You ask me what kind of a job Carroll, Grisdale, and Van Allen did in the design of the airport and what kind of help we got from the old Division of Aviation. I think Carroll, Grisdale, and Van Allen did a fairly good job. They were hampered by a lot of things. One of them was that all airport design at that time was in a state of flux. The airlines themselves didn't know what was happening. There were several groups that had different ideas of how an airport should be designed. In the actual work as the work went on, we had a change in administration which of course brought people in with different ideas. They also were working with an engineering firm outside the city with which they had never worked before. One other factor which was fairly important and which most people have forgotten -- that was that the day when the bids were received for the major portion of the work the Korean War had just started and the Federal government had imposed controls over the use of materials in somewhat the same way as had been done in World War II and so some of the design work that had been done prior to the Korean War had to be changed because materials were not available. I've always liked Carroll, Grisdale, and Van Allen -- Roy Carroll particularly with whom I spent most of my time. One indication of it is that this very building in which we are sitting now, Walter, the East Girard Savings Association, was designed by Carroll, Grisdale, and Van Allen when I was chairman of the building committee here.

As concerned the old division of aviation, this was a small operating division. I think at one time it became a Bureau in the Department of Public Works. The head of it for a long time was J. Victor Dallin. Vic Dallin was an experienced flyer from way back in World War I days. He had great ideas and promoted the expansion of the airport and although I always considered him a friend and we got along ok, his knowledge of construction and design did not keep up with his ability as a flyer and so we had many problems. As the work actually went on in the actual design of the new airport, Vic Dallin was practically kept out of it.

Question 37 asks me to talk about the progress of the Water Department during the Clark-Dilworth years in the Mayor's office. There was no question about the fact that during the Depression years and the war years that the Water Department's facilities, or really the facilities of the old Department of Public Works for both water supply and waste water treatment had run down. One of the major reasons was that there had been little or no money for that particular work. People who wrote the new charter believed, I think, that the Water Department, or at least those two facilities because there wasn't a Water Department prior to 1952 had hit bottom and the only way to go was up. They did create in the new charter a separate water department still having most of the same administrative controls which other departments had
such as reporting to the Managing Director and to the Mayor and having to go to Council for their budget, but with the special provision that funds were to be kept separate and that the Department would be financed completely with revenues from water rents and sewer use charges. With that in the new charter and with that also having been an idea that I had had for a good long time -- and I had participated in an indirect way in the writing of the charter. I had no official connection with the writers of the charter. I think that I took advantage of it and immediately tried to establish the Department as something different from the other departments of the city. And of course we were different because our funds were separate. We did not have to compete for capital funds from other departments because when a limitation was placed from time to time on total capital expenditures for such things as police and fire and health and recreation in order to keep some control on the size of the city debt, the water department debt supported entirely by revenues was not under that same limitation.

The bonds that were sold for water department work were not revenue bonds in the true sense of the word. They were still supported by the faith and credit of the city, but I used to refer to them as bastard bonds, because being fully supported by the faith and credit of the city they also had to be approved not only by the voters, but by the court. Each year when water and sewer bonds were sold we had to go into the court and prove to the court that we had revenue sufficient to carry the debt service on those bonds plus all of the other costs of running the water department.

In the beginning Mayor Clark completely supported our program of acting as a separate department and later on, Mayor Dilworth did the same thing, and I have to say that Jim Tate during his time as Mayor did not interpose any objections to having the water department act somewhat separately from the rest of the departments of the city. I recall that my fellow department heads used to call me their rich Uncle Sam because they thought that I had more money than they did -- that there was no limit on how much we could spend. There was a limit and the limit was covered by another provision in the charter which did cause some problems in the early days of the Clark administration. That problem was this -- and it was unique as far as I know in water and sewer operations anywhere in the country.

The annotated notes of the charter pointed out that one reason that the department had run into trouble in the past was that the City Councils of the various years because of political pressures would not increase the rates in order to provide money and the annotated notes said that they would take that away from the city council and put it in the hands of an administrative officer who was a commissioner of the water department. Some of the political leaders didn't like the idea -- thought that these charges were in the form of taxation and only elected officials should carry out that particular function. But the charter writers thought otherwise and I tried to point out that
the control was still in the elected officials because they still controlled the expenditure by passing on the capital and the operating budget and that what I did as the Commissioner in fixing the rates was merely to divide the total amount of water into the amount that was appropriated and therefore come up with a price of so much a gallon. Now I hasten to point out that rate-making is not that simple. It's far more complicated than that. But the Council did control the spending by their budget process and then as an administrative officer I was under the duty of fixing rates that would bring in enough money to pay for that. What we did with the money that we had was this -- in the early years beginning with the Clark administration we started to completely modernize the three water plants and then as time went on we modernized the only sewage treatment plant at Northeast works and then built two additional treatment plants looking toward the treatment of all the sewage of the city. Construction and completion dates on these projects overlapped.

