

Race, Poverty & the Environment

A newsletter for social and environmental justice

Volume II, Number 2

\$2.00

Summer 1991

The naive man who flies directly toward the sun will not be able to see his own shadow.

-- Robert Bly, Poet

Energy and Air Pollution are Social Issues

by Lily Lee

Poor people and people of color are benefiting the least and paying the most for this society's wasteful dependency on fossil fuels and nuclear power, and from the resulting air pollution.

Suffering at every step of the fuel cycle. From the time oil is taken out of the ground in Alaska in the land of the Gwichen to the refining process in North Richmond to the final combustion of the oil on the freeways through West Oakland,

>> see POOR PEOPLE, page 18

Hydro-Electric Power and Flooding of Indian Lands

by Ann Stewart

Four hundred miles north of the Great Lakes, James Bay straddles the border between the Canadian provinces of Quebec and Ontario. For 5,000 years, the Cree and Inuit people have lived in this region. Hydro-Quebec embarked on an ambitious plan to dam and divert to give of Quebec's rivers to produce electric power for cities as far away as New York. The following article reports on ecological devastation to the region, and growing opposition to the current phase of hydroelectric development.

The cry, "Save James Bay!" is being heard more frequently throughout the northeastern United States and Canada as a growing grassroots movement takes shape to save northern Quebec's most pristine wilderness from further hydroelectric development.

The Northeast Alliance to Protect

James Bay (NAPJB) is an eight-month-old network of human rights advocates, students, environmental activists, and other concerned citizens scattered across New England and New York. Its purpose is to inform the public

and the press, as well as state and federal legislators, about the James Bay project and to promote regional strategies that will unplug the northeastern U.S. from reliance upon electricity imports from Quebec. The Alliance has produced a 32-page publication written by Canadian and U.S. activists, as well as a video on the problem.

Power companies in New England and New York already have contracts to buy power from government-owned Hydro-Quebec, the region's largest employer. Activists want to rescind these contracts and prevent future agreements. NAPJB contends that money invested in energy efficiency and alternatives, coupled with more aggressive demand-side management by regional utilities and Hydro-Quebec, could easily meet the electricity needs of the northeastern U.S.

Hydro development in James Bay began in the 1970s. Phase I, largely completed by 1985, dammed and diverted five of Quebec's major rivers, flooding 4,400 square miles to create vast reservoirs. No provincial or federal environmental assessment was ever required or undertaken by regional or national authorities.

Twenty years later, the devastation is evident: Critical habitats for caribou have been destroyed; migration routes and staging areas for North American waterfowl have been

>> see JAMES BAY, page 14

Special Issue on ENERGY

- Hydro-electric Power & Exploitation in Quebec
 - Energy and Air Pollution as Social Issues
 - The Automobile & Inner City Abandonment
 - Uranium Mining on Indian Lands
 - Weatherization and the Poor

In February of this year, President Bush's National Energy Strategy was released to the American public from Washington, DC. The Strategy identifies no specific author or agency responsible for the contents, nor does it take into account the social justice aspect of energy policy. For example,

the NES missed an opportunity for addressing low-income weatherization policies. People who are transient or homeless usually have fewer options and less access to information regarding energy rebates and other programs. These individuals and their families fall between the cracks of practically every policy and program that is enacted in this country. Yet the halfway houses, shelters and other public buildings these people occupy are among the most energy inefficient.

This issue of *Race, Poverty, & the Environment* puts the spotlight on energy. When I look at the title of this newsletter on the one hand, and think about energy on the other, the connections become apparent. **RACE:** people

of color in this country have been largely absent from arenas where energy policy decisions are made, although those decisions have a direct impact on them. **POVERTY:** the poor must spend significantly more of their income on energy than the non-

MENT: the natural resources necessary to produce energy are often

located in or near areas occupied by poor and/or non-white populations, particularly Native Americans. The extraction and production of energy, and the waste generated from these activities, has adverse effects on the physical environment and the nearby residents.

These are some of the reasons people of color and the poor must take a closer look at how energy policy is developed. Who are the people making the decisions? What are some methods local activists and citizens can use to make their needs known? Are there alternatives to the standard energy supplies?

Inside this issue are articles that examine these and other aspects of the

energy debate. We look at energy efficiency programs in low-income communities, how local community development organizations can become and are becoming key participants in local energy issues, and why it is important for low-income people and communities of color to organize and become active in energy policy in their areas. There is an examination of the abandonment of the inner cities to accommodate suburban sprawl and the automobile (a subject with which I identify since my first home in a predominantly African-American part of Chicago was torn down to make way for an expressway). There is an

>> see **EDITORS' NOTES**, page 18

Editor's Notes

Race, Poverty & the Environment

Managing Editor
Ellie Goodwin

Editors
Carl Anthony Luke Cole

Contributors
Marice Ashe Abu Baker
Arthur James Audrey Lawrence
Lfly Lee Andrew McAllister
Marina Ortega Ann Stewart
Christine Vance Max Weintraub

Subscriptions
Eleanor Walden

Race, Poverty & the Environment is published four times a year. Articles are ©1990 by their authors; please reproduce RPE by every means, and give authors credit for their work.

Charter subscriptions are \$8/four issues. \$15 for institutions, or free for low-income persons and community groups.

Articles, stories, reportbacks, resources and general information are all accepted with appreciation.

Send submissions and subscription checks to **RPE**, c/o Earth Island, 300 Broadway, Suite 28. San Francisco. CA 94133.

RPE is a joint project of the California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation and the Earth Island Institute Urban Habitat Program.

In This Issue...

Energy and Air Pollution are Social Issues, by Lily Lee.....	1
Hydro-Electric Power and Flooding of Indian Lands, by Ann Stewart....	1
Energy Policy and Inner City Abandonment, by Carl Anthony.....	3
Energy Costs, Conservation and the Poor, by Andrew McAllister.....	4
Energy Efficiency in Action, by Max Weintraub.....	4
Native Americans' Energy Crisis: An Interview with Lance Hughes, by Arthur James.....	5
Conservation and Economic Development Join Hands in Bayview, by Christine Vance and Abu Baker.....	9
RPE Profile: Dr. Lenneal Henderson, Jr.....	20
Departments	
Reportbacks.....	6
Resources.....	10



Energy Policy and Inner City Abandonment

by Carl Anthony

Few people realize the price inner cities have paid for our national love affair with the automobile. But the evidence of devastation is not hard to find. White flight to the metropolitan fringe, driven in part by racism, is linked to destruction of human resources in the metropolitan core, to waste of petroleum energy, pollution of air and water, and degradation of urban biological resources. But older urban neighborhoods can help lead the way to more sustainable cities and suburbs.

I was recently invited by several foundations to participate in a seminar on energy and transportation. The meeting was held in an office building in downtown Philadelphia near City Hall. Since I had grown up in Philadelphia, after the meeting, I decided to visit the neighborhood where I had lived as a child. The neighborhood where I grew up during the Second World War had been typical of many working class enclaves originally built in the late 19th century, before petroleum had become a cheap source of energy. Wood and coal were used for space heat, and trolley cars depended on coal-generated electricity for power.

I remembered our street as a tight little cluster of two story brick townhouses with tiny backyards. Around the corner, two blocks away from our place, was the elevated train station, at the commercial center of the community. The intersection was filled with life. There was a newsstand on the corner, a shoe shine stand right next to it. Along Market Street was a poultry shop, a fish store, a bakery, a hardware store, a barbershop and a pharmacy, each with apartments located above. A block away, in the other direction from our house, was a tiny candy store. I had been allowed to go there by myself since I wouldn't have to cross any intersections. Less than a mile away was the University of Pennsylvania. My parents hoped my brother and I would go there when we grew up. They had chosen this neighborhood to raise our family, because it was conveniently located and the rent was cheap.

The neighborhood was not far from city center. A brisk twenty-five minute walk across the Schuylkill River Bridge from the edge of downtown got me there. When I arrived at the familiar street, the house in which I had been born was gone. A dozen other houses nearby were empty, boarded up. Vacant lots — filled with sofas, old appliances, tires, and debris — were everywhere. The shops along Market Street

were empty, except for a liquor store a few blocks up. The train station was still there, but the train ran underground now. The trolley tracks had been taken up, and a six lane arterial, with halogen lamps every 500 feet, cut through what was left of the neighborhood. The big street trees were all gone, and there was no life, it seemed, except for the struggling ground cover along the asphalt road bed, and three idle young men who gathered on the corner next to a lamp post.

The story of this community, its loss of economic functions and vitality, and the destruction of its housing stock, has been repeated in a hundred different neighborhoods in the older core districts of the nation's largest metropolitan regions. The story is a national disgrace. It is a story of investment decisions made without regard for community needs, a story of freeways wrecking businesses and undermining the social integrity of neighborhoods. Communities of color have borne a disproportionate share of toxics and health burdens based on these decisions — from lead in automobile emissions, to contamination of soil and groundwater under abandoned gas stations, to noise and accidents caused by industrial truck traffic too nearby.

As they search for incentives to reduce energy consumption, transportation and energy planners often overlook these issues, the needs of and the potential contribution that inner city communities might make to building new sustainable urban neighborhoods. At the seminar I attended, for example, most of the debate focused on the technical capacity of large corporations to manufacture more fuel efficient cars, the potential of legislation requiring large corporations to purchase these cars, the importance of developing alternative fuels, and strategies for extending new mass transit facilities to the growing suburbs. All of these topics are important. But a component is missing. How can we involve the inner cities —

>> see *INNER CITY*, page 12

Energy Costs, Conservation & the Poor

by Andrew McAllister

Meeting monthly payments for household energy use is increasingly difficult for families with incomes at or near the poverty level. While the system of extraction, generation, and distribution of energy in usable form has many other economic and environmental impacts on most sectors of society, for the poor, the monthly bill is this system's most direct consequence. Living in (often forced to rent) the least efficient housing in the country, the typical poor household faces energy costs of up to 25% of its total income. This household has but two options: reduce consumption and/or look for aid in meeting unmanageable energy costs. Federal funding for both of these options, however, has been dwindling since the mid-80s; more and more responsibility for controlling these costs to the poor falls on local governments and groups.

