

PLANNERS NETWORK

P.O. BOX 4671, SATHER GATE STATION

BERKELEY,

CALIFORNIA

94704

#24—May 21, 1980

Spring greetings to everyone out there Networking. The editorial tasks of the newsletter have passed on from the Western Urban Regional Collective to a new Newsletter Collective of thirteen people in the Bay Area: Bob Ruhloff, John McCloud, Vincent DePillis, Daniel Farber, Amy Glasmeier, B.T. Washington, David Wilmoth, Nancy Leigh-Preston, Michael Storper, Marc Weiss, Linda Lillow, Ann Markusen and Hilde Jeffers. The new group has formed out of both enthusiasm and a need to share the work around. The last newsletter contributed to an acute case of pneumonia on the part of Hilde Jeffers and while we applaud dedication, no one ought to find working on the newsletter bad for her health! In order to make the newsletter a collective project, we have decided upon two major changes, one in the organization of the production process and the other in the way we deal with membership. The first we won't bore you with, except to say that we hope we have hit upon a way of introducing specialization of labor and a bit of hierarchical responsibility while maintaining a truly collective process. The plan is to cycle collective members through the four specialized functions (communications, administration, editorial, and production) and through the vertical integration system (e.g., we will have revolving editorship) every issue.

The second concerns *you*. Our collective process is a lot more humane to the workers, we think, but it does mean that you will lose the personal touch that Chester brought to the newsletter and to his correspondence. Try to think of us as a bunch of friends who are putting in a lot of volunteer time to keep the Newsletter going but who as individuals will not always know you or remember when we last heard from you. Specifically, this means really taking seriously the responsibility to contact us at least once a year to ensure that you stay on our mailing list. Preferably, we'd like to hear what you are doing and thinking, not just a change of address form.

And now is a timely moment. The next newsletter mailing will include the updated roster, which will have your name and address and interests in it if we've heard from you in the last year. If not, get it to us quick. If there is a red mark on your label this time, it means that we have not heard from you. (Bear with us and don't get incensed if we've made a mistake—help us out and send us a line again.) If we don't hear from you by June 30, then you won't be on the next roster or get the next newsletter.

And while you are at it, we'd really appreciate a contribution. Our bank account is running low and the roster is a costly item. (In fact, we probably couldn't have afforded to print it this time.) It's miraculous that it's worked so well in the past, not charging people but operating on contributions. So let's keep it up.

In the future, we plan to dispense with the current practice of provisional membership. All people who inquire will receive the newsletter for one year. If we don't hear from you again, then you will be dropped from the list in the annual tidying up. Since January is usually a slow time, we plan on doing the mailing list tailoring every January, so keep in mind that all of you members,

new and old, should be in touch with us by then. We have a terrific crew tackling the backlog—their motto is "We're going to control it, not have it control us!"

One final request—don't forget to send us things. We have an overly Western issue this time, but it's because we haven't heard much from folks elsewhere. Remember to jot down a brief summary of conferences, organizational breakthroughs, good books, your work, your needs, jobs coming up, etc., and sent it to us!

THE REGIONAL STRUGGLE AROUND THE MX

MISSILE: by Amy Glasmeier (Dept. of City and Regional Planning, U.C. Berkeley 94720).

If all goes according to plan, by the Spring of 1981, the Air Force should begin the first development phase of the MX missile project. Acclaimed as the "largest construction project ever undertaken by man," the new land-based multiple nuclear warhead system will cover almost 60% of the remote valleys of Nevada and 20% of Utah. Where population is less than one person per square mile, Air Force officials hope to inhabit the Great Basin with 4,600 missile shelters and at present plan to build at least two major support bases for the project.

But as we all know, plans rarely come off as expected, or on time, or which are inclusive of all the essential parts. Beginning in January 1980, the Air Force began trying to sell this massive mechanical maze to the local residents of the arid reaches of these two states. Holding the first scoping meetings in Ely, Nevada, the Air Force had the first taste of local opposition which has been growing for some time. Even the state officials are reputedly against the system though one wonders when they read the local papers. The Air Force is frantically searching for a way to make the system palatable to the local residents, but who can swallow the prospects of 100,000 new people, a tremendous drain on natural resources, particularly water, and an inflationary cycle which could effectively destroy the way of life which has existed there for almost 125 years?

