Club pay for.

The only other time I read about the Sierra Club recently was in a provocative article by Gregg Easterbrook, a contributing editor to *Newsweek* and the *Atlantic Monthly*, in the September 11th New York Times Sunday Magazine under the headline: "Forget PCBs, Radon, Alar." To me, the article provides some true perspective on, for lack of a better term, "environmentalism" today. I urge everyone who is interested in the subject to read it and I will ask PLA to make copies available to readers of the *Landowner* upon request. Because of deadline pressures for this issue, only excerpts of the article are quoted here but I believe they eloquently speak volumes about the modern environmental movement without the need for further elaboration by me.

The next time someone mentions the Sierra Club, maybe my mind won't conjure up an image of old John Muir.

**"Forget PCBs,
Radon, Alar."**

1. The March 1994 issue which our good friend Don Nonneman was kind enough to send me and from which I obtained the statistical information about the Sierra Club.
2. Getting just a little pompous, aren't they?

THROUGHOUT the world, many more people die each year from filthy air and dirty water than from asbestos, dioxin, electromagnetic radiation, nuclear wastes, PCB's, pesticide residues and ultra-violet rays — the sorts of ecological issues that obsess Western environmentalists. Problems like dioxin and nuclear wastes are real enough and must be dealt with. But Western public consciousness and environmental groups continue to focus on such issues while all but ignoring millions of annual deaths from polluted air and water.

Dangerous air levels have become almost unknown in the West, but 1.3 billion people in the developing world live in zones of dangerously unsafe air. According to the World Health Organization, last year 4 million third-world children under the age of 5 died from acute respiratory disease, brought on in most cases by air pollution. This is about as many people of all ages who died of all causes that year in the United States and the European Union combined.

IN the third world, polluted air is more than matched by polluted water. Some one billion people lack access to drinking water that meets the crudest safety standards. Unicef reports that 3.8 million developing-world children under age 5 died last year from diarrheal diseases caused mostly by impure drinking water. In the West, diarrheal deaths are practically unknown; in the developing world, diarrhea kills far more people than cancer.

Yet such problems do not seem to be on the priority lists of Western environmentalists.

A large faction within the environmental movement concentrates on the comparatively minor ecological problems of developed nations in order to support the view that Western materialism is the root of all ecological malevolence. The low point of such thinking was reached at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. There, institutional environmental groups got the attention of the world and its heads of state, but what message did they choose to proclaim? That global warming is a horror. The sole environmental area in which the United States is the leading malefactor is carbon dioxide emission, which contributes to the greenhouse effect; in virtually every other ecological category, America is the world leader in progress.

To make Rio a fashionably negative event about Western guilt-tripping and America-bashing, the prospect of global warming was put above the urgent loss of lives in the third world from water and air pollution. Rio concluded with Western leaders' agreeing to devote billions of dollars to controlling global warming, while not lifting a finger for the 7.8 million poor children who die each year mainly from what they drink and breathe.

Western Environmental thinking has great difficulty coming to terms with such realities. That third-world economists would call propane and kerosene "clean fuels," and speak longingly of the day when their countries are wholly electrified like the West, horrifies Western environmentalists, or enviros, as they are known in Washington. According to ecological orthodoxy, fossil fuels are hideous and central electric

generation promotes an artificial greenhouse effect.

What developing nations need to free their populations from death by extreme air pollution is hydroelectric dams, advanced petroleum refining installations, high-efficiency power plants for the clean combustion of coal. But Western environmental lobbies oppose nearly all new central energy production facilities for the developing world, especially hydroelectric plants. Greenpeace, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the **SIERRA CLUB** and other major environmental advocacy groups are pressuring Washington, Tokyo, Paris, London, Bonn and the World Bank not to support the Three Gorges and Xiaolangdi dams in China; the Narmada River dams in India; the Bio-Bio River dams in Chile, and power dams proposed for Malawi, Pakistan and elsewhere. In most cases the campaigns have succeeded. The World Bank, for example, recently withdrew from the Narmada project.