In a recently published study, "Utility-Financed Low-Income Energy Conservation: Winning for Everyone", one of the *Energy Policy and the Poor* series, the National Consumer Law Center, Inc. (NCLC) studied the relationship between energy use and failure to pay among low-income families relative to the nation as a whole. The study showed that the inability of a family to pay its energy bill is not, as many have thought, strictly the result of high energy bills, or of energy "wastage". In fact, low-income households generally use about 20% less energy than the nonpoor; this conclusion is valid for the various fuels (electricity, fuel oil, and natural gas) used for different household tasks. The study found that the higher the portion of income needed for energy bills, the higher the rate of failure to pay. Payments for this fuel, though, can

poor family spends up to 94% of its income on housing, food, and home energy. Very little remains for other items which can also be considered as basic needs: health care, clothing, transportation, etc. In short, the poor are under immense economic pressures to conserve energy, and are making a large daily effort toward that end.

Some accepted programs designed to help the poor or to promote energy efficiency in general, have had inequitable impacts. The classic "renter's dilemma" hits low-income tenants especially hard: since tenants pay the energy costs of wasteful buildings and appliances, owners have little incentive to pay for improvements. Two pertinent examples are given here: in one case, energy efficiency programs have actually discriminated against the poor; in the other, a federal housing and energy subsidy program costs the poor more than allowed by law.

In the previously mentioned study, the NCLC shows that utility appliance rebate programs can effectively result in the poor's subsidizing the efficiency appliances of the more wealthy. In general, in order to receive a rebate on, say, a refrigerator, one must have the money for a new refrigerator in the first place—this *de facto* requirement serves to "screen out" the poor, who are not in the market for new refrigerators. The poor's utility payments do, however, subsidize these utility programs. The poor, then, in many cases have ended up helping the wealthy save energy and money. Some progressive utilities though, are working to eliminate this type of inequity by offering low-income rates or substantially larger subsidies for the poor. One electric utility in rural Minnesota is experimenting with low-income appliance purchasing programs which require no initial investment by the ratepayer.

Hidden energy costs in housing

>> see COSTS, page 16

Energy Efficiency in Action

by Max Weintraub

Elaine Goodall wryly notes, "In my children's bedroom the window doesn't shut all the way. The room feels like a deep freeze. You can put your groceries in there and never have to worry about a refrigerator." Or almost never anyway. Ms. Goodall is the mother of four and a resident of low-income housing in Richmond, California. We met when she requested a new refrigerator. As a Pacific Gas & Electric energy auditor, I authorize people for energy conservation programs. Ms. Goodall's experience speaks to the numerous problems energy dependence poses to low-income people.

In simpler times, we discovered the essentials for survival: food, shelter, and clothing. However, we are no longer cavedwellers. Energy must be added to this trio of needs if a person hopes to participate in modern society. This realization comes quickly to those who can least afford it. While the rural poor limit their dependence on the utilities by using firewood, windmills, watermills and small dams to provide energy, their urban counterparts have no such options and must bear the fiscal burden of energy policies designed to promote growth. Solutions to

>> see EFFICIENCY, page 19

equal 25% of the total income of a poor family, as opposed to around 7% for the nonpoor.

It will be difficult for the typical poor family acting alone to make further cuts in energy use. One reason for this is that low-income dwellings generally use more energy per unit area; this fact is largely a reflection of the low quality of poor people's housing. A 1986 study by the Economic Opportunity Research Institute showed that the average

Point of View

Native Americans' Energy Crisis

An Interview with Lance Hughes

Lance Hughes is the director of Native American for a Clean Environment (NACE) of Tahlequah, Oklahoma. He and Arthur James of the Urban Habitat Program recently conducted this telephone interview. Hughes details some of the ways Native Americans suffer from America's energy use— at the resource extraction level, the energy production level and the disposal level.

AJ. Resource extraction is perhaps the primary environmental issue for Native Americans. What has been the result of this extraction?

LH. Ecologically, it's been pretty devastating both to our natural environment of land, water and air, and also to the health of our people. That, of course, gets back to the whole philosophy of Native peoples: we know that everything is interrelated and you can't destroy one thing without destroying the other.

You can divide the problem into three areas which affect us most as a people: mining, deforestation and water diversion. For example, water diversion for hydroelectric power generation -- there are a lot of reservations that depended on the water that is now diverted for hydroelectric power. A prime example would be at Fort Berthold in North Dakota, where a river runs right through the reservation. They put a big dam there and separated the reservation. It is also common for these dams to flood Indian lands and housing, so they have to be moved.

The main mining related to energy is for coal and uranium. The uranium is used for nuclear energy. The Navajo, Zuni, Laguna, Cheyenne, Arapahoe, Utes, Cree -- they all suffer from uranium mining on their land. But Indians suffer at every level of the nuclear fuels cycle, from mining and milling to conversion, enrichment, fabrication, to the power plants and then the waste. There's no nuclear waste site at a reservation yet that I know of, but there *is* waste from every stage of the nuclear fuels cycle that gets dumped on us.

Here [in Tahlequa], we are at what we call the third stage of the nuclear fuel cycle, that being conversion. The uranium conversion plant we're fighting has caused radioactive contamination levels in the bed of the Arkansas River that equal those at Superfund sites, but nothing is being done by the government. It's been going on for 21 years. Last year they dumped 1.5 tons of uranium into the river -- and that's an *improvement* on 4.9 tons in the previous year

At the power plant level, the Prairie Island Nuclear Reactor up in Minnesota is adjacent to the Prairie Island Souix -- the only way to get to the reactor is through the reservation. Their water is now contaminated with tritium.

AJ. How has this happened?

LH. Because reservations have been -- and still are -- in a regulatory no-man's-land, corporations are able to get away with a lot of contamination, and occupational practices, which wouldn't be

allowed anywhere else. I mentioned the contamination of the Arkansas River, which is one huge example. The companies are extremely negligent in worker and environmental protection because they are in an area where they *can* be negligent.

AJ. Could you describe specific problems or ecological damage Native Americans face from mineral extraction?

LH. It would be a little hard to generalize because it's so different across the U.S. where the reservations are located. For example, at the St. Regis Mohawk reservation up in New York, they are suffering from extreme industrial pollution, both in the air and in the water. The Southwest tribes, particularly those that are sitting on top of uranium, are literally dying due in part to the uranium mining and milling that goes on. The Alaska tribes were affected by the Valdez oil spill. What resources the tribes have determines how they could be poisoned.

AJ. How can companies come into Indian lands?

LH. Initially, the companies could not get in the front door with our traditional tribal structures to get at our resources, so the companies went to the government. Through the Indian Reorganization Act in the 1930s, we were forced into a situation where we had to develop a corporate tribal government structure, with a chairman and a council, because it was necessary for the [outside] corporations to have a chair to sign on the dotted line.

AJ. Do Native Americans profit from mineral extraction or energy processing activities on their native lands?

LH. We get extremely little economic benefit in relation to the profits seen by the companies. A lot of the income is channeled directly into the tribal government. We have our bureau-

cracies, too, and a lot of money can get lost that way and never really gets back to the Indian people. Some of it does and some of it improves some of the conditions for some tribes.

AJ. When a proposal, say for mineral exploration and extraction, is presented to a tribal council, is there much debate within the tribal council and its membership?

>> see NACE, page 17

We know that everything is interrelated and you can't destroy one thing without destroying the other.

REPORTBACK..

Organizing for a Healthy Community Conference, Oakland, CA, March 22-23, 1991.

Organizing for a Healthy Community

It took more than one and a half years to pull off — strategizing, leadership development, fundraising and logistics — but it was the "best conference" many participants "had been to in years." *Organizing for a Healthy Community* joined environmental and community activists, health care workers and labor union organizers in a two-day workshop during the Spring 1991 in order to more fully explore the links between these parallel, but too often divergent, movements. More than 100 organizers worked to overcome language and ethnic barriers, regional distances, and other long-standing organizing difficulties to renew efforts in coalition-building.

The conference was initiated by the California Public Health Association-North and Health Access, and conference planners included dozens of community-based activist organizations. The goal of the conference was to join activists across issues and focus on areas of common concern and mutual interest. Workshops included "Organizing to Get the Lead Out of Our Homes and Workplaces," "Land Use Planning for Environmental Justice," "Right to Know — Right to Act," and many others. One of the most exciting developments are the extensive conference follow-up plans, including:

- **Activist Resource Guide.** The guide will include the names and addresses, as well as issues of interest and expertise, of conference participants, as well as samples of newsletters of activist organizations.

- **Support for the Health Care Crisis Ambulance Drive.** Citizen Action, Service Employees International Union,

and Families USA are sponsoring a cross-country ambulance drive to highlight the health care crises facing the poor and uninsured. Conference participants are encouraged to join the effort in this media event to show how the health care crisis affects all issues and populations.

- **Childhood Lead Screening in San Francisco and elsewhere.** As a direct result of the conference, community activists in San Francisco will receive funding to develop educational brochures in multiple languages to encourage parents to have their children tested for lead poisoning. These brochures could be used by other communities in a lead screening and abatement effort.