How would you like your first planning job to be as a junior planner with the consulting firm who is responsible for preparing the massive EIS for this project? The Air Force has given HDR, a Santa Barbara-based environmental sciences firm, the unwieldy task of completing a massive search-and-find study to determine what the impacts of such a project will be. It does not take much more than a hand calculator and a science fiction oriented imagination to come up with designs such as 20,000 new homes, 2,000 new classrooms outfitted with teachers, buses, and other facilities, and 500 new hospital beds where there are only 300 now. If you are wondering who is going to pay for these new towns, the Air Force and the Office of Economic Assistance promise that pennies will miraculously come from heaven once the local residents sign up for a lifetime membership with the MX. What they don't tell local residents is that the pot of gold lies at the feet of many hungry domestic agencies which have just

suffered severe budget cuts by their "benevolent dictator"—Jimmy Carter, who gave the MX the go ahead last summer. Past experiences in Kitsap, Washington—the home of the Trident submarine—suggest that all the pre-planning in the world can't alter the disruptive path of a project the size of the MX. And, unlike the Trident, the MX is set to get underway after only nine months of study and analysis. The Alaska pipeline, one-sixth the cost of the MX, took five years to plan for and even then local communities suffered inflation rates of 25% above the national level, housing prices 400% of normal and a lack of all essential public facilities. It is also not hard to remember that the real benefactors of the Alaska pipeline were non-local construction workers who traveled thousands of miles to take part in some of the highest paid construction work performed to date.

So where does this leave us? The funds have begun to trickle in for state planning studies but the lack of staff and the bickering among local governments may make any attempt at local and statewide planning strictly *pro forma*. There is neither time nor enough money to conduct the studies which would be required to assess the full impact of the MX. At the grass roots level community groups are continuing to fight against the MX. Despite a lack of funds and the great distances which separate the small communities in the Great Basin, residents have shown the Air Force they can't be ignored. Nationally, various groups are mounting campaigns against the MX. The Council on Economic Priorities will soon be publishing a large study of the regional and national economic impacts of the project and have taken to task the military strategists to make public the local and regional destabilizing implications of the MX as well as its wastefulness on purely defense grounds. For more information, write: The Council on Economic Priorities, 84 5th Ave., NY, NY 10011.

SAN FRANCISCO ENACTS SIX MONTH MORATORIUM ON HOTEL CONVERSIONS TO PROTECT THE ELDERLY

by B.T. Washington and Kathy Livermore (Dept. of Sociology, U.C. Berkeley 94720)

In November, 1979, San Francisco's Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance #564-79, which put a six-month freeze on the conversion of low-income residential hotels to expensive tourist hotels. This ordinance was a temporary measure to stop the increasing number of conversions which were displacing many senior and disabled citizens who generally live in these hotels. The drafting of the Residential Hotel Conversion, Demolition and Change in Use Ordinance was the result of a wide base of support, e.g., Gray Panthers, Legal Assistance to the Elderly (LAE), Central City Hospitality House, and Supervisor Ella Hill Hutch.

Diana Bilovsky, a legal activist with LAE, describes this type of conversion as an "insidious form of speculation by the rich at the expense of the poor." Hotel owners, anxious to increase their profits by catering to the tourist industry, remove housing units from an already tight housing market when they convert their hotels to tourist use.

A recent study of San Francisco's residential hotels housing stock by Central City Hospitality House (CCHH) illustrates the effect hotel conversion has on the city's supply of low-income housing. According to the CCHH study, residential hotels "provide a significant portion of housing in the Tenderloin, Chinatown, North Beach, South of Market, Nob Hill, Polk Gulch, Upper Market-Castro, and Mission neighborhoods." This study concludes that in excess of 20,000 San Franciscans reside in residential hotels.

The conversion not only exacerbates the already tight housing market, it also has a disastrous effect on the elderly and disabled,

who are attracted to these hotels because they provide (a) a sense of community, and (b) close proximity to transportation, shops and needed services. Alison Brennan, housing coordinator for the North Market Senior Citizen Center explains that "for many senior citizens, living in residential hotels affords them their last chance for maintaining some degree of independence."