We did not have unlimited funds because as the bonds were sold these things immediately meant that rates should go up and I tried in the beginning to look at some or try to find a formula which would allow us to increase rates to a point where the people would accept them even though normally no one wants to pay any increased rates. But I thought that there was a point of no return, where if we spent too much money too soon that this would increase the rates to a point where there could be political problems. So as an administrator, I tried to limit the amount and I came up with what for me was a rule of thumb, and that was that expenditures should not be increased which would require a rate increase for water and sewer to be more than 25% every four years and we followed that fairly closely. I was practical enough to try to keep the rate increase away from the actual year of an election. That was just plain keeping trouble away from us.

In addition to the money that was needed for bonds we also needed money to upgrade the normal day-by-day operating procedures -- the maintenance work which had been again one of the reasons why we had so much work to do and we did use some of the increase money to bring the operating and maintenance procedures up-to-date. And as I said we did follow that general idea that roughly every four years we had a rate increase that was somewheres in the 20-25% amount.

Question 38 asks for some comments about my thoughts on the various city charters. I actually of course worked under the 1951 as a top department head and have some thoughts about that. I came to the city under the 1919 charter and did get up to a fairly responsible position under that charter.

My comment about them is this -- and I say this because I studied the various city charters and at times I have commented or written about it. We had the first real administrative charter, which was the act of consolidation of 1854. Then the famous Bullitt bill, which was approximately 1883 was another revision of the City government. An interesting comment on that is that a statue of Mr. Bullitt still stands on the North Plaza of City Hall and I...
would imagine most people today don't know who and why Mr. Bullitt is there. That was an improvement over the consolidation act, which of course was a tremendous improvement over the other things. Then the 1919 charter was another improvement over the Bullitt bill and the '51 charter again was an improvement over the 1919 charter. All of these things are steps forward -- I know that we can make steps backward -- but each of these was a step forward enacted within the political and limitations of the particular time. Enacted within the knowledge of government organizations and how much government actually participates in the life of the citizen. So it probably is not fair to compare any of these charters unless you put yourself in the position of what was the whole atmosphere of government and people and general knowledge -- technical, social knowledge at the time that the charter was enacted. We say that the laws of this country -- and we point with pride particularly at this time at what the founding fathers knew 200 years ago -- but we've made many changes, both in the constitution and in the law and even in the interpretation of the law as times go on. So that's the way I look at the charters of the City of Philadelphia.

Question #39 asks me if I would compare the periods of when Buck Sawyer was managing director and then Vernon Northrup. You'll remember that Buck Sawyer served the first three years of the Clark administration and then a month or two when he was suddenly taken away with heart problems and Vern Northrup only served for approximately 10 months. Buck Sawyer had been a student of municipal government. Vern Northrup's background had been in Federal government. Buck Sawyer was a civil engineer. Vern Northrup was I think a political scientist in general. So they did bring different approaches to it. I had known Buck before he became Managing Director and because we were both civil engineers we perhaps had a closer tie-in or ability to work with each other than with Vern Northrup. But I had as Water Department Commissioner I had no problem with Vern Northrup at all. And in later years when I worked with him when he was the federal representative on the Delaware River Basin Commission and I was the advisor to the Pennsylvania Governor on that Commission, I had high regard for Vern Northrup's administrative ability.

During the time when he was Managing Director, because water and municipal water supply and waste water treatment were something a little foreign to him, we had no problems at all. He accepted my recommendations. In the case of Buck, because he had knowledge of the work we were doing, I never had any problems in getting him to accept what we were doing -- the only difference was that sometimes I had to explain it longer than what I did for Northrup.

Question #40 concerns Tina Weintraub and my thoughts about her. I met Tina first when before the new charter -- it could have been 1947, '48, '49, when she was an assistant to Buck Sawyer in the Bureau of Municipal Research. Comparatively young woman. She had been a graduate of the Maxwell School up in Syracuse, and I think had done her undergraduate work at Stanford in public administration and she came in to see me at that time when I
was either Chief of the Bureau of Engineering and Surveys and Zoning or was Acting Chief or was Chief Engineer -- one of those particular times. I think Zane Hoffman was still around and I would say that we struck up a very interesting professional friendship that carried on during all the time that I knew her. At that time, in 1947 or '48, women were not accepted too well in positions of Government and for a young woman who was going around asking different department heads or different bureau chiefs what they were doing and how they were doing -- I have a hunch that she wasn't always accepted fully. From my standpoint I think that I talked openly and friendly to her and that carried on when she then became Buck Sawyer's Deputy Managing Director.

(WMP: Maybe you'd answer another question -- do you know how Tina happened to be in Philadelphia and go into City Hall with Buck Sawyer?)

No, except that I know she had worked for him in the Bureau of Municipal Research, but I don't know what the other side of the story was.

(WMP: It was really Bill Byer -- we raised some money for Bill at the Bureau of Municipal Research so that he could expand his staff and he selected Buck Sawyer and Tina.)