Given the crisis in basic environmental needs among the world's disenfranchised, Western environmentalists and governments would do well to shift their focus from the ecological problems of the developed world. A dollar spent protecting the environment will accomplish 10 times as much in the third world as in the first.

Henry Ingram is Chairman of the Natural Resources & Environmental Law section of Buchanan Ingersoll, P.C. and has practiced law for over 20 years. Mr. Ingram also serves as legal counsel for PLA. Questions or comments regarding this article or any other legal issue may be directed to Mr. Ingram in Pittsburgh at (412) 562-1695.

GOOD NEWS

E.H.B. Rules D.E.R. Abused Its Discretion in Penalizing Farmer

On September 9, 1994, the Environmental Hearing Board (EHB) ruled that the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) abused its discretion in fining Chester County farmer Perry Phillips for \$21,000 regarding three violations of the Solid Waste Management Act, (*Perry E. and Jeanne E. Phillips v. DER*). The Board reduced the penalty to \$6,500 in-part, stating DER had given the farmer, who had a 7th grade education, confusing advice on what types of waste he could legally dispose of on his farm. The Board also stated DER could not rely upon unpublished policies to calculate penalty amounts without first having to prove the policies were valid.

The West Fallowfield township farmer was issued three notices of violation in 1989 and 1990 for burning municipal waste and burying construction debris. DER staff conceded, however, that the incidents did not threaten the environment or cause harm to neighboring properties. Based on the evidence presented, the Board concluded Mr. Phillips lacked the "education and sophistication" to fully understand the requirements of the Solid Waste Management Act and was confused by DER's advice that he could burn farm-related material, but nothing brought onto the farm.

Perhaps the EHB is sending a message to our legislators and regulators that they have an obligation to make their rules understandable to the lay-person.

Casey Administration Disallows State Employees to Make Charitable Payroll Deductions to Enviro's

In a surprising decision by the Casey Administration, a new ruling disallows state employees from making charitable payroll deductions to the Environmental Fund for Pennsylvania. Currently, 16 Pennsylvania non-profit environmental groups split the proceeds from these deductions, including the Audubon Council, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, PA Alliance for Environmental Education, PA Environmental Defense Foundation, PA Recreation and Parks Society, PA Resources Council and the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy of PA. In 1993, the Fund raised \$53,000 for environmental groups from campaigns covering 60,000 employees.

Rep. Brown Introduces Pro-Property Rights Wetlands Legislation

On October 5, 1994, state representative Teresa Brown (R-Crawford County) introduced H.B. 3130, The Wetlands Conservation and Management Act. The bill, which parallels H.R. 1330, proposed federal legislation by Congressman Tom Ridge (R-PA), Pennsylvania's republican gubernatorial candidate, would establish a fair playing field for property owners throughout the Commonwealth regarding wetland regulation. In addition to establishing compensation for regulatory takings of property, classification of wetlands by value, and a realistic definition of wetlands, all issues addressed in H.R. 1330, Rep. Brown's legislation also requires that wetland mitigation projects take place on

public lands, rather than on private, unless preferred by the applicant. It also requires that municipalities and affected parties be notified of any proposed mitigation projects so that a public hearing can be conducted and to assure that projects will comply with municipalities' zoning requirements. The bill also establishes funding in-part for mitigation projects and compensation for takings through one percent of the licensing fees collected by the PA Game Commission and the PA Fish and Boat Commission. The additional amendments were all suggested and supported by PLA. Hats off to Representative Brown for standing up for private property rights!

Senator Pressler Introduces Wetlands Bill Identical to H.R. 1330

Although the 103rd congress has only a few remaining days, Senator Larry Pressler (R-SD) introduced S. 2490, the Comprehensive Wetlands Conservation and Management Act. S. 2490 is a modified version of Senator John Breaux's (D-LA) wetlands reform bill S.1463, which was introduced during the 102nd congress and had considerable cosponsorship. S.2490 is identical to Congressman Jimmy Hayes' (D-LA) wetlands reform bill, H.R. 1330.