The reduction of the city's low-income housing stock has resulted in both public and personal consequences. In terms of public consequences, the intensification of competition for low-income housing increases San Francisco's present housing shortage. This extreme housing shortage results in the elderly being forced out of the rental market and forced into seeking shelter in boarding institutions. The personal impact, according to Fred Bray, a lawyer with LAE, is that "displacement results in the loss of community, social and emotional ties, and close proximity to transportation, shops, and needed services." In certain cases, Bray continues, "the trauma of having to move has led to the need for hospitalization for the most frail tenants, and in a few instances, it has also led to their deaths."

Although San Francisco has a rent control measure in effect which prevents rent hikes above a certain set annual percentage, hotel owners are able to circumvent this ordinance through the decontrol clause contained in the measure. This clause allows the landlord to charge whatever the market can bear once a unit becomes vacant. To get tenants to move out, hotel management have used various forms of harassment. Fred Bray explains that "from what we [LAE] were able to determine, the management of these hotels generally did not go through any legal process to get tenants to move out." These forms of harassment range from mild coercion to extreme harassment including removal of furniture from the lobby, terminations of mail service, suspension of maid service, removal of public phones from the lobby, tenants being forced to move from floor to floor as the building is being renovated, elevators left unrepaired for weeks, garbage chutes nailed shut, and heat turned off. The general result is living conditions which have so deteriorated, that tenants are forced to move out.

This ordinance has certain shortcomings. According to one of its authors, Diana Bilovsky, Ordinance #564-79 leaves enforcement "up to the Department of Public Works, which is presently understaffed." The ordinance forces potential converters to sign a statement saying they will not convert their residential hotels when they apply for building permits. To overcome the problem of an understaffed enforcement team and other related problems, Ms. Bilovsky recommends a comprehensive program. Such an overall package is indeed on the drawing board and will include (1) declaration of all residential hotels as endangered housing resources, (2) a residential hotel preservation and repair ordinance, and (3) incentives for residential hotel owners to maintain their property. This comprehensive program is still being developed. For more information, contact Fred Bray, Legal Assistance to the Elderly, Inc., 944 Market St., Rm. 803, San Francisco, CA 94102; (415) 434-3895.

THE NATIONAL LOW-INCOME HOUSING CONFERENCE, Washington, April 24-27

by Chester Hartman

The conference turned out to be a very impressive event, if for no other reason than the turnout—about 750 people from 46 states and representing a very large number of grass roots organizations. It was sponsored by a wide range of left-liberal groups: AARP, AFSCME, UAW, National Rural Housing Coalition, Urban League, Urban Coalition, NAN, National Housing Law Project, Center for Community Change, etc. The focus was on an 86-page platform that had been drafted by sponsoring groups prior to the conference, and workshops on

specific issues—from land, tax, energy and monetary policies to displacement, housing discrimination, Indian and farmworker housing, and condo conversions—took it from there, generally moving the platform considerably to the left. The final document called for an end to forced displacement; establishment of a legally enforceable right to decent, affordable housing; substitution of outright government housing grants for the mortgage system; and direct production of housing by nonprofits and democratically controlled government bodies.

The National Low-Income Housing Coalition (Cushing Dolbeare, President, ex-Senator Edward Brooke, Chair), which put together the conference, is largely a lobbying group that over the past few years has become a respected and at times effective force on the Capitol Hill scene. It tends to represent national organizations (although it has 300 individual members, in addition to its 300 organizational members) and focus on Washington, and specifically on lobbying Congress. The conference was a somewhat different creature in terms of its base and politics, and over the next few months it will be interesting to see how and whether the Coalition will shift its emphasis to reflect the constituency it brought together in Washington.

Dolbeare would like to set in motion a process of building state and local coalitions parallel to her national group. The revised platform will be available in a few weeks (their address is 215-8th St., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002; (202)544-3619—think about joining: \$10 individuals, \$10-\$100 organizational), and will be used to some degree in the 1980 campaigns. But Dolbeare is also thinking about preparing an Omnibus Housing Bill, based on the platform, that might serve as a focus for housing organizing work over the next few years in the same way that the Humphrey-Hawkins bill and Sen. Kennedy's National Health Insurance legislation served that function for unemployment and health care organizing (although hopefully with more positive long-term results).