Tina became one of the two or three managing directors who served under Sawyer, Northrup, Wagner, and Corlettel (?). Generally she handled administrative work and the other deputy or deputies were involved in technical work. Although, this was not always the case, particularly in the tail end of the Tate administration and if I remember, Sawyer had Bradley as Deputy Managing Director and of course he was from the political side of the Philadelphia organization. But Tina learned quickly many of the technical problems and from my standpoint I enjoyed always working with her. We didn't always agree -- I can still remember once in a while when we would have technical disagreements. She would even say to me "Samuel" -- she called me by my full first name. But it was all very good. And sometimes there would be an engineering problem and I would go directly to somebody like Don Wagner and Tina would get a little concerned in some cases that I might be moving over her head. But from my standpoint there is no question that it was an excellent relationship and she did a very very great job for the City of Philadelphia and for these Managing Directors and I think that applies particularly in the later years for the work that she did for Fred Carletto in the Tate administration.

Question #41 talks about the separation of management and budget difficulties and as the question is written it says "did that separation cause difficulties that might not have arisen had the manager been given more direct budgetary responsibilities in regard to the operating departments. I think what you are talking about is that instead of the traditional city manager form, where the manager had all controls -- in Philadelphia we had a Finance Director who had control over finance. The writers of the charter
saw in Philadelphia, I think, a reason to have that particular separation and it did cause problems and has caused problems -- continues to cause problems. This does not mean, however, that it is not the proper way to do things because in a city of this size, with the ramifications of the work and of the political arrangements it might be a good thing to have that kind of separation. What is required in that kind of a situation, however, is for the Mayor to actually make sure that the situation doesn't get out of hand. That when the manager and the finance director can't agree on something that he makes certain that the matter is brought to him and that he resolves it.

I saw it myself at a lower level in the operation of the Water Department where we had design people, construction people, and operating people. Each with their own responsibilities. The real point was that after they had been unable to agree, if the operating people said that the design person hadn't designed the thing properly, or that if there was no resolution the job had to come to me for decision and I would guess that if there is a problem that it is the Mayor that has to act in a certain sense as an arbitrator and not necessarily to take a side between the manager and the finance director. He's got to be the final decider. I had problems, nothing major, but I can remember problems with finance where the finance director did not want to send a certain budget along, but where the managing director fought it out. I don't remember any real serious ones during the Clark administration, but I do remember some real strong ones during the Dilworth administration and by that time the former finance director was out of city service and was using some of his thoughts and ideas from the standpoint of a civic agency. So this is my thought about them -- in a small city I think the City Manager to have overall responsibility is good. In a big city, separate them, but make sure that the Mayor has full knowledge of both operation and finance work and make certain also that things come to him before they drag on too long or before they get out of hand.

Question #42 asks me if we've ever had management consultants review and advise us as to organization and administrative procedures. I'll give you a sort of combined answer -- first of all although basically I'm an engineer, I'd like to think that I've worked in problems relating to management. I'm sort of an amateur student of the works of Frederick Taylor and some of the other people who have done management work and actually have written articles on general management in the water field especially. So we did apply some good management procedures to the organization of the water department. At the same time I recognize that there is knowledge outside and one of the places that we used that was in relation to the 5 million dollar study that city council authorized somewhere around 1967 or '68 in several of the city departments. There happened to have been an argument between the director D'Ortona who was then President of City Council and Mr. Tate who was Mayor
and D'Ortona had this survey started. The basic study was given to Price Waterhouse and they many of these originally auditing firms have gone over into the field of management in addition to their auditing work. Price Waterhouse did bring in some other firms. Some work was done in the Water Department and there were recommendations that came out of it. Now practically all the other city departments pooh-poohed the whole report and I was critical -- there was no question that it was a somewhat superficial one. And in the Water Department I pointed out some critical items. In that report for the Water Department they claimed that very substantial savings could be made and some of the things that they had were items that we already had done. Some of the other ones were matters that in general policy had been considered and had been rejected. One of the items, however, which was not covered directly in the report and which we had, I think, discussed with him, was whether we could get better utilization of manpower. I'm sure we were the only department that did this -- that I had some preliminary discussions with the H.B. Maynard Co., a Pittsburgh consulting firm in the field of management. They had done a lot of work in industrial management; a small amount in municipal operations. And after a long discussion with them it appeared that although they said that we were running an operation in the water department that was as good as any around the country, both public and private, and better than most, that if we would use some real top-level management procedures that we could probably save 20% in manpower.

As a result of that we entered into a contract with them. Went to work on it and started with one division which happened to be the distribution division in the water supply division of the department and after a year or year and a half of that work we did show that we could drop 20% in terms of manpower.

Then we went over to the sewer maintenance division. There we also saved 20%, but in that case we wanted to improve operations so what happened was we improved operations by 20% without reducing costs. We tried it then in the clerical division and while it was a little more difficult to separate each executive or each division head from his own secretary, and in some cases to ask secretaries to work for more than one person, we did make some savings. So that particular operation was a use of management consultants. It did turn out well. Some of the material has been published in some of the journals and only recently after I saw an article by Dave Eastburn of the Federal Reserve Bank in the newspapers on the general subject of improving operations in the city, I sent him along some of that material.