Upon introduction of the legislation, Senator Pressler stated he "wanted to introduce this bill to begin the debate for the new congress." He further indicated that he "will be reintroducing this bill at the beginning of the 104th congress and will work for its adoption." He has urged his colleagues to take a close look at the bill and join him in sponsoring it next year.

Additionally, in his introductory statement, Senator Pressler stated "Congress has never passed a comprehensive law defining wetlands. Without that definition, federal agencies have been aggressively pursuing control over private property in the name of saving wetlands. What the government should or should not be doing in this area needs to be clearly defined. My bill does that. It provides definitions that protect true wetland areas and protects the rights of private property owners."

BAD NEWS

Carnegie Mellon Sponsors "Green Industries" Symposium

On September 21, 1994, the Heinz School of Public Policy and Management at Carnegie Mellon University sponsored a "green industries" symposium designed to focus attention on Pittsburgh's potential to become a leading competitor in developing environmentally sound industries and products. John Gibbons, science advisor to President Clinton, delivered the keynote address. The symposium brought together international experts on "green" development speaking on a wide range of issues.

It's no wonder university students graduate with one-sided views when big corporate dollars continue to sponsor programs with the anti-development, preservationist philosophy in mind.



PLA members attending the recent "Fly-In for Freedom" campaign in Washington, D.C. are from left to right: Robert Brace, PLA Vice President, Lorraine Bucklin, PLA Assistant Executive Director, Nancy Cubbon, Executive Director Elect, Allegheny Hardwood Utilization Group, Roy Magee, Kimberlee Cable, and Mary Wirth, Executive Director, Allegheny Hardwood Utilization Group.

Fly-in For Freedom

For the fourth consecutive year, members of the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association participated with grassroots groups from 40 states in conjunction with the annual Fly-In for Freedom in Washington, D.C., September 17-21. In an attempt to balance property rights with environmental values, the nationwide movement exhibited an energized theme centered around participants' commitment that "democracy is not a spectator sport."

As the years have progressed, we have recognized that although diverse resource-based groups have individual agendas, a commitment to a common goal has become greater each year... a dedication to the private property movement. Legislators, media and the general public are beginning to listen to our message.

PLA Member Prepares for Hunting Season

Since big game hunting season is rapidly approaching, PLA member James L. Beck of Pleasantville, Pennsylvania checks to make sure his "Posting for Support" signs are clearly visible and in good condition. In an effort to protect private property rights, "Lowell" encourages PLA membership to promote land-use education and financial support for the organization. As a year-round participant in the program, Lowell is also promoting a silent, but highly visible lobbying effort every day of the year.



PLA Participates in Adopt-a-Highway Program

If you are traveling or reside in Northwestern Pennsylvania, you may have noticed the newly erected highway signs on Route 97 South displaying the affiliation of the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation's Adopt-A-Highway Program. The stretch of highway encompassing the two mile clean-up effort is located directly in front of the PLA offices in Waterford, Pennsylvania.



Mark Troyer (L), Jamie Bellis (C) and David Malinowski (R), employees of Troyer Potato Products, Inc., assist PLA in the litter removal project.

Congratulations!

At this time of year, PLA participates in several exhibits across the state and normally incorporates a promotion in our display booth. This year chances were sold on a very detailed, custom-made, solid hardwood toy truck (semi trailer) which was raffled on September 30, 1994. The delighted winner of the semi trailer (retail value \$150.00) was Vicky Holst of Harborcreek, PA. A special "thank you" to everyone who supported PLA through this promotion.

VOLUNTARISM...

...Is Always Needed!!

PLA is always in need of dedicated and concerned volunteers to help in the battle of protecting private property rights. Whether it be volunteering to recruit new members, assist for an evening at a local fair or expo exhibit, or speaking to grade school or college students about the abuse of private property rights, your help is always needed!! If you are interested in doing more to promote PLA and helping to protect YOUR property rights, call Lorraine Bucklin at (814)796-3578 to place your name on our volunteer list and to inform us of how you may be of assistance. When we're in need of a volunteer in your area, this "database" of volunteers will allow us to more efficiently promote the private property rights cause.

DO YOUR PART...BE A VOLUNTEER!