Relatedly: the National Comm. for Rent Control which held its initial meeting in Newark in November, is having a follow-up meeting June 20-22 in Cleveland. Mostly nuts-and-bolts workshops, but some policy and programmatic work as well. It sounds like it will be an important and well-attended event (200-300 persons expected from all over the country). Contact Woody Widrow at Shelterforce, 380 Main St., E. Orange, N.J. 07018; (201) 678-5353 for further information. The NCRC and National Low-Income Housing Coalition are signs that a real 1930s-type housing movement may be aborning.

And while I've got your attention, two personal notes: First, I'll be remaining to teach the fall semester as well in the City Planning Department at the University of North Carolina; second, I'd like to recommend highly a new novel a friend of mine wrote which I think will interest Network folk. It's called *Don't Mind Dying: A Novel of Country Lust and Urban Decay*, by Steve Chapple (Doubleday). Good politics by a good writer.

WESTERN CONFERENCE IN SAN FRANCISCO: Towards a Union of Progressive Planners

Over 100 people gathered in San Francisco on April 12, 1980 for a Planners' Network-sponsored conference entitled "Towards a Union of Progressive Planners." The meeting, timed to coincide with the APA convention, brought together working planners, students and community activists from the West Coast, particularly the San Francisco Bay Area with a strong contingent from Southern California. Others came from elsewhere in Northern California and from as far as Washington and Colorado. The group, which included several blacks, Chicanos and Asians, was about evenly divided between women and men.

The purpose of the conference was to discuss the need for and the possible structure and activities of an organization of pro-

gressive planners. This is similar to efforts elsewhere in the country to organize planners on a regional basis, in part as a response to the call for a national organization made at the 1979 radical planners conference at Cornell. At the half-day San Francisco meeting, panel discussions focusing on the experiences and problems of progressive planners and the activities and planning-related needs of community groups were followed by a general discussion of organizing issues.

The afternoon began with a welcoming address by Ed Bergman of North Carolina who is a member of the ad hoc national steering committee. His remarks focused on concurrent organizing efforts elsewhere in the country.

The first panel, chaired by Erica Schoenberger of the Western Urban and Regional Collective, included Bob Heifetz, an activist planner and sometime professor of urban studies at U.C. San Diego, Noel Day, a consultant and founding partner of Urban and Rural Systems Associates (URSA) in San Francisco, Michael Cronbach, a planner with the San Francisco Municipal Railway, and Roger Montgomery, a professor at U.C. Berkeley and long-time physical and community development planner. The initial focus was on Heifetz's account of the history of activism and attempts to organize within the planning profession, particularly the 1930's effort to form a union (the Federation of Architects, Engineers and Technicians-CIO) and later organizations such as Planners for Equal Opportunity and the Planners Network. The importance of establishing close ties between progressive planners and organized labor was underscored.

The discussion then turned to the particular problems associated with working in various sectors (public, private and university). Day argued that there is little room for maneuver by planner/activists in the private sector and that the 1960's optimism concerning the possibilities for explicitly working to promote social change has given way to concern with the issue of economic survival. The potential importance of a planners' organization that can step in where the private consultant is unable to act because it would be uneconomic to do so (e.g., working with community groups) was emphasized. Cronbach indicated the lack of contact between public sector planners and the people who use these services, and the planners' consequent lack of understanding of community-based protests. In a subsequent discussion he underscored the fact that the conference had helped him understand the extent of this isolation and the need to break out of it. Finally, Montgomery cautioned us against viewing the university as a haven or base for leftist activity both in teaching and professional practice. He noted that the situation progressives face within the university appears to be increasingly tenuous, which again suggests the need for an independent base for progressive planners.

A second panel, chaired by Tak Nakamoto of U.C. Berkeley and composed of representatives from community organizations from San Francisco and Oakland, spoke about the issues their organizations face, how they have responded, and how a progressive planners' organization might help. The panelists were: Jim Shoch of San Franciscans for Affordable Housing and the Gray Panthers; Pat Jackson of the San Francisco Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO; Scott Reed of Oakland Community Organizations; Vic Rubin of the Oakland Study Center; Jennie Lew, formerly of the San Francisco Chinatown Neighborhood Improvement Resources Center; Bob Siegal of Operation Upgrade in the San Francisco Mission District; David Tam of the Political Action Coalition for the Environment.