(WMP: About how many people were employed by the Water Department?)

The whole operation ran approximately 1,500. It moved up and down from time to time. In the work that we did in this management survey, we worked on divisions at a specific time because each division had to be looked at separately. The thought that you can take some department and say we'll cut out 10% -- that type of sort-of broad axe approach to reducing costs is not the way to do it. You have to certainly handle clerical work entirely different from the group of people that are working in the field.
Not that the people are different, but the operations are different.

Question #43 talks or asks me to say whether the office of the Finance Director was helpful in dealing with City Council in regard to our operating budget. Here's an interesting comment about our budget. First of all, the procedure over the years generally was this -- that in my own department the budget started down in the operating branches, came up through the divisions with different people looking at what was going on, and then with my own budget officer and myself a real thorough look was had at the operating budget. This meant that when it went out of our hands that we believed that we had something that we could stand with and justify.

I'll go back to an old procedure the time when I was the Assistant Director of Public Works and John Niessen was the Director of Public Works and when we would have hearings before City Council and I was only the Assistant Director for two or three years. Mr. Niessen would let me do the testifying for the whole department and he generally had some extra things in the budget that he was willing to yield on. And then after I would testify and have our strong differences with the people in Council at the hearing, Mr. Niessen would then go in himself and make the adjustments and the result was that he got exactly what he wanted. I was, in one sense for those two or three years the shock trooper as it were. Without in any way being critical of Mr. Niessen's procedure, because I liked him and I worked for him and he always treated me very well, I decided in our budget hearings that I would as far as possible as far as I could control it -- that we would go into Council and through all the other procedures in a different way. That we would put those things in that we said were needed -- those things that were needed to advance -- and that we would not put any padding in the budget from which we would retreat. The procedure then was that the Managing Director's office would have a look at it, the finance department would have a look at it, and then you went to council. I would not want to say that the finance department was either helpful or was a hindrance in preparing it. They had their own ideas from time to time as to how a budget document should be prepared and we followed that.

In terms of finally getting the things through Council, there were people particularly at the Assistant Finance/t level that always were helpful in the final arrangements with council.

(WMP: What about the Mayor? Did he not review your budget?)

The Mayor had the opportunity to review the budget after the Finance Department did and in most of the years that review as far as the Mayor was concerned was not done with the Department head present, but was done with the Cabinet or the two or three additional people that were in the Mayor's close circle. I do not remember ever appearing before the Mayor unless it happened to have been for some specific problem.
Now when it came down to Capital program in question #44 you asked did the City Planning Commission give you difficulties at any time and my answer to that is a real no. We never had any difficulties with them. In the whole 20 years in the department we practically always got what we asked for. And I think there were several reasons for that -- that first of all the general limitations which the administration in all the years had put on total borrowing and I think I discussed this under some other questions did not apply to the Water Department because since we were self-supporting our debt did not come under the general restrictions. So that left us in a position where they did not have to consider our capital program as compared to others. That's a real good start to have -- the other side was that the Planning Commission staff was and I would say still is far more competent in the fields of (tape runs out) of the Water Department -- these things were primarily the building of new treatment plants. In nearly all cases the sites had already been selected and were fixed. When it came down to a lot of the other capital works, such as the replacing of water lines and sewer lines, we were the ones that knew which lines had to be fixed and where they were to be fixed and although we did keep close contact with the staff of the Planning Commission, we never had any real problem or trouble. Sure, there always are individual differences which occur from time to time, but other than that it was all right. You ask about the extra work that I did as emergency coordinator when I was assigned that work by Mayor Clark. The instigation of that was interesting. It started one Sunday at a little store at 7th and Cantrell in South Philadelphia. This was a store of some sort on a Sunday afternoon in which an explosion had occurred. The whole building had practically dropped down into the basement. Everybody ran down there with equipment. I got there for some reason or another. It happened maybe 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon. There was even one young woman who was in the telephone booth on the first floor. The booth dropped into the basement and the manner of getting her out, which happened hours and hours later, was part of the work.

The firemen came along. There were two or three people injured, there may have been some killed, I can't remember. The crowded streets there -- we had equipment pushed into the whole place so that you could hardly get injured persons out and in order to rescue the other persons the firemen who always do a real job -- they were taking this building apart plank by plank and I offered to bring some equipment in and do something. And so we brought our cranes and other work in and started on it and as a result of that I was named the Emergency and Disaster Coordinator and I had that job all the way through until I left the city at the end of 1971. It was an interesting job and as time went on it not only included work on such things as explosions, where as an individual person I had the responsibility of making the basic decisions. Such things as to whether a building should be pulled down immediately for traffic. I later on had the overall responsibility for snowstorm work and hurricane work, gas explosions, after an explosion would
wreck a few houses and the police would take people out of the whole row, which of course was the proper thing to do. Who was to say when everybody could go back. That's kind of a lonely decision because you only get two choices -- the right one and the wrong one.