Conference planners sought to combine the experience and expertise of grassroots, state-wide and national organizers to create an interface between communities, issues and organizing strategies. Workshops focused on basic skills building (working with the media, leadership development and maintenance, if/when/how to do health surveys) as well as developing long-term visions and opportunities for action. Plenary speakers included Tony Mazzochi of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers; Dr. Marion Moses of the Pesticide Education Center and the United Farm Workers; and Ignacio de la Fuente, Glass Molders and Allied Workers Union. The right to universal health care, a safe workplace and clean environment provided consistent themes to workshops, presentations, and plenary sessions.

Three issue tracks developed joint organizing strategies:

- **Communities and Toxics: A Hazardous Combination.** The location of hazardous waste production and disposal facilities is an issue of social justice and equity. Poor communities are too often at multiple risk for poor health due to these facilities, economics, lack of jobs or being forced into high risk jobs, lack of access to

health care, and exposure to other toxics in their environment. We need:

- An active state-wide political organizing process to address problems on a regional level.
- A clearinghouse of information, strategies and resource people with technical skills and/or experience.
- Training and skills building for grassroots organizations.
- Fundraising!
- Improved communication with government agencies.

Jobs vs. Environment vs. Health Care. Occupational and environmental problems are creating health problems that result in an increased burden on an already failing health system. Health care costs are increasing at an unprecedented rate. More individuals are uninsured and even those that are insured face increased co-payments and deductibles making health care unaffordable. We need to provide information for newsletters on health insurance issues; to target problem health insurance companies for community action to promote justice; and to get the labor movement more involved in health care benefits issues.

Get the Lead Out! Lead exposure to children and workers is a big problem throughout the U.S. There is a general lack of awareness concerning lead poisoning, partially due to the lack of physician training, and the underreporting of lead poisoning. Other problems include the lack of laws to protect people, bureaucratic red tape, powerful opponents, and the lack of a common agenda among groups working on the issue. We need:

- More screening of children, case follow-up and source identification and abatement.
- Education of parents, workers, and health care providers.

Environmental investigation resources for homes and workplaces including safe abatement procedures.

- To reduce and eliminate the source

» see ORGANIZING, page 7

<< from *ORGANIZING*, page 6
of lead in our communities.

- Access to health care for lead-poisoned children and adults.

The conference was endorsed by a broad range of groups, including Asian American Health Forum, California Environmental Health Association, California Professional Fire Fighters, California Public Health Association - North, California Rural Indian Health Board, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, Glass, Molders, Pottery, Plastics and Allied Workers Union, Health Access Coalition, Interfaith Council on Economic Justice and Work, Labor Occupational Health Program, Natural Resources Defense Council, **Oakland/Berkeley** Rainbow Coalition, Plant Closures Project, Sierra Club, **Urban** Habitat, Vote Health Coalition, West County Toxics Coalition, and others.

For more information on follow-up activities, contact Donna Wapner at 4151468-5657 or **Marice Ashe** at 5011 655-3002.

— **Marice Ashe**

U.S. Energy Policy: Who Bears the Burden? Berkeley, CA, April 28, 1991.

Energy and the Poor

On April 28, 1991, the coalition for Race, Poverty and the Environment, out of the University of California at Berkeley hosted a forum on the U.S. Energy Policy: Who Bears the Burden? The conference, featuring speakers from the community as well as academia, addressed the exploitation of natural resources and the plight of poor and disenfranchised communities that suffer more of the consequences. Carl Anthony, of **Earth Island/Urban** Habitat, introduced the panel members and opened the forum by discussing the compatibility of the tenets of environmental restoration and protection with the struggles of social justice, and

advocating for a more cohesive movement which brings these issues together.

Robert Mowris, an environmental engineer and energy consultant and is currently working on an alternative energy strategy, began the panel presentation. Mowris emphasized the need to correct the deficiencies of the National Energy Strategy (**NES**) while minimizing the total societal cost of providing energy services in the U.S. Mowris severely criticized the proposed NES for its lack of meaningful policies and disregard for relevant issues, while outlining alternative solutions for energy extraction and usage.

Among the critiques and alternate solutions were that the NES has no meaningful policies to reduce transportation, which accounts for 27 percent of the total energy usage in the U.S. Mowris's alternative strategy proposes a 50-75 percent reduction in energy expenditure through land use planning and more and better mass transportation options. This can be achieved through more efficient technology that has already been developed. The NES instead offers more oil drilling in environmentally sensitive areas such as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and off the California coastline.

Additionally, Mowris noted that the NES does not offer meaningful policies to improve energy efficiency in industry, or guidelines for recycling.

Mowris proposed as an alternative energy strategy policies aimed at improving energy efficiencies and reducing waste without sacrificing comfort. A well-designed alternative strategy could seek to increase fuel economy standards, encourage rail transportation, improve and enhance mass transit options, and increase federal funding for low-income weatherization programs.

Antonio Gonzales of the International Indian Treaty Council fostered a feeling of kinship and urged an integral spiritual movement with Mother Earth to provide common ground for environ-

mental justice. Gonzales advocated the need to re-educate the public about Native American treaties and a need to honor these "laws of the land" to ensure environmental and social justice. He also pointed out that President Bush's insistence on drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge spelled genocide to the Athabaskan people who rely on caribou which breed on the refuge.

Henry Clark, the dynamic spokesperson of the West County Toxics Coalition, presented a dramatic slide show of Richmond, California. The slides began with maps of heavily industrialized areas, and a breakdown by race and economic status of the **surrounding** residential areas. Clark had many slides of contaminated sites and industrial polluters with permit violations that continue to exist and operating without retaliation or remediation. Clark also spoke of the potential for accidents and fires which constantly threaten the community. At the Chevron **Ortho** Chemicals division, holding tanks of ammonia and other potentially dangerous chemicals are stored or transported. It could force an emergency evacuation if these chemicals were to be released in an accident. One such calamity was the **Safeway** fire in 1988 which sent billowing black clouds of smoke over Richmond for weeks. North Richmond residents, already plagued with a disproportionate share of respiratory problems were admitted in record numbers to Contra Costa County hospitals and clinics.

Ying Lee Kelly, Administrative Aide to Representative Ron Dellums, concluded the energy forum with her analysis of national policies 10 years into the **Reagan/Bush** administration. Kelly spoke of a need to have a cohesive environmental justice movement to counter policies that have led to an acceptance and despair about the situation. She also spoke about the increasing polarization of society

>> see *ENERGY*, page 8

1991 Protecting Mother Earth: The Toxic Threat to Indian Lands Conference, Bear Butte, Sturgis, SD, June 7-9, 1991.

Los Coyotes Landfill Defeated After Indians' Toxics Conference

What is the answer to the problem of toxic threats to Indian lands? Some of the answers were found at this years' "Protecting Mother Earth: The Toxic Threat to Indian Lands" conference, which was held in the sacred Paha Sapa/ Black Hills of the Lakota/Cheyenne people in South Dakota.

From June 6-10, more than 500 indigenous people from all areas of the nation and some 57 tribes gathered to share information and experiences, and to pray together for future generations. There were workshops on sovereignty, working with non-Indian environmental groups, media relations, group organiz-

ing, alternative economic development and other pertinent issues.

We celebrated major victories in the past year, including the Navajo at Dilkon, Arizona, stopping a toxic dump and incinerator; the Paiute-Kaibab halting an incinerator; the Kaw voting down an incinerator; the Yankton Souix banning garbage dumps; the Pine Ridge people stopping a waste dump; and the Los Coyotes Band overturning a lease for a garbage dump.

The conference was the second annual gathering of Indians concerned about their environment, and was spurred in part by the 53

Indigenous peoples are alive and an integral part of the natural world. From the Amazon to the Arctic, our peoples strive to maintain our traditional relations with the Earth and to defend our rights to self determination on our land.
-- From the Environmental Code of Ethics and Conference Statement. 1991 Protecting Mother Earth Conference

separate proposals around the country to put garbage or toxic waste dumps on Indian lands. This historic event was twice as large as last year's founding conference in the Navajo Nation at Dilkon, AZ. Many at the conference pointed out that we had long fought for the sanctity of our lands. As Winona LaDuke of the White Earth Band of Onishinabe put it, "the only reason we have what we have left is because Native people have made critical struggles."

For those of us present from the Coalition for Indian Rights — a San Diego County-based intertribal group — the conference provided not only information, but recharged our spirits as we continued our struggle against the Chambers Development Company and its proposed solid waste landfill on the Los Coyotes Reservation here in San Diego County.

In April and May, before the conference, the Los Coyotes Band had voted down a proposal from Chambers

to make a significant section of their reservation into a garbage dump, and had forced their Tribal Chair to rescind a lease agreement he had signed with the company. When we returned from the South Dakota conference, we found out that the Tribal Chairman had set up yet another meeting on the dump, and attempted to initiate a secret ballot vote for the landfill. The secret ballot ran directly contrary to Los Coyotes custom and tradition.

The Chair was pushing a vote on the dump and also set dates for two meetings to be held on two consecutive weekends. This too was unusual, but once tribal members learned of the secret ballot they struck

it down.

The first of the two tribal meetings was held, and Coalition for Indian Rights members took advantage of the opportunity to hand out information that was provided by Greenpeace, Native Americans for a Clean Environment, and Citizens Clearinghouse for Hazardous Wastes that we had received at the South Dakota conference. This information further explained the dangers of landfills to tribal members.