Though each of the speakers related different experiences, they were in general agreement about the role for progressive planners in their efforts. They stressed the value of the availability of planners to do specific research to support their particular

efforts and to provide a general overview of trends in their community so that these organizations could develop alternative proposals rather than being constantly forced to react to policies developed by others. However, they also stressed that much of the help they needed was not glamorous, but rather mundane.

There was agreement that a national planners organization could be useful as a network in which information could be exchanged among different organizations within a region and among regions.

A few cautionary remarks were also made by the panelists. Shoch referred to problems which arise due to lack of participation by planners altogether or due to advocate planners taking actions unrelated to the activities of community organizations concerned with the same issues. Both Jackson and Lew directed attention to particular problems the groups they work with face. Pat Jackson emphasized labor's necessary concern with preserving jobs and wages. Jennie Lew gave the example of downzoning permitted density in residential areas, which appears to be a policy of racial exclusion when seen from high-density Chinatown. Both emphasized the need for community organizations and progressive planners to understand these differences.

After a lengthy coffee break which gave people a chance to relax, compare impressions and ideas and get to know each other, a somewhat slimmed-down group returned to discuss the why, how and when of a progressive planners' organization. The discussion, chaired by Chip Downs of U.C. Berkeley, was lively and jumped around considerably, but the basic points can be summarized as follows:

Purpose/Goals: Various people offered reasons for having an organization and suggested the kind of thing they would like to see it do. These included:

- provide a forum to educate ourselves and others about each other's work and current issues;
- help provide a collective critique of the professional planning world, as well as more specific information, e.g., topical bibliographies and reading lists;
- provide greater human contact with other progressive planners, helping to break down a feeling of isolation expressed by many people;
- provide an alternative for people who find they cannot do the kind of work they would like in their places of employment;
- help develop the possibility for people to do the kind of work they would like in their jobs;
- formulate and take positions on current issues and develop broader analyses and proposals;
- provide a more social way for progressive planners to get together;
- provide a skills bank and research and proposal support for community groups.

Principal Debate: There were two topics that produced a certain amount of debate. The first concerned how best to support progressive planners outside the Bay Area (or other metropolitan areas) and how to integrate them fully in the work of a regional or national organization. While all recognized this as an important issue, the discussion became focused on the name of the organization and nothing was resolved. Second, there was general agreement that the organization should not become strongly tied to any political organization. But there was an interesting discussion counterposing the advantages and problems of being as open as the current Network or being strongly partisan—of being a “respected source of objective analysis” or being something that makes the Chief Planner worry to know there are members of the organization in the office. This debate will clearly continue.

Resolution: There was strong agreement with the idea of having an organization of progressive planners that would meet

periodically and over the long run seek to serve the various purposes mentioned above, as well as others that may arise. Many issues were left unresolved, but the development of the organization will provide the context in which they can be debated and resolved. It was decided that the organization would sponsor a forum every three or four months on some topic of interest to progressive planners. They will normally be on Friday nights, followed by a social gathering. Forums will be planned and organized by small groups of volunteers who are experts or interested in particular issues; they would make an effort to recruit other participants who would contribute to or want to learn from the debate. The first forum, tentatively scheduled for Saturday morning, May 31, will include a fairly brief discussion of the anti-Proposition 9 campaign followed by canvassing activity in San Francisco. A second forum is tentatively scheduled for August on the changing industrial and employment structure in California and the West.

In addition to the public forums, there will be regular meeting of all those interested in discussing and working on the development of the organization of progressive planners and expanding its functions. Continuity of these various activities will be ensured by an interim steering committee, based in the group that organized this first conference and others who wish to take part.

The steering committee was composed of Chip Downs, Bob Heifetz, John Keilch, Tak Nakamoto, Vic Rubin, Erica Schoenberger and David Wilmoth. Thanks also to Amy Glasmeier, Hilde Jeffers, Anno Saxenian and Marc Weiss who assisted in the organization of the conference, and to Ann Markusen who reported on the afternoon's events.