(WMP: Sam, by what authority did you make those decisions? Was it an ordinance of City Council that set up the Emergency Coordinator office or were you just appointed by the Mayor?)

Actually the appointment instigated originally from the Mayor. It came out through an administrative order from the Managing Director that outlined in full detail. There were a couple of places that recognize the Emergency Coordinator in ordinances. The one I think about is the one that created the emergency streets under snowstorms where you were not allowed to park or drive without snow tires or chains during the emergency. There were fines and such things provided and in that particular case, the ordinance does point out that the person who calls the emergency as to when that particular procedure starts is the emergency coordinator. So the Council recognized that even though they were not the ones that originally created the office. It was done by a directive of the Managing Director.

(WMP: Who succeeded you in the role of Emergency Coordinator? Is there one today?)

There was some reorganization of that and I believe that Fire Commissioner Rizzo is now the overall person in charge of emergencies. Just as an aside, I'm back in the business because after I left the City, within a few months I became the disaster chairman for the Southeastern chapter of Pennsylvania Red Cross, so all of the work that the Red Cross does in everything from taking care of a family in a single house that gets burned out to a larger one in these five counties in Pennsylvania and then some overall area of Southern New Jersey in the case of hurricanes, I'm still the Volunteer Chairman for Red Cross. So I still play some role in it. I don't have to run around to every one of the incidents like I used to. In the roughly three years that I've had this -- and in New Jersey it's only hurricanes -- I don't have it for fires and explosions. In those three years there hasn't been a hurricane yet, so I haven't had to do anything like that.

In answer to question #46, yes I do recall that you and Buzz Whitehall were doing some volunteer work at the request of Mayor Clark which finally led to the creation of the Delaware River Basin Commission and that you were homeless for a while and that through your personal acquaintance and mine -- that is between the two of us that for the time being we gave you office space or gave you some chairs or something to sit on.

(WMP: When you did this, were you aware that I was persona non grata to Mayor Dilworth?)

Yes, I was aware of that. Sure I was. But I don't think that made any difference and if Mr. Dilworth ever learned about it this was the kind of thing that I would have been willing to face up with it at the time because at least the City generally was in accord with
idea of getting something started and since you were part of it that was perfectly all right. This was only a very minor risk compared to risks of that same sort that I have taken over many many years.

You ask me whether I remember that in initiating the undertaking that Joe Clark had recommended to the four governors and the two mayors that they name a leadership person not previously involved in the technical problems of water supply, but that Mayor Wagner had disregarded that by appointing Major Hughey. I don't remember that particular point, Walter. I knew Major Hughey for a long time. I think I first met him as far back as 1938 or '39 in the days of Inkadel (?) and when he was Chairman of the Board of Water Supply in New York City. Whether in that early very beginning that was a request that New York City disregarded, I'm not sure. I do know this - that as the negotiations went on it finally led to the creation of the Delaware River Basin Commission. This thing that you describe was not the first time that New York City wanted to go alone and didn't always play along with everybody else. Which happened of course also even after the compact had been enacted during somewhere in the middle of the 1960's during the drought years when New York City completely disregarded the Supreme Court ruling.

When you ask me whether Philadelphia was handicapped on the technical questions because of a layman on the Delaware River Basin advisory committee and you were the layman I think that we were talking about on this question.

(WMP: No, Joe Clark worked out the idea of the basin compact with Governor Minor and they both decided they wanted it to be a layman's committee. But Mayor Wagner, when he consulted with the Board of Water Supply, disregarded that request and appointed Major Hughey, so we had ringer amongst a group of laymen.)

But from the Philadelphia standpoint, you were one of the laymen.

(WMP: I was a volunteer for about a year before they paid me. I was never a representative of any of the governments. I worked for the advisory committee once it was fully formed.)

Looking ahead, or looking through two or three questions like 48, 49, and 50, let me comment on them on the matters involving those questions in general. The Advisory Committee, of course, was the first step to get going on this work and after the Advisory Committee had worked out a plan and if I remember the people you were of course involved locally, Hopkinson was involved in it some way, I think he helped to finance it -- we had a report that came from Syracuse from Roscoe Martin. When that came out there were in my recollection a couple of alternates that were involved in it. My own recollection is that Hoppy made the final recommendation.

(WMP: Hopkinson raised money to finance the Water Research Foundation we called it and they hired Jim Kearney and that group brought in the interests of the businessmen -- the big industrial water users. And the big water users were the ones that financed the Water Research Foundation excepting for one grant of $125,000 from the Ford
Foundation which was used to do a study at Syracuse. That's where Roscoe Martin came in and that study produced the proposal of the Basin Commission that now exists and it went through pretty much as the proposal was made.