PENNSYLVANIA LANDOWNER BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Keith Klingler
President
Titusville, PA

Robert Brace
Vice President
Waterford, PA

Charles Bolgiano, Ph.D.
Lancaster, PA

Norm Clark
Springville, PA

Herman Espy
Spruce Creek, PA

Harry Fox, Jr.
Dillsburg, PA

Hank Ingram, Esq.
Pittsburgh, PA

Bob McColly
Ligonier, PA

Scott Miller
Warren, PA

Don Ranck
Paradise, PA

Mark Troyer
Waterford, PA

EXECUTIVE STAFF

Rhonda McAtee
Executive Director
Waterford, PA

Lorraine Bucklin
Asst. Executive Director
Harborcreek, PA

Pennsylvania Landowner is published as a member service by the Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Inc. (PLA)—Reproduction or use of editorial or graphic contents in any manner is welcomed with permission. To reproduce or to comment on newsletter content, change of address notices or subscription, requests should be directed to the:

Pennsylvania Landowners'
Association, Inc.

P.O. Box 391
Waterford, PA 16441

Phone: 814/796-3578
Fax: 814/796-6757

PLA Membership Categories

Please indicate: ☐ New Member ☐ Renewal

- ☐ **INDIVIDUAL I** 25.00
Any individual supportive of private property rights
(owning 0 to 15 acres)
- ☐ **INDIVIDUAL II** 35.00
(owning 16 to 100 acres)
- ☐ **INDIVIDUAL III** 50.00
(owning 101 to 250 acres)
- ☐ **INDIVIDUAL IV** 100.00
(owning 251 to 500 acres)
- ☐ **INDIVIDUAL V** 200.00
(owning over 500 acres)
- ☐ **ASSOCIATE I** 100.00
Any business entity supporting the free
enterprise system and the principle of private
ownership (local businesses in communities)
- ☐ **ASSOCIATE II** 250.00
Trade Associations (state organizations
supportive of private property rights)
- ☐ **ASSOCIATE III** 300.00
Major suppliers to land use entities (resource
development, construction, agriculture)
- ☐ **AFFILIATE** 50.00
Local or regional grass roots, non-profit
organizations
- ☐ **BUSINESS I** 750.00
Corporations or other business entities whose
activities involve ownership, use and/or
development of acreage in excess of 100 acres
but less than 500 acres.
- ☐ **BUSINESS II** 1,250.00
Same as I but in excess of 500 acres

Any land owning member (excluding Individual I) purchas-
ing PLA signs and participating in the "Posting For Support"
program is entitled to a 50% reduction in
membership fees for the current membership year.

☐ POSTING FOR SUPPORT PROGRAM

Yes, I wish to become a participant in this program.
Please send me _____ signs.

I have enclosed 60¢ for each sign ordered.

- ☐ I am a current participant in the
"Posting for Support" program.
- ☐ I am a new participant in the
"Posting for Support" program.

- ☐ **USA v. Brace & Brace Farms Videotape (VHS)**—
"One farmer's battle with federal wetland provisions."
\$15.00 donation.
- ☐ **Wetlands Videotape (VHS)** ☐ Part I ☐ Part II
"Our Environment, Whose Property?"
\$15.00 Donation each.

Please complete this information:

Name _____

Address _____

County _____

Acreage Owned _____

Phone Number (_____) _____

Township _____

How many acres of land posted? _____ acres

Membership Amount \$ _____

Less 50% reduction in fee if
"Posting for Support" participant - \$ _____

Amount of signs purchased + \$ _____

Additional contribution (If any) + \$ _____

Total remittance enclosed \$ _____

Membership dues and contributions may be deductible as
a "Business" expense. Please consult your tax advisor
regarding your particular situation.

Enclose form with check or money order payable to:

Pennsylvania Landowners' Association

P. O. Box 391

Waterford, PA 16441

Please allow up to 4 weeks for delivery of membership card.

Pennsylvania Landowners' Association, Inc.

P.O. Box 391
Waterford, PA 16441

Address Correction Requested

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 7
Waterford, PA