

that will treat a community's wastes benefits only the neighboring communities downstream.¹⁰

The growth of water recreation has heightened public concern somewhat, but its impact is far from universal. For example, in 1961, Peter F. Mattei, executive director of the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, told the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives that the basic problem in St. Louis was in securing the two-thirds majority needed for a general obligation bond issue or the four-sevenths majority required for a revenue bond issue. A large percentage of St. Louis' population is not bothered by the pollution of the Mississippi. No one swims in it, and boating takes place north of the city's discharge points. The only people who suffer are downstream. Under these not uncommon conditions it is a difficult proposition to sell a \$100 million bond issue.¹¹

The reluctance of local governments to provide water and sewer facilities is greatly reduced, however, when someone else foots part of the bill. Only during the 1930's, when the Federal public works programs were in effect, did water facilities and sewerage construction keep pace with demand. More recently, the handful of State assistance programs for sewage treatment works, the Federal grant program established in the Water Pollution Control Act, and the public facility loans program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency have provided a definite inducement to local investment. More effective and rigorous State, interstate agency, and Federal enforcement of pollution controls—with court action against local governments where necessary—is another factor spurring greater local investments in sewage treatment works. Finally, more inclusive metropolitan arrangements, because they offer economies of scale, provide more permanent solutions, spread construction costs over a broader base, and protect the community from having its efforts undermined by the inaction of a neighbor, have also induced more adequate investments in water and sewer utilities.

FRAGMENTATION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Metropolitan water and sewage services are often handled by a series of small, separate governmental units and private companies. In the Sacramento metropolitan area, water supply and distribution are the most splintered of all public functions, with 44 public and 55 private agencies operating independently. Minneapolis-St. Paul and their suburbs have 45 individual water utilities operating without an organizational or operational tie, except for the minimal controls exercised by State agencies. Fifty-six agencies supply or distribute water in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County. This fragmentation for water supply and distribution is concentrated in the suburbs, and parallels a similar pattern for sewage disposal service. In suburban Nassau County in the New York metropolitan area, there are 48 water districts and 41 districts for waste disposal and removal. Fragmentation in the handling of the sewage function has had an adverse effect on public health in a number of metropolitan areas.

¹⁰ William L. Rivers, "The Politics of Pollution," *Reporter*, XIV (Mar. 30, 1961), p. 34.

¹¹ U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Public Works, *Federal Water Pollution Control Hearings*, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961, pp. 43, 48.