I was familiar with that general work as it went on because the Water Department had an interest in it and then after the Advisory Committee got started the job was to write a compact and the compact was written again by representatives from the four states and two major cities. My recollection is that each of the cities had three representatives — an administrative, a technical, and a legal person — and I remember that I served during those writings of the actual draft itself as the engineering or technical person from the city of Philadelphia and those meetings were long. It was my first contact at that time with Bill Miller, who became the legislative draftsman of the whole compact. But there were long, long arguments during the actual writing. Entirely aside from detail, one of the important arguments that Philadelphia did play a part was the fact that New York City was insisting that it be a part of the compact and that we might also be a part of it as a city, but that if we ever wanted to bring the Federal government in it still had to be a compact in which the states only were involved with the Federal Government and one of the outstanding things about those negotiations was that they were conducted primarily by the four states and the two cities and the federal government was not brought into it until quite late in the drafting, and then miracle of miracles was that a compact like this which in other places where I've had experience, the enactment and approval by four legislatures and the federal government has taken years.

This whole thing was approved within roughly one year. Even though in the beginning Secretary Udall was not in accord with it. He did change his mind quite early. Incidentally, he was in Philadelphia about two weeks ago and I had a chance to say hello to him.

Question 54 you ask me whether I've been disappointed in the performance of the Delaware River Basin Commission. Considering everything I can't say that I have been disappointed. During practically all of its life, all except perhaps the first year, but then through 19 other years I became the advisor to the government of Pennsylvania. Under the compact, you'll remember that each of the signatory parties had both an alternate and also an advisor. The advisor had no vote, but the advisor was able to be present at all executive sessions and all committee sessions. He was sort of ex officio a member with no vote. Theoretically he was to advise the various parties. The various governors of Pennsylvania recognized that since the compact when approved by New York State required that the advisor to the Governor of New York should be the Mayor of New York or his designee. That was the only one of the four parties that required that and since Philadelphia had been involved in this, the governor of Pennsylvania has always recognized that his advisor should be a person from the City of Philadelphia, from the City of Philadelphia government, to kind of balance off New York City's spot and which gave the
two cities some unofficial representation on the Commission.
So I think for 19 years each of the Governors' had appointed me.
Bill Rafsky served for about a year, I believe, and since I left
the City, Carmin Guarino has served. During all of that time,
if I recall right, Morris Goddard has been the Pennsylvania alternate.
I could never ask for a better, more satisfactory arrangement.
He used me as an advisor for general things whenever he thought
it was the case. He was always ready, however, to let me present
the position of the City of Philadelphia, and in lots of cases
to present my own individual, professional opinion. I considered
it one of the nicest arrangements that I ever had in that particular
point. So the City always had a chance to get its viewpoint in
the general handling of the Commission. And it got to be a very,
oh maybe sticky is not the word, problem and the Commission finally
in the late '60's started to put out regulations that affected
the City of Philadelphia because in one particular case there
I definitely on behalf of the city appealed their decision.
(tape runs out)

(new tape -- possibly not in correct sequence)

... and in the one particular case, the Commission never got around
to enforcing its original decision. The problem is now moot
because of the new Federal controls. Talking about how Philadelphia's
needs have been provided for under the new compact and under the
Delaware Basin Commission, I recognize first that the Delaware
River Basin Commission is the first of its kind around the country
with all of the controls that it had. Therefore any new organization
of that type can have problems, but I think the City of Philadelphia
has been better off because of the Delaware Basin Commission than
what it would have been without the basic commission being in
existence. The relation of the staff of the Water Department and
particularly my own with the Commission members beginning with
the Governors down through their alternates and through the staff
has been an excellent one. There have been differences as you
would expect in a problem that effects control and has as many
difficult technical problems. In the days of the drought situation
in the middle 1960's when New York City actually disobeyed the
original Supreme Court decision which of course is part of the
Delaware River Basin compact, the Delaware Basin Commission stood
on the side of Philadelphia to try to work out an arrangement
and we did work out an arrangement that helped New York City.

Somewheres back in one of the questions you mentioned Mr. Schneider's
name, or else I guess it's in question 57. Mr. Schneider had his
own ideas which were that he wanted to use the Supreme Court order
completely. The Supreme Court order was an important one. I had
nothing to do with the original order. I had participated as a
witness and in some of the negotiations with the master that led
to the current Supreme Court compact. But when the Basin Commission
came into effect there were reasons why Mr. Schneider apparently
wanted to throw the whole compact out and the one vivid recollection
that I have is for a meeting in Mr. Schneider's office with Mr.
Tate and Mr. Rafsky on a Thanksgiving eve late in the afternoon.
Now as I think back over the 20 years or so that I was Water Commissioner and maybe ahead of that in some years where I had a responsible position, I presume there were many many times when I put my job on the line by what I did. That's distinct from saying to somebody where some problem existed, "Well, if you don't do it my way, I'm going to quit." That's another way of putting your job on the line. Sometimes you just do it by a certain action. I can only remember twice when in words I've said my job is on the line. And one of them was this meeting in Mr. Schneider's office with Mr. Tate and Mr. Rafsky. He had brought them there and me there that night wanting to practically scrap the whole Delaware River Basin Commission and at that point was when I did say, "If that's the case then you'll get a new Water Commissioner." And Tate and Mr. Rafsky did stay with me at that particular time.

