

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and
Social Sciences

Great Plains Studies, Center for

Spring 2000

Review of *Hazardous Wastes in Rural America: Impacts, Implications, and Options for Rural Communities* by Steven H. Murdock, Richard S. Krannich, and F. Larry Leistritz. Lanham

Larry E. Erickson
Kansas State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsresearch>



Part of the [Other International and Area Studies Commons](#)

Erickson, Larry E., "Review of *Hazardous Wastes in Rural America: Impacts, Implications, and Options for Rural Communities* by Steven H. Murdock, Richard S. Krannich, and F. Larry Leistritz. Lanham" (2000). *Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*. 499.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsresearch/499>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Great Plains Studies, Center for at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Hazardous Wastes in Rural America: Impacts, Implications, and Options for Rural Communities. Steven H. Murdock, Richard S. Krannich, and F. Larry Leistritz. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999. xx+232 pp. Tables, figures, notes, references, index. \$60.00 cloth (ISBN 0-8476-9049-0), \$29.50 paper (ISBN 0-8476-9100-4).

Hazardous Wastes describes the goals, methods, results, and conclusions of a research study, funded by the US Department of Agriculture, on

the consequences of hazardous waste processing and storage sites in rural America. The inquiry compared current conditions and patterns of recent socioeconomic change in communities affected by waste facility siting and development with those that have experienced other types of recent development and with communities that have experienced only baseline patterns of change. Fifteen communities in five states (Colorado, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas and Utah) provided information for the study.

The inquiry's goals were to assess the level of support for hazardous waste processing and storage sites; establish the determinants of social responses to waste siting processes; determine the impacts of siting, storage, and processing of wastes on communities; and develop a set of general principles and recommended actions for community leaders and residents to follow to ensure community input during waste siting studies. The study focused on four types of communities: those involved in siting a waste development project; those with an operating waste development project sited after 1970; those with a nonwaste development project sited after 1970; and a community with baseline economic growth that had experienced no major development projects after 1970.

A written questionnaire, the study's base survey instrument, was completed by 1,683 residents and 190 leaders of the fifteen communities. This was supplemented by additional data collected on the communities and the waste industries and other economic development projects.

The volume recounts the demographic, economic, and fiscal impacts on the residents and communities, along with estimated employment and unemployment numbers, annual personal income, per capita income, and retail sales for each community. The greatest economic development was found in the communities with nonwaste development projects. Communities with waste projects did not experience extensive economic growth; the characteristics of the population did not change significantly, and no negative impacts were reported. For baseline communities the study revealed patterns of relative stagnation.

The results of the analysis indicate that waste-related facilities have not had major impacts on communities. Residents in areas containing waste processing and storage sites perceive lower levels of risk from waste projects than residents in other communities and are also more likely to favor siting a waste facility in their community. The results suggest that open, broadly participatory siting processes are essential where waste facilities are being sited. Educating leaders and residents is therefore imperative. **Larry E. Erickson**, *Center for Hazardous Substance Research, Kansas State University*.