ONGOING WORK

CO-OP BANK SOON TO OPEN: On March 21, 1980 the National Consumer Cooperative Bank began accepting loan applications for consumer and producer cooperatives. The NCCB provides three types of funding services: Bank Fund, Self-Help Fund, and Technical Assistance. Borrowers from the Bank Fund automatically become shareholders in the NCCB. One percent of every approved loan goes toward the purchase of voting stock. Fifteen percent of each interest payment is used to purchase stock. “In this way, co-ops will gain control and ownership of the Bank. Up to 10% of the Bank Fund will be loaned to producer cooperatives.” The Self-Help Fund is set up to provide financial help to co-ops that are (a) new, (b) have no financial history, or (c) don't have enough equity to qualify for a loan from the Bank Fund. Capital acquired from the Self-Help Fund are repayable and “carry a lower interest rate.” This type of loan does not acquire any voting stock in the Bank. The NCCB will provide technical assistance to co-ops in such areas as marketing services, management, accounting. This assistance will be provided to all co-ops. For more information contact: Credit & Lending Department, National Consumer Cooperative Bank, 2001 S Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20009. (202) 376-0890, or (800) 424-2481 (loan applicants only.) NCCB's first regional office will be located in Oakland, Calif., and is scheduled to open this summer.

NEW COMMUNITY-BASED ENERGY CONSERVATION DIVISION AT HUD: A Community-Based Energy Conservation Division in the Consumer Affairs Office of HUD (rm. 3174, (202) 755-0857) has been established. “Its goal is to design and implement neighborhood energy conservation programs which result in technical and financial assistance for local projects sponsored by community-based organizations.” For more information, contact the director at the above address. The HUD Office of Neighborhood Development has prepared an *Alert* letter which suggests ways in which resources can be mobilized to address problems of the energy crisis.

ENERGY INFORMATION IN CALIFORNIA: from Bonnie Cornwall. A central energy information center has been established in California to eliminate the confusion and clutter of energy information available to the consumer. This California Energy Extension Service, 1211 16th St., Sacramento, CA 95814, (916) 323-4388, also has federal funds available for energy conservation projects. Bonnie Cornwall

writes that the goals of their program tie in nicely with Planners Network housing and service issues.

SIERRA CLUB VOLUNTEERS?: S.C. has a Letter Writers Program and an Activist program in which interested persons can participate. Contact: Campaign Desk, Sierra Club, 530 Bush St., San Francisco, CA 94108.

COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT: James Carras writes: I am currently the Executive Director of a statewide public interest organization, the Massachusetts Urban Reinvestment Advisory Group located in Boston. The organization has been working on community reinvestment issues. Recent successes include filing a successful challenge against the largest savings bank in Massachusetts based on their lack of lending in Boston's neighborhoods; stopping a large commercial bank from closing a neighborhood branch; and signing a community reinvestment compliance agreement with another large commercial bank. I would be very interested in hearing from others in the Network that have CRA experience to share. Especially interested in financing of housing coops and reinvestment without displacement. I would be glad to send others more specific information on our organization and the forementioned activities. Contact: James Carras, 3710 Washington St., Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts 02130, (617) 522-2077.

BACK OF THE HILL: Chris Curtiss writes: "I belong to Back of the Hill Community Development Association, which is beginning to redevelop about 13 acres of open land on a south-facing slope in Boston. This is a neighborhood virtually destroyed by an institution, Lahey Clinic, which bought up and tore down houses, planned to build a hospital, and then pulled out. For the past 9 years we have been fighting to reclaim the land and rebuild the community. We are at last beginning to succeed. Our first building, a 125-unit apartment building for the elderly and handicapped, has already begun, and we are looking towards the next phase. We are determined to build a low-density, mixed income, family development which is affordable to the kind of working-class people who live in the area. We are interested in home ownership—so is the city—but we are concerned with the dangers of gentrification. Because of the location, we have decided that the development should be solar. We'd be interested in hearing from anyone who has ideas or help to offer, or who would be interested in getting involved in our project in any way. Contact B.O.T.H.C.D.A., c/o Chris Curtiss, 88 Fisher Ave., Roxbury, MA 02120.

RENT CONTROL RESEARCH: (from Dennis Keating, 432 Hudson Street, Oakland, CA 94618) "I am presently working on both a theoretical and empirical study of the issue of landlords' right to a "fair" return on investment under rent control. Right now I'm conducting a survey of hardship appeals in New Jersey's 110 rent-controlled cities