(WMP: Sam, that intrigues me because knowing of Mr. Schneider's rather offishness about the Compact, Edward Hopkinson and I went to visit with Mr. Schneider in his office and just the three of us sat there and talked about the matter and Schneider felt that this was a very bad thing because in perpetuity we would have lost our right to change the allocation of water to Philadelphia and so on. He was sort of overwhelmed by Hopkinson, I think, and he finally agreed that if we put a time limit on the compact that he would agree to it. And so we arranged to have a time limit of 100 years on the compact.)

Well, of course you're talking now about the original time when the compact was first being written. I'm talking now about when it was actually in operation and when we were having the problem with New York and when the Basin Commission had the responsibility of working with New York City and getting them to obey, but at this particular time Mr. Schneider wanted to forget entirely about the compact and go back and reopen the Supreme Court order which under the decree of the court can be done. And my point at that time was that we have a Basin Commission already working. It has the job of working out these particular things and let's not go back to the Court.

(WMP: Well, I think Mr. Schneider would have been thrown out of the Court if he had tried to go back to the U.S. Supreme Court they would not have heard the case.)

Well, I should not take a position involving you as a lawyer and Mr. Schneider as a lawyer that time because I was looking at it from what was the administrative way. I had to assume that at least what he wanted to do was possible and I think maybe it was possible, Walter, in the thought that the Supreme Court decision has a specific case in it that says that any one of the parties may reopen it at any time. That case is still open as I think you know. It's an open case on the books of the Court.

(WMP: But the Court would be acting in what is called equity and in light of the parties having an agreement like they did I don't think that Schneider would have been successful in his procedure.)

That was exactly the point in my nonlegal way that I was making.
That here we had a Basin Commission that had been working. It was faced with a difficult problem, but let's settle it with all of the powers that the Commission had and the Commission finally did settle it and settled it because Philadelphia took the position also that it was willing to yield a little bit and to weigh some of the provisions temporarily only as a way of letting New York City get out of a pretty tight situation.

It was the year of the severe drought -- the year that New York City was running out of water. You remember you couldn't get a glass of water on your restaurant table. They cut back all sorts of ways.

(WMP: That was after the enactment of the Compact?)

Yes, see that was my point -- that we already had a compact and let's use the compact to settle it but Mr. Schneider wanted to use the Supreme Court decision to get it. And that's the point as I said when sitting right there right in front of them I said "Look if you do that, I'm out."

Answering question 56, I do continue my interest in water resources, water supply, many many other things related to both public work and to environment in general. I served and this was while I was still in the water department -- I served for two years on the National Water Commission. I got off that. I didn't know it at the time, by some of the machinations of the Erlichman-Haldeman arrangement. I had been serving and continued to serve as Chairman of an advisory group to EPA on all the regulations and guidelines that come out from EPA on the municipal grant program for sewage treatment work. I'm working with several committees of the National Academy of Engineering, one of which has been reviewing the way in which EPA makes decisions. It's a very interesting one to work on. I continue my interest in the research foundation of the American Public Works Association, of which I've been Chairman for the last 10 or 12 years, doing research. The Foundation does research and in a few of the cases in my own field I serve as one of the investigators although for most of them I only act as Chairman of the trustees who generally manage these things. I'm Chairman of the education committee of the American Waterworks Association which looks after the training of people in the water field. I write a column for the American City magazine. I do a certain amount of consulting work for other cities, primarily for larger engineering organizations that work in this particular field, so I do keep myself pretty active.

Now I see a final $64 question which says would I say that the Department of Public Works that was in the 1919 City Charter was an organizational arrangement more effective than the 1951 charter?

Well, I think I said earlier that as each generation comes along it faces new problems and it creates new agencies and new methods of handling them using whatever is considered the best judgment of the time. I think the Department of Public Works in the 1919 charter was a good idea at the time. It did a lot of work and was able to do a lot of work under that charter far more than most people recognized. It did, however, encompass in that period
from 1919 to '51 some unusual periods. First of all, there was a Depression or recession immediately after World War I. I certainly do remember it too because I started to work at about that time and that went on for about 2 or 3 years. Then there was the expanded period from about 1924 on to the 1929 stock market collapse when there was work done. And then the Public Works Department in Philadelphia had the function through the Depression years of the '30's and through the war years of the '40's with little money or later during the war years ability to get material. So it may not have had a full chance.