On June 30, Los Coyotes tribal members *again* voted against the proposed landfill and ordered that no further negotiations with Chambers Company were to be pursued. The Coalition for Indian Rights continues to place their faith in the Indian people and future generations. Given the information, they will make intelligent decisions.

For all my relations,

— Marina Ortega
Coalition for Indian Rights
Star Route Mesa Grande
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070

<< from ENERGY, page 6
between wealthy and poor. This polarization affects people of color most severely, siting as an example, the Vietnam and Gulf Wars where injuries and death were disproportionately borne by people of color. Kelly also criticized the changes in budgetary spending in the past 10 years, where the military budget increased by 46 percent while the housing decreased by 77 percent. "It is no accident that we have the homeless," Kelly stated. Kelly ended her effective and moving presentation with an urgent message to organize at every level of society.
— Audrey Lawrence
Coalition for Race, Poverty & the Environment
28121/2 Piedmont
Berkeley, CA 94705

Recognition of the connection between social justice and environmental issues can help us develop a sound national energy policy.

Thinking Globally, Acting Locally:

Conservation and Economic Development Join Hands in Bayview

by Christine Vance and Abu Baker

There are links between social justice, local economic development and energy conservation. For example, low income people pay the highest proportion of family income to heat and illuminate their homes. Likewise, small neighborhood businesses see a higher proportion of their operating costs spent on energy purchases. Energy conservation can impact this inequality by reducing energy expenses for residents and local businesses. Further, conservation programs can increase the demand for local goods and services and lead to the creation of new local job training and employment opportunities. In this way, neighborhood-based energy conservation programs can support local economic development.

The Bureau of Energy Conservation of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, is working with the **Bayview Hunter's Point** community, and the local utility, Pacific Gas & Electric, to develop and promote a package of neighborhood energy and economic development programs. The project grew out of previous energy planning efforts in 1988 in which the Bureau worked with members of the Economic Development Subcommittee of the New **Bayview** Committee, and with the Department of City Planning to identify ways in which energy efficiency might service the needs of the community. The New **Bayview** Committee functions as an umbrella group for a large number of local community organizations. As a result of those efforts, the Bureau, with the assistance and input from the community and the **Department** of City Planning, developed an energy plan that provides a comprehensive menu of strategies that use energy management as a local economic development tool.

Bayview Hunter's Point is a low-income, predominantly African American neighborhood in San Francisco. The mixed-use district is approximately 3,000 acres and has a population of 21,000. **Bayview Hunter's Point** residents pay residential energy bills 40% higher than the city average, although the median family income is almost 30% lower. This inequity will only worsen with expected energy price escalations in the coming decade.

Various factors have contributed to the creation of such social inequity. The national shift from an industrial to a

service and information based economy have contributed to economic displacement during the 1980s. During the 1960s, manufacturing accounted for 40% of the jobs in **Bayview Hunter's Point**, many filled by local residents. From 1970 to 1980 there was a large reduction in employment due to the decline in the shipping industry. The economic situation has been further exacerbated by the recent recession.

Most inner city residents would not consider energy or environmental issues as one of their primary concerns. In fact a socioeconomic profile of many inner city areas would suggest that many residents view immediate health, food and safety issues as their primary concerns.

Yet, energy costs impact low-income communities hardest. Low-income residents pay a larger percentage of their incomes for energy costs. Low-income residents generally have far less discretionary energy use to eliminate in response to increasing energy prices. Further, with less discretionary income, home energy improvements are often too expensive.

The combined forces of energy inefficient homes, the unequal energy burden, and the lack of appropriate energy education and assistance programs, have a compounded impact on the community economic well being. In **Bayview Hunter's Point**, annual energy expenditures currently average \$24 million, with residents spending approximately \$6.5 million a year on housing energy costs alone. Since the community imports its energy supplies, every dollar spent on energy leaves the community—constituting an enormous drain on the local economy. Energy conservation and the use of local renewable energy technologies can help retain dollars in the community that would otherwise leave in the form of energy purchases. Further, the dollars retained in the community will recirculate and generate new economic activity. On the household level, energy conservation can reduce the unequal economic burden, thus increasing the amount of discretionary income an individual has available to address other primary and secondary needs.

The present project, entitled the Neighborhood Energy and Economic Development Project, marks the beginning of implementation of the energy plan. It began with the **estab-**

>> see BAYVIEW, page 15

Resources

Toxics Resources

Playing with Fire: Hazardous Waste Incineration, by Pat Costner and Joe Thornton. A Greenpeace report which lays out the history, technology and dangers of toxic waste incinerators. A must for any community facing such a facility. Greenpeace Public Information Office, 1426 U Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009. 2021319-2444.

Questions to Ask About Risk Assessment, by Peter Montague. A laypersons guide to the arcane "science" of risk assessment. Gives the reader the ammunition she needs to take on government and industry risk assessors. Available from the Environmental Research Foundation, PO Box 73700, Washington, DC 20056-3700. 202/328-1119.

Evaluating Chemical Hazards — Some of the Questions to Ask, by Peter Montague. Helping the average citizen overthrow the tyranny of experts, this handy 14-page guide helps the reader put the numbers, tables, facts and figures thrown at us by regulators and industry into perspective. Available from the Environmental Research Foundation (address above).

Green Business Made Black and White, by the Council on Economic Priorities. A 6-page report on the attempts by corporations to "greenwash" their public images through environmental good deeds or expensive advertising campaigns. Write CEP, 30 Irving Place, New York, NY 10003. 1-800-822-6435.

Energy Resources: GROUPS

Transit Now is a coalition of about 200 organizations including environmental groups, businesses, the differently-abled, and chambers of commerce committed to working towards a major increase in funding for public transportation. For more information, contact Bruce Fried, Transit Now, 1317 F Street, NW, 6th Fl., Washington, DC 20004. 2021638-0215.

The American Association of Blacks in Energy is a professional organization open to managerial and professional employees of energy-related businesses, to consultants who offer expertise primarily in energy related disciplines that serve the energy industry or agencies of local, state, or national government, to managerial and professional employees of related trade associations, to educators in energy related disciplines, plus many others. For more information, contact the American Association of Blacks in Energy, 801 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Suite 250, Washington, DC 20003. 2021 547-9378.

The Center for Neighborhood Technology is a non-profit technical assistance corporation working with organizations serving low- and moderate-income urban communities. The Center publishes a bi-monthly newsletter *The Neighborhood Works* which shares the resources urban residents use to move their neighborhoods toward self-reliance and stimulate economic growth. They examine policy issues impacting communities, and review projects, people and events as reported by contributors or noted in other publications. For more information contact the Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2125 West North Avenue, Chicago, IL 60646. 312/278-4800.

Energy Resources: PUBLICATIONS

Energy Policy and the Poor: Utility-Financed Low-Income Energy Conservation. The National Consumer Law Center, Inc. (1991). A report on energy conservation and rate relief in low-income households. Sets forth several proposals for the involvement of Alabama utilities in the provision and promotion of low-income conservation programs. National Consumer Law Center, 11 Beacon St., #821, Boston, MA 02108. 6171523-8010.

Energy Planning for Economic Development. The Energy Task Force of the Urban Consortium for Technology Initiatives (1989). A report demonstrating the usefulness of energy conservation activities as a local economic development tool, focusing on San Francisco's South Bayshore neighborhood. Available through Public Technology, Inc., Publication and Distribution, 1301 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20004.

"Squeezing Out the Juice: Fresh Ideas for Energy Conservation," *The Portland Alliance* (May 1991), by Patrick Mazza. Describes technologies in household energy conservation with the Northwest in mind. Available through Northwest Alliance Alternative Media and Education (NAAME), 2807 S.E. Stark, Portland, OR 97214.

Berkeley Energy Resource Directory, July 1991. Listing of energy organizations, services and businesses. For more information contact Berkeley Energy Commission chairperson Kristin Heinemeier, City of Berkeley Energy Office, 2180 Milvia St., Berkeley, CA 94704.4151644-6309.

"Energy: From Crisis to Solution," by Hal Harvey and Bill Keepin (January 1991). Report on energy efficiency both domestic and international. Looks at utilities, buildings, transportation and obstacles to sustainability. The Energy Foundation, 75 Federal St., San Francisco, CA 94107.415/ 549-7400.



Major Vernon Victory

On May 23, 1991, grassroots anti-toxics activists across the country scored a major victory when Security Environmental Systems announced that it was abandoning its plans to build a massive toxic waste incinerator in Vernon, next to East Los Angeles, California. The incinerator was opposed for years by a broad coalition of groups led by the Mothers of East LA, who viewed the attempt to site the dangerous facility in their overwhelmingly Latino area yet another case of environmental racism.

The California anti-toxics movement's focus now shifts to incinerator battles in Kettleman City and Martinez, with special attention on Kettleman which is another overwhelmingly Latino area. "We don't think it is a coincidence that the toxic dumpers targeted East LA and then Kettleman City — only us Mexicans live here," noted Mary Lou Mares of the Kettleman community group El Pueblo para el Aire y Agua Limpio (People for Clean Air and Water). "We are all in solidarity with the people of Kettleman City," said Cathy Ivers of the group CASE of Martinez.

Resource-Efficient Housing: An Annotated Bibliography and Directory of Helpful Organizations, 1991 Edition, by Robert Sardinsky and the Rocky Mountain Institute, 1739 Snowmass Creek Road, Old Snowmass, CO 81654-9199. 303/927-3851. \$15.00.

"Acting in the National Interest: The Transportation Agenda." Surface Transportation Policy Project, April 1991. A report on the state of public transportation and proposals for a federal agenda. Available through the Surface Transportation Policy Project, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC, 20036. 2021673-4236.

Transportation Efficiency: Tackling Southern California's Air Pollution and Congestion. March 1991. Report on transportation efficiency projections for the year 2010 encompassing per vehicle costs for southern California. Includes bibliography by the Environmental Defense Fund and the Regional Institute of Southern California, 257 Park Ave. South, New York, NY 10010. 2121505-2100.

General Articles and Publications of Interest

"Serious Reservations: Native Americans Fight Dumpers," *Everyone's Backyard*, (June 1991), by Mike Williams. Tells of the Native Americans for a Clean Environment (NACE) and other Native American grassroots organizations around the country opposing toxic waste sites on their land. Single copy \$5.00. Available through CCHW, PO Box 6806, Falls Church, VA 22040. 7031237-CCHW.

World Rivers Review, the International Rivers Network, A Project of the Tides Foundation. March/April 1990. Special Issue: Women and Water in Africa. Contains articles on the James Bay hearings, World Bank, Katun Dam, Glen Canyon. Available from International Rivers Network, 301 Broadway, Suite B, San Francisco, CA 94133.

"From Ash to Cash: The International Trade in Toxic Waste," *E Magazine*, July/August 1991, by Ron Chepesink. Informative article on international toxic waste trade using Greenpeace statistics. Investigates actions taken against this "toxic imperialism" by the United National, World Bank, Greenpeace, Third World governments, and non-governmental organizations. \$3.50.

Ecoforum, a publication of the Environmental Liaison Centre International (ELCI), Global Coalition for Environment and Development. Special issue: Women and the Environment in Developing Countries. Contact ELCI, PO Box 72461, Nairobi, Kenya.

"The Living Earth," *Woman of Power Magazine*, Spring 1991, Issue 20. This special issue focuses on ecofeminism. Includes an interview with *RPE* managing editor Ellie Goodwin. *Woman of Power, Inc.* PO Box 827, Cambridge, MA 02238. 617/625-7885. Single issue price is \$7.00.

"Will North Impose 'Eco-Fascism' on South?" *The Guardian*, July 3, 1991, page 18, by Mary Judith Ress. Latin America Press interview with Manuel Baquedano, president of the Santiago, Chile based Institute for Political Ecology and author of "Ecological Security in Latin America (1986). Explores North-South relations, poverty and the environmental crisis in Latin America. Institute for Independent Social Journalism, Inc., 24 West 25th St., New York, NY 10010.

"Shades of Green," *The East Bay Express*, April 12, 1991, Vol. 13, No. 27 by Laura Hagar. Interview with Carl Anthony, president of the Board of Directors of Earth Island Institute and director of the Urban Habitat Program. Explores the environmental movement's lack of interest in issues concerning the non-white, urban poor.

"Green and Proud," *San Francisco Bay Guardian*, August 14, 1991, page 17, by David Spero. Fighting for the health of their communities, people of color are emerging as leaders of the environmental movement. A look at the emerging multicultural movement in the San Francisco Bay Area.

<< from *INNER CITY*, page 3

which have energy-efficient infrastructures already in place — as active participants in shaping and defining new policies? In reviewing the lessons of the past several decades, three important conclusions about connections between transportation, energy and urban social justice emerge.

- The increasing concentration of poverty in the nation's largest metropolitan areas is linked to the practice of investment in suburban sprawl, and divestment from energy-efficient, inner city communities where people of color live.
- Transportation and energy issues are of critical concern to low income neighborhoods and practitioners of community-based economic development, but advocacy systems for energy and transportation issues are almost non-existent. These systems should be developed.
- Community development corporations in low income and minority communities are well positioned to provide a new and potentially powerful national leadership in advocating energy and transportation efficient patterns for urban neighborhoods.

Suburban Sprawl and Inner City Decline

White flight to the suburbs has left a host of fiscal and social problems in the inner city. The changes in older neighborhoods started in the 1950s, when an extensive highway system, cheap gasoline, and reliable, and relatively inexpensive automobiles made possible dispersion of the population. White flight shifted the development of housing and jobs out of the cities, into the suburbs.

Housing. By the early years of the decade, the rate of national suburban growth was ten times that of the central cities. Characteristically, suburbs were designed and built as completely detached single family dwellings. Zoning and deed restrictions were used to enforce economic and racial homogeneity.

Industry. Between 1947 and 1972 the central cities of the thirty-three largest metropolitan areas (based on 1970 census figures) lost 880,000 jobs in manufacturing, at the same time that their suburbs gained 2.5 million manufacturing jobs. These same cities lost an additional 867,000 jobs in retail and wholesale trade, while millions of such jobs were added to the economies of their suburban areas.

White flight also created fiscal problems. From 1970 to 1980, the largest 50 cities lost five percent of their populations, while populations in poverty increased by 20 percent. The result was declining tax bases for cities at precisely the moment when demands for services were increasing the need for more revenues. Out migration of families increased difficulties of sustaining basic urban institutions — churches,

banks, stores, recreation facilities — in the face of growing joblessness. At the same time, the demise of these institutions cut off the traditional modes of social mobility and subjective perceptions of opportunity, resulting in a circular process of downwardly adjusted hopes and expectations, and increased isolation of poorer urban populations. Yet spatial segregation in the metropolitan region cut off suburban populations from any feeling of responsibility for the less advantaged left behind in the cities.

However, past efforts at inner city revitalization have often brought in their wake gentrification and displacement. Economic development does not begin with goods. It begins with people, their education, organization and discipline. The same might be said for energy conservation. To avoid the problems of gentrification we must come to terms with the historical trend and to address the institutional needs of disadvantaged urban communities.

White flight has also destroyed millions of acres of valuable farmland close to our urban settlements. Nearby farmland is valuable to urban communities for a variety of reasons: it helps to increase ecological diversity, preserves open space and increases the self-reliance of regions, and reminds us of where our food comes from. It conserves energy in the transport of food.

Suburban sprawl has wasted farm land. Speculators bought up available agricultural properties, and subdivisions squeezed out the remaining farms. During the early part of the decade, for example, thousands of new houses were put up on the outskirts of Philadelphia, on land which had been a productive agricultural settlement for generations. The suburban housing tract is based on a radical and energy inefficient separation of land uses. In a typical suburban block, much of the total land area is wasted. Streets that serve only local traffic are oversized. The density of suburban blocks are low, typically six to eight houses per acre. Stores are spread out along single-purpose, sparsely covered strips.

Lower density means a higher per capita cost of building and maintaining services — roads, utilities, transportation. In other words, a waste of energy.

The magnitude of the loss is staggering. According to Lester Brown, president of Worldwatch Institute, "Wherever national data are available, they usually show the growth of cities to be a leading source of cropland loss." In 1967,

only 35 million acres of land had been devoted to urban and built-up uses. A decade later, the figure stood at 65 million acres. From 1977 to 1982, the American Land Forum estimated that an additional 10 million acres had been converted to non-farm use.

It is costing hundreds of millions of barrels of non-renewable petroleum resources to fuel the automobile commute. As suburban employment grows, the freeways and

>> see *INNERCITY*, page 13

There are parallels between the waste of land and biological resources from fragmented land use decisionmaking, and the waste of human lives resulting from the same processes.

<< from INNER CITY, page 12

roads surrounding urban villages are carrying more motorists. Increasingly, commuters are finding the road to work blocked by gridlock. The Union of Concerned Scientists has estimated that as much as 72 % of petroleum consumption in the U.S. is used for transportation. A recent study by the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Sierra Club found suburban residents are likely to travel as many as five times the number of vehicle miles as residents of denser urban developments.

There are parallels between the waste of land and biological resources from fragmented land use decisionmaking, and the waste of human lives resulting from the same processes.

Transportation, Energy and the Inner City

Transportation and energy consumption patterns of the urban poor are different from those typical of affluent suburban residents. Policies based upon the habits and resources of well-to-do suburbanites do not meet the needs of inner city residents, or address the opportunities for energy conservation in the inner city.

In general, city dwellers consume less land, less energy, less water, and produce less pollution than their counterparts living at lower densities in the suburbs. Housing densities in suburbs range from four to six units per acre, while urban housing ranges from 20 units (rowhouses) to 80 units (mid-rise construction) per acre. Less land is therefore needed for each person. Compact buildings have more shared walls and less exterior surface, and therefore, smaller heating demands.

The urban poor more often live in attached dwelling units, row houses, and multifamily housing than do middle- and upper-income whites. Their homes are more often rented. Studies show that although multifamily housing is more energy efficient as a building type, poor and renting households consistently live in less weatherized units and spend a higher portion of their household income on home energy than the affluent.

Cities require less travel distances and automobile use. High density and mixed use makes mass transit viable. Yet we continue to invest in suburban development and inner city abandonment with its concomitant waste of human and natural resources.

Black households tend to own fewer vehicles, use them more intensively, purchase fuel more frequently, and maintain smaller fuel inventories than do white households. They travel less than half the vehicle miles in private automobiles than the national average and use public transportation more frequently than do the affluent. They are thus less likely than suburban whites to benefit from policies which emphasize increased automobile efficiency.

Market-based solutions to energy conservation are often unfair to poor people. Policy makers often suggest market based solutions as a way to encourage energy conservation. Such policies are often unfair to poor people. They

ignore the extent to which upper-income groups have benefited by government subsidies, such as the federal tax codes which encourage businesses to abandon old structures before their useful life is at an end. They ignore the influence of federal highway construction or the impact of reimbursement formulas for waterline and sewer construction on the decline of inner cities.

Low-income households pay a disproportionate amount for their energy, up to a third of their

The suburban housing tract is based on a radical and energy inefficient separation of land uses. In a typical suburban block, much of the total land area is wasted. Lower density means a higher per capita cost of building and maintaining services — roads, utilities, transportation. In other words, a waste of energy.

total budgets for basic energy services, and pay more for the same services than the average customer because they cannot afford energy investments. Though inner city residents

are already suffering the most from the current wasteful energy system, they often bear the burden of policies that on one hand attempt to account for environmental externalities by increasing the price of energy, but that on the other hand ignore the economic externalities. Frieden and Baker found that of all population groups, poor families turned out to be the most responsive to price increases, and in some cases this led to more than minor inconveniences. "For some low income families, economizing on home heating meant living with temperatures well below comfort or health levels."

Policies which would increase the cost of gasoline would hurt the elderly living on fixed income in neighborhoods without adequate public transportation, who have no way of shopping or getting to the hospital other than using their cars. On the other hand, policies which encourage and strengthen the convenience of public transportation and affordable, sustainable neighborhoods could reduce the number of abandoned buildings and the amount of vacant land located close to the existing urban energy infrastructure. Such policies would result in benefits to the urban poor. Increasing the number of people living in underutilized census tracts would strengthen the economic viability of neighborhood services, reducing the need for travel. Such policies would benefit fiscally strapped school boards and public agencies who need to install more energy efficient furnaces and insulation in old schools and energy wasting public buildings.

A National Energy Policy for Inner City Communities

The Persian Gulf crisis has once again focused public attention on the need for a national energy policy. Inner city community-based organizations should develop strategies of active support of new legislation and policies as solutions to urban energy problems. A new national energy policy is an opportunity reverse the pattern of urban abandonment. Advocates of a new national policy, however, should play

>> see INNERCITY, page 14

<< from JAMES BAY, page 1

altered significantly. Methane and carbon dioxide have been released into the atmosphere as flooded vegetation continues to decompose and methyl mercury has entered the food chain.

The native Cree and Inuit peoples that have inhabited the James Bay region for approximately 5,000 years were never notified of Hydro-Quebec's ambitious plans for their homeland. Since the project began, they have organized politically, traveled worldwide and filed numerous lawsuits. Now that Hydro-Quebec plans to create 3,800 square miles of new reservoirs as part of Phase II, both the Cree and Inuit have redoubled their efforts to enlist the residents of New England in their campaign to stop Hydro-Quebec.

In March, David Brower, Boyce Richardson (author of *Strangers Devour the Land*), representatives of the Grand Council of the Crees of Quebec and members of the Goodman Group (energy consultants to the Cree) toured New England to alert the public to the issue through public appearances, radio and television interviews. In New York, the NAPJB team gathered for a press conference at the United Nations building, sponsored by Dr. Noel Brown of the United National Environment Program. The tour concluded at an organizers' conference in Burlington, Vermont, where David Brower and Winona LaDuke gave keynote speeches.

Hydro-Quebec wants to accelerate its scheduled construction but is running into numerous difficulties. In late 1990, the Canadian National Energy Board (NEB) ruled that any dams being built to serve the export market must undergo a federal environmental assessment. Hydro-Quebec, arguing that the review process can proceed while the necessary road and airports are being built, has appealed the decision.

On March 13, the Canadian Bond Rating Service Ltd. put the entire province of Quebec on a credit watch because of the many unresolved issues concerning the provincial debt load, potential legal actions stemming from the recognition of the rights of native

people and the fiscal results anticipated from environmental impacts of the dam. More recently, Moody's Investors Service Inc. expressed its concern over past financial practices that permitted Hydro-Quebec to issue its bonds in foreign currencies without agreements to swap them back into Canadian currency.

The New England and New York activists who started the Northeast Alliance believe that only a regional approach—ne emphasizing energy efficiency as well as cultural protection and biological diversity—can prevent additional development in James Bay.

"It is very hard to accept [conservation alternatives] when people here are being told the choice is between nuclear, fossil or hydro," Cree Grand Council executive director Bill Namagoose said during the tour. He pointed out that any energy plan has to consider the social, health and environmental costs at both ends of the transmission lines.

"Flooding massive amounts of so-called wasteland for one purpose only—electricity production—when more environmentally benign alternatives may soon be available, is not the answer to our energy needs," added the Goodman Group's Ian Goodman.

NAPJB's affiliates include Massachusetts Save James Bay, Inc., No Thank Q Hydro-Quebec (Maine), PROTECT, James Bay Action Team, James Bay Action Network, The Vermont Coalition to Save James Bay, Yale Save James Bay! (Connecticut), regional chapters of the Student Environmental Action Coalition (SEAC), Preserve Appalachian Wilderness (New Hampshire) and the NAPJB chapter in New York. Organizing efforts are underway in Rhode Island and elsewhere.

For more information, contact Northeast Alliance to Protect James Bay, 139 Antrim St., Cambridge, MA 02139. Phone 627/491-5531. Tax-deductible contributions may be made to James Bay Project/Earth Island Institute. This article is reprinted from the summer issue of the Earth Island Journal.

<< from INNER CITY, page 13

closer attention to the intersections between land use patterns, energy consumption and social justice.

While efforts to increase fuel efficiency of automobiles are important, it is equally important to reduce the need for automobile transportation through intelligent urban design and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods, especially poor neighborhoods. We should redesign and rebuild such neighborhoods for access by proximity—bringing energy efficient housing, amenities and services into each community, rather than relying exclusively on vehicles. One strategy would be developing guidelines to change bank lending practices, to provide additional credit to homeowners in efficient houses in neighborhoods with access to public transportation.

An opportunity exists to bring the voice of communities of color and other inner city residents into the process of developing national energy and transportation policies. Community development corporations (CDCs) in low income and minority communities are well positioned to provide a new and potentially powerful national leadership in advocating energy and transportation efficient patterns for urban neighborhoods.

Neighborhood-based community development corporations were established in the 1960s to address issues of economic disenfranchisement of the nation's poorest communities. The location of CDCs in poor, inner city neighborhoods, their ability to undertake educational programs, their knowledge of community needs, and their position in the core of metropolitan regions suggests an important role they may play in providing leadership to the metropolitan region helping to make the transition away from wasteful, polluting practices to more sustainable patterns of land use.

CDCs are non-profit corporations with neighborhood representatives sitting on their boards. Such corporations—many located in inner city neighborhoods—are able to acquire

>> see INNER CITY, page 15

<< from BAYVIEW, page 9

lishment of a Community Advisory Committee to guide the design of the programs to best meet the needs of the community. This Committee consists of key interested individuals from the community which were nominated by local leaders.

The project has two main goals: one, to improve the energy efficiency of the community, thereby hopefully reducing the amount of money leaving the neighborhood each year in the form of energy expenditures, and two, developing and promoting community-based energy efficiency programs which also serve economic development needs and provide for the greatest benefit to the local economy.

Program designs are being developed in three areas: Youth Training and Home Weatherization, Small Business Energy Assistance, and Energy Review of New Housing Construction. In an effort to use local resources to address local needs, the Youth Program links youth training to weatherization and minor home repair. The Bureau is working with Young Community Developers, a neighborhood youth employment services provider, and PG&E to determine how weatherization programs and services can address job training and employment for youth as well as provide valuable home improvement services for seniors in the neighborhood. A Youth Advisory Committee is participating in program development.

An important element of community and economic development is affordable housing. "Affordability" has increasingly come to include the energy costs of housing. Bayview Hunter's Point has a much higher percentage of home owners than the city as a whole, and over 64% of these homeowners are African American. The project's housing component is intended to provide information on housing energy issues and prepare appropriate energy efficient design and construction guidelines to lower energy costs in new housing construction projects.

The Small Business Energy Assistance Program includes a series of

energy educational seminars for small businesses in the area. All support services required for the seminars are provided by businesses or individuals from the community. The program includes training and promoting minority-owned businesses in the energy management field. The program is being coordinated with PG&E small businesses programs being offered which provide free energy services to small business in Bayview. It is hoped the education being offered will better ensure that Bayview businesses are able to take advantage of the technical and financial opportunities being provided by PG&E and other agencies to cut business energy costs.

The Bayview Neighborhood Energy and Economic Development Project is targeting lowering the costs of living and doing business in the community, job training and employment for neighborhood youth, as well as improving community-wide energy efficiency. These results are important, but so is the process. Community participation is a large component in all program development and implementation phases. In this way the program fosters ownership of local energy programs while educating and empowering neighborhood residents. The Bayview Energy and Economic Development Program can serve as a model for how local energy planning initiatives can contribute to a community's economic well being and be supportive of a range of other community development goals. It can also serve as a demonstration of sharing the economic benefits of energy programs with low-income residents that need it the most. Hence, community energy management can serve the wider economic strategy as well as being a valuable end in itself. Community groups might request their local utility companies and governments to explore the possibility of implementing similar neighborhood-based projects.

Christine Vance is the project manager for the Neighborhood Energy Economic Development project in Bayview Hunter's Point. Abu Baker is a summer intern working with Ms. Vance on this effort.

<< from INNER CITY, page 14

property, build housing, undertake economic development, provide education and job training. From 1970 through 1990, CDCs built more low income housing than the federal government. During the 1980s, despite hostility from Washington, these groups thrived, and new ones were established. Today there are 1500 to 2000 such organizations around the country, showing surprising vitality and strength.

In the light of the need for urban energy transformation, new functions of community development corporations could be: energy education and information; urban agriculture, canning, and other local food processing enterprises; businesses related to weatheriza-

Strengthening our understanding of the connection between social justice, energy and transportation issues may encourage effective collaboration between environmental and social justice movements.

tion, heating, air conditioning; retraining; encouragement of energy efficient new housing construction, including advocacy of compact urban land use, energy efficient location decisions; diversifying recreational opportunities, using school buses rather than cars; developing car and van pool systems.

Recognition of the connection between social justice and environmental issues can help us develop a sound national energy policy. It can also assist inner city communities to reclaim and restore forgotten urban neighborhoods. Advocates of social justice should pay more attention to the National Energy Policy debate. Strengthening our understanding of the connection between social justice, energy and transportation issues may encourage effective collaboration between environmental and social justice movements which all too often in the past found themselves at odds.

<< from COSTS, page 4

subsidized by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides another example of the inordinate impacts of inefficiency, both organizational and with respect to energy, upon the poor. Here we are referring to privately-owned housing. Public, or HUD-owned, housing uses enormous amounts of energy too, but these costs are not passed directly to the residents. But about 40% of HUD units are not public-owned but rent-subsidized under the various HUD Section 8 programs. Briefly, the Section 8 programs work like this: landlords agree to receive a "fair market" rent, established by the Housing Authority (HA), in exchange for renting units in their buildings to low-income tenants. So long as tenant energy use is less than a "ceiling," also established by the HA, the tenant is to pay no more than 30% of adjusted family income for rent/ utilities; the difference is paid by a HUD Section 8 subsidy. Energy usage above the ceiling must be paid by the tenant. One recent survey of Housing Authorities, conducted by Steven Ferrey of Suffolk University, found that, largely due to both artificially low usage ceilings and inaccurate calculations by HAs, families under Section 8 programs pay on average over 36% of total income for rent and utilities, or 20% more than the law allows.

Though the physical condition of Section 8 dwellings is variable, as a group these units represent one of the most neglected housing sectors in terms of energy efficiency. HUD's management of these units is characterized by inadequate contact with building owners and limited capacity to evaluate not just energy costs but even building soundness. HUD can provide an illustration of lack of action to promote conservation in low-income housing. A brief look at HUD's energy expenditure woes will help us understand the complicated relationship between the provision of energy and the quality of life of the nation's poor.

Nationwide, HUD directly subsidizes the rents and/or energy payments of around 3.5 million units, or about 12% of the rental units in the country.

Most public housing in the U.S. was built before 1973, when the first oil price shocks occurred and energy efficiency began to work its way into building construction. Much of the public housing stock, therefore is very inefficient, especially in urban areas, where older multifamily buildings are the main low-income dwellings.

Energy conservation, affecting as it does realities of equity and environment, is essentially an issue of community development. Community groups are in an ideal position to equip themselves to enter the conservation field and help to lessen the energy burden on their poor. Particularly in urban areas, where inefficient buildings are inhabited largely by low-income renters, and where detailed local connections can be needed to gain the trust of owners and renters alike, community groups are essential. In communities where Community Development Organizations (CDOs) exist, these would seem to be logical managers of low-income weatherization programs.

Community-based groups have proven to be one of the most convenient and effective means to implement conservation programs. The most longstanding and successful utility program in California, as relied on community action agencies (CAAs), local contractors, and other community-based organizations for the installation of weatherization measures. In Minneapolis, a utility-sponsored non-profit works with a variety of other organizations to fund, install, maintain, and monitor energy-conserving retrofits; this group has at times cooperated with HUD and the local Housing Authority to contact owners of multifamily buildings in need of conservation work. In Portland, Oregon, the city's Energy Office coordinates with utilities and the CAA to put technicians and funding where they might do the most; they condense all relevant programs into one "conservation package", easily understood by the owner/tenant. There are many other examples of this type of coordination at the local level; the catalyst is a local group, in many cases a non-profit.

Community-based low-income weatherization programs throughout the country have been working against the general trend of neglect at the federal level; programs are getting much more effective even as program stability would seem to be more uncertain. Both the technical expertise and the marketing ability of weatherization agencies have developed as smaller-scale collaboration supplants federal leadership.

Entrance into the field of low-income energy conservation services, then, offers great opportunities for local groups to help their communities by reducing the negative impacts of energy costs on low-income residents.

Unfortunately, weatherization programs are usually evaluated by policymakers in strictly economic terms rather than within the context of community development. For the CDO trying to get involved with weatherization, this fact presents some problems: 1) competition for money and contracts is a fact of life for weatherization firms, especially those bidding for demand-side management contracts; 2) similarly, groups which possess a high level of technical expertise have an edge over those that do not. Currently, there is a great need for trained weatherization personnel. For local groups, particularly non-profits which may have social goals such as job creation and basic skills training in mind, hiring and keeping qualified personnel can be difficult.

Small-scale, locally-run programs can help largely low-income communities begin to control their own energy destinies while creating jobs and teaching weatherization skills. In the face of decreased federal funding for weatherization, though, non-profits involved in weatherization are having to streamline their operations and compete for survival. There is a real danger of non-profits being locked out of the weatherization industry. The challenge for groups interested in community development and weatherization is to reconcile these opposing pressures.

Andrew McAllister is a graduate student in the Energy and Resources Group at the UC-Berkeley.

<< from EDITOR'S NOTES, page 2

Native Americans for a Clean Environment discussing extraction methods and the effects on indigenous people, a first-person account by an energy auditor about home audit programs, and a reportback on a symposium which focused on the National Energy Strategy and its effects on the poor.

It is a beginning—hopefully more information will become available from you, our readers. Let us know what programs are working in your area, and which ones aren't. Communication is the key, not only among the major utilities and power suppliers, but among ourselves as well.

As we go to print, the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, to be held in Washington, DC October **24-27, 1991**, is in its final planning stages. Among the environmental and social justice agenda items slated, there will be discussion of national energy policy as it relates (or doesn't, as the case may be) to low-income people and people of color. As managing editor of *Race, Poverty, & the Environment*, I applaud in advance the efforts of the Summit coordinators and advisory committees for bringing the topic of energy production, use, and cost to the attention of the broader social justice and environmental community.

Energy. How is it produced? How much does it cost? Are elected officials seeking input from their low- and fixed-income constituents about their energy needs and supplies? Further, are they taking this feedback to their governmental committees and caucuses for inclusion in policy discussions? Is information about energy efficiency programs and efficient appliances easily understood and accessible? How can people of color and low-income people gain access to the meetings where energy policy decisions are made? Are energy professionals willing to come into the community and work in the neighborhood? The answers to these and other questions can and will shape energy policy well into the next century.

For environmental and social justice,


Ellie Goodwin

<< from POOR PEOPLE, page 2

poor people and people of color pay the cost.

Air pollution deaths.

A **1987** Contra Costa County Department of Health Services study showed lung cancer rates significantly higher than the national average in West Oakland, site of the Nelson Mandela Parkway (formerly "Cypress Freeway"), and North Richmond, site of the Chevron refinery (the Bay Area's largest single source of criteria pollutants) and many other industries. State epidemiologists tried to blame Richmond cancers on smoking, a U.C. Public Health professor later wrote a report estimating that smoking could only account for a fifth of the excess cancers.

Poor people use the least energy.

Department of Energy research has shown consistently that household energy consumption rises with income: poor people cannot afford the large houses and appliances that use so much fuel. According to the Economic Research Institute, poor households spend **94%** of their budgets on housing, food and energy (typically **25%**), leaving **6%** for transportation, clothing and medical expenses. In the transportation sector, Argonne National Lab researchers have shown that though poor households own older and less efficient cars, they are less likely to be able to own cars at all, and when they do, they drive fewer vehicle miles per month per household. The **1980** census shows that, in California, "nonwhites" are nearly 3 times as likely as "whites" to use public transportation for work commuting. In the Bay Area, those who take public transit are twice as likely to be under the poverty line as those who drive.

Inner city people are left out of policy decisions

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District estimates that transportation control measures of its **1991** Clean Air Plan may increase living expenses by two percent in an average household and seven percent in a poor household. These disempowered groups are already bearing the burdens of the energy and air pollution problem; they should not bear the burden of the solutions. We need affordable mass transit.

What is being done?

At the Urban Habitat Program, we are working on solutions to these problems. The newly formed Urban Habitat Energy and Air Task Force has these goals:

1. To illustrate the adverse impacts of current energy policy on poor communities and communities of color;
2. To increase participation of these traditionally excluded groups into the energy, transportation and land use planning decisions in the Bay Area; and
3. To develop policy options that address the needs of inner city residents and promote an efficient and clean urban infrastructure and housing base.

<< from NACE, page 5

LH. One of the basic problems with these proposals is that they are done pretty much behind closed doors for a considerable amount of time, and arrangements are made without including participation from the various tribal memberships. What really angers tribal members more than anything is that deals are being struck that could affect them for a long time without their input. I'd say that 90-95 percent of the proposals are done with only a tribal chairman and a few members of the council working relatively secretly for a long time, to the point where they are forced by federal law [to disclose a project], without having public hearings at all. When it comes out what's been going on, the membership usually doesn't relate to that very well. They'd like to be included sooner in these processes.

AJ. What does NACE look at when examining "economic benefits" to the community?

LH. When we look at economic development we try to look at it with a more holistic view. The economy is not just jobs, it's not just money. It's also things like the

infrastructure within our community systems and the stability or the sustainability of whatever project we're looking at. [In terms of jobs,] a lot of these proposals these days require a staff of very qualified engineers and scientists. We don't have many Native American scientists running around. We usually get what I refer to as the "ditch digging" jobs — the low paying jobs which are always the first point of contact with any kind of contamination. We may have a job with this industry for five or ten years, but if it contaminates us and we can't provide a living for our family, then in the long run we don't think it was really worth it. I think a lot of that happened particularly

When we look at economic development we try to look at it with a more holistic view. A lot of these proposals require engineers and scientists. We don't have many Native American scientists... We usually get the "ditch digging" jobs — the low paying jobs which are always the first point of contact with any kind of contamination.

with the uranium mining out at Navajo.

AJ. Tell us about NACE.

LH. We've been around for over six years. We have a primary focus on nuclear issues, specifically a uranium conversion facility in the Cherokee community here. In the last couple of years we've been working with other tribes and citizen groups on toxic hazards and nuclear issues in their tribal areas, trying to keep tabs on what's going on around the country with different companies and also keeping tabs on some of our "National Indian" organizations.

AJ. Why NACE?

LH. Indian peoples on the reservation have always been subject to some of the most devastating types of activities from industry. Because we are geographically and culturally

removed from the rest of the U.S., few people hear about the things that go on in our homes.

AJ.

What tools does NACE use?

LH.

The basic tools we use are

public education, some citizen activism, and we certainly use litigation. We also publish a newsletter every month to try to keep people informed.

AJ. Is NACE interested in or supportive of any current energy technology developments?

LH. Well, we're a major supporter of what are termed "alternative energies." It's a sad fact that the energy companies in the world aren't really developing these types of technologies and so they're left on the drawing table and the gas, nuclear, coal, hydroelectric, which is what these companies control, is what we have to work with. But we're very supportive of alternative types of energy and, of course, energy

conservation.

AJ. Let's say you had to deliver a speech to a group of urban residents — African American, Hispanic and Asian American. They don't know much about Native American lands, but you want to convince them to begin to think about these issues and actually support your movement. How could we build a coalition with Native Americans? What would you tell us?

LH. The only thing I could really say is work with your city council so you know where all your garbage is going. With such an effort to regionalize these waste dumps and ship garbage out of the urban areas, there are really few places it can go and you're usually talking rural areas, usually midwest, Indian areas. The Rosebud proposal [for a 5,000 acre garbage dump] is an example. Do the people in the city of Denver, people in the city of Minneapolis, do they know all their trash is proposed to go to the Rosebud reservation in South Dakota? Is that what they really want to do? If people have a truthful, proper education, they'll be able to make the right decision.

When we look at things like nuclear energy, we ask the people who live in urban areas, whose power is supplied by nuclear power plants, to be aware and take it personally. Our children get all kinds of cancer so that people can run their VCRs.

I try and explain to people that if my good friend has a child born without eyes and eye sockets and I have to have that vision in my mind and it doesn't go away, I want you to have that vision also when you flip that light switch. It's unfair to force this upon a people who don't want it in the first place, to support your needs and then live with the devastation while everyone else ignores what is happening. NACE is asking people not to ignore what happens to us, and that in itself is an education process. I think that evolves further into a more rational determination of how we're going to work on these issues.

For more information, contact NACE, PO Box 1671, Tahlequah, OK 74465, 918/458-4322.

<< from EFFICIENCY, page 4

this problem have been a long time coming. One possible future is being examined in Richmond.

Richmond, California is a middle and low-income community located 20 miles northeast of San Francisco. This city of 90,000 is predominantly African-American with a growing Latino and Asian population. The area is largely residential, but the western fringe contains numerous industrial plants controlled by oil and chemical companies.

Many utilities operate according to a standard industry credo: "When people use more energy, their lives are more comfortable, they make more products (which helps the GNP), and we make more money." Using more energy was good for the individual, the country, and the utility—to a limit. Pacific Gas & Electric is the largest utility in the United States. It provides energy to over 12 million people in Central and Northern California.

In order for an utility to supply increased quantities of energy, they must locate new fossil fuel energy supplies and build new power plants, a very expensive proposition during the past decade.

The price of developing new energy sources became so high that PG&E has revisited an approach it began to enact during the energy crisis of the mid-70s: conservation.

Richmond is a particularly promising target for residential energy conservation for three reasons: 1. low-income residents pay a disproportionate amount of their income in energy costs, 2) low-income residents are less likely than their middle and upper-class counterparts to have been exposed to energy conservation practices, and 3) the poor condition of much low-income housing allows large energy (and consequently bill) savings with only a small investment in repairs.

PG&E, as part of a collaborative plan designed with other utilities and environmental groups (such as the

Natural Resources Defense Council), is implementing a ten-year energy-efficiency campaign that will affect millions of residential customers. The goal is to acquire at least 75% of the projected 3300 megawatt increase in electric demand for the next decade via efficient energy use. This two billion dollar effort is one-fifth the cost of constructing a new nuclear power plant to satisfy such energy needs. The conservation methods are varied and, more importantly, adaptable to the local situation.

The three major means for addressing energy efficiency are through appliance replacement, education, and weatherization. These free programs are not new, but the scale on which they are being implemented is. Some programs are income based with low-income being defined as those who, in the expensive state of California, survive on earnings under 150% of the federal poverty line if under 60 years of age, or 200% if older.

The Target Customer Appliance Program (TCAP) provides low-income households with new energy-efficient refrigerators, furnaces and water heaters; the greatest energy users in most homes. The benefits are twofold. Ms. Goodall explains, "I receive \$940 a month. After PG&E, rent, and water, I'm broke." Without TCAP she cannot afford a new refrigerator and "...would have been trying to lug my groceries from my neighbor's house." The appliances provided in the TCAP program are energy efficient, consequently, Mrs. Goodall's monthly bill should show increased savings.

The Energy Savings Plan questions residents on their energy use, provides a customized breakdown of the cost of using each appliance, and suggests where savings may be achieved through a change in appliance use and/or resident behavior. This educational program was implemented because PG&E discovered that previous energy efficiency efforts sometimes achieved only half of the energy savings antici-

pated. Reverend R.D. Dotson, of the Seaport Missionary Baptist Church, maintains "We need advice specific to the needs of the community." The energy auditor provides that advice on a household by household basis while installing low-flow showerheads, water heater blankets, and fluorescent lights.

Energy Partners (EP) weatherizes low-income households. Ms. Goodall's situation with the window that would not close in her child's bedroom is repeated with a thousand variations ranging from flues, doors, ducts, and faucets. EP provides ceiling insulation, weatherstripping, and a variety of other measures intended to save energy by preventing the egregious escape of heat and hot water. This program targets over 600,000 homes in the next decade.

PG&E also has a number of programs that provide rebates on home insulation, energy-efficient appliances, and fluorescent lights. The biggest problem is that people are unaware of them. Tina Green, a 26-year old single mother of four notes, "PG&E should make commercials. I get this information with my bill and throw it away."

PG&E's energy efficiency programs serve as a model for the nation's utilities. They help people limit their energy use and, in particular, provide vital assistance to low-income households. PG&E also recognizes that the Energy Plan proposed by President Bush is founded on the antiquated notion that oil exploration is the solution to our energy woes. Ironically, by promoting efficiency, PG&E is also delaying the day of reckoning when we stop the search for increasingly scarce fossil fuels, and the environmental, mental havoc they wreak, and use alternative fuels that treat the biosphere with respect.

An energy auditor for Pacific Gas & Electric Company, Max Weintraub is pursuing a master's degree in environmental advocacy at the University of Michigan. He wrote the booklet "African-American Environmentalists in the Bay Area."

RPE Tribute: Exploring the Energy Needs and Strategies of People of Color

Dr. Lenneal J. Henderson, Jr.

When attempting to cover a topic as broad as energy, one can become overwhelmed by the amount of information — or the lack of it. In compiling the articles and information for this issue of *RPE*, we noticed two things: first, much of the information that has been generated regarding people of color and energy needs was from the mid-1970s. The second interesting item is that since the 1970s, most of this information has been generated by one person: Dr. Lenneal J. Henderson, Jr.

Dr. Henderson is a Distinguished Professor of Government and Public Administration and a Senior Fellow at the Center for Public Policy at the University of Baltimore. As well as serving on numerous boards and having professional affiliations that cover a range of disciplines, Dr. Henderson has written the following articles that specifically address people of color, the poor, and energy:

- *Municipal Energy Management and Conservation*, Conference of Black Mayors, 1982.
- "The Socioeconomic Basis of Energy Policy," *Proceedings of the U.S. Department of Energy 1990*.
- "Neighborhoods in the Capitol: The Role of Advisory

Neighborhood Commissions," *National Civic Rev.*, July 1989.

- "Energy Policy and Minority Business Opportunity," *The Journal of Minority Business Finance*, Fall 1981.
 - "Energy Policy and Public Administration: A Social Systems Perspective," *Howard Law Journal*, 1981.
 - "Energy Policy and Urban Fiscal Management," *Public Administration Review* v. 41, January 1981.
 - "Public Utilities: The Socioeconomic Basis of Reform," *The Review of Black Political Economy*, Fall 1979.
 - "Energy Policy and Social Equity," in Robert Lawrence ed. *New Dimensions of Energy Policy* (Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books, 1979).
 - "Energy Policy and Socioeconomic Growth in Low-Income Communities," *The Review of Black Political Economy*, Fall 1977.
 - "Public Utility Regulation and Social Equity," in Ellis Cose, ed. *Energy and Equity: Some Social Concerns* (Washington, D.C. The Joint Center for Political Studies, 1978).
- RPE* salutes Dr. Henderson and hopes his work can help crystalize the policy debate regarding energy needs, the poor, and people of color.

Race, Poverty & the Environment
 c/o Earth Island Institute
 300 Broadway, Suite 28
 San Francisco, CA 94133-3312

Nonprofit
 Organization
 US Postage
 PAID
 Permit No. 1414
 San Francisco, CA