I will, however, say this -- that it was proper that the 1951 charter should do what it did and especially what it did with the water and waste water functions. For a long, long time I've been an advocate of the fact that the water service and later on the waste water service should be supported by rates which makes it different than most other public works functions. That it should be able to operate as much as possible the way that a private utility operates with its own rates. In doing so it has to be able to work faster than what other governmental functions do. The same way that the telephone company or the electric company make decisions immediately if something has to be done. The 1951 charter did create that possibility in the Water Department. I would probably want to choose as the optimum way of running a municipally owned water and waste water utility the creation of a separate board to run that utility. The Board making its own regulations, selling its own bonds, appointing its own officers, with the Board members being created in some way by the Council or the Mayor of the City and hopefully with an overlapping arrangement so that there would not be a complete change every time there would be a political change.

(WMP: But you would want to have Municipal bonding because you would get lower interest rates...)

Yes, although that would have to be balanced in some cases, but I'm thinking of a separate board so that it did not have to go through the long procedures involving Councilmatic ordinances and hearing and such things. I do not rule out the fact that such a board would have hearings and such.

(WMP: Well, it would be essentially a municipal authority, like the port authority...)

There's a difference. Now that's another alternate -- to have an authority. Authorities as you know have come into somewhat disrepute in recent years. There are people who say they are not responsive to the will of the people and you may remember that the 1951 charter points out that the city council can at any time create such an authority to run the water department. You may have forgotten that that is in there as a special provision. It's an interesting one because the council already had that authority under the Pennsylvania Municipal Authorities Act. But by putting it in the charter it called attention to that fact and there were people at that time who thought it was a good point and I imagine that in the discussions among the members of the Charter Commission some said to put it in there. And one of the very first reports that I had to make to Mayor Clark was whether I thought that it should
be a water authority. I still have that report and if I can find it, I'll mail it on to you because it was my decision at that time. It was my recommendation which I had to make to Mayor Clark at that time as to whether we should go into an authority or still continue in the department. My recommendation was that we should try to work within the lines of the departments and that I would try to keep it as independent as I could from the other departments. And as time went on it worked that way and the different Mayors and the different Managing Directors and the Finance Directors allowed it to work that way and I think that it has done well. Whether in the present administration it has done as well, I'm not so sure. I think that perhaps I had a certain standing with the people during the 20 years that took my recommendations and assumed that they were good and did not try to overrule them for political or other purposes.

I think there was an understanding between the Water Department and the Mayor and the Managing Directors that we were doing a job and it was from their standpoint good politics to use us and that if we did a good job it was to the benefit of the political organization.

(WMP: There is a factor there that Samuel Baxter was so pre-eminent that none of the politicians would dare to do funny business with him...)

Well, there's a difference between funny business, which is shady business, I presume, and also the major decisions which could be differences of opinion. Nobody wanted to do funny business at all and in practically all of the cases when it came down to the recommendation as to the scale of things and how we should do things we got along well. So the basic question -- the 1919 City Charter worked fine for its day. I recall that Tom Buckley who was the Director of Public Works and who was advisor to the Charter Commission did make the point that the work of the department had gotten so big that one man couldn't handle it. So the Public Works Department of the 1919 charter that was divided under the '51 into the Department of Streets, the Water Department, the Public Property Department, and some of the airport work went to the Commerce Department, I think I (tape runs out)
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... and having a Managing Director would allow the Mayor elected because of his vote-getting and other ability to devote himself to general policy matters of the City and then to let the Managing Director look after the ten department heads and to hire, as I say, somebody who knew these overall functions. This is an interesting fact, Walter, that as the head of the Water Department during those 20 years through those three mayors, I believe that I was not in the actual office of the Mayor to talk to him about any one problem more than half a dozen times and I might have a little problem in thinking up a half a dozen times in 20 years to talk to the Mayor. On the other hand, there were plenty of times when problems were discussed or reported to the Managing Director. Most Managing Directors again let me run the department. I did feel that I had responsibility or duty to let them know
of major decisions. I didn't bother them with minor problems nor did they want me to do it. But all those years I can almost count on one hand the times that I was in the Mayor's office to talk about problems. There were ceremonial times -- such things as that -- but that was a little different.

(WMP: Would you say that the Managing Directors were sufficiently professional. Some were more than others. Would you want to comment on that?)

It gets a little difficult when you start to measure men because I have to say that the three Managing Directors that I worked for always completely treated me as well as I would ever ask for, but they were different people. Sawyer and Wagner were civil engineers, both with experience in municipal work. Don Wagner had been a City Manager for many years. With the Water Department being a department related to technology and technology related to civil engineering, my relations with them during the three years of Sawyer and the six years with Wagner were very very good, I could talk technical language to them and they knew what I was talking about.

Then we had the ten months with Northrup and again having come out of the Department of the Interior he knew enough about this particular thing, we had no problem. Fred Corletta was a different person. Fred had little or no knowledge of the technology involved in water work but I do not recall that Fred Corletta reversed any decision that I ever made. In fact, one of his points was that if you think that that's the way to do it, go ahead and do it. Now this was a little bit different than perhaps Buck and Wagner, who would say well if that's the way you want to do it, go ahead and do it, but tell me about it. Corletta was still completely supportive, never reversing me on anything, but his general knowledge of fields like the water department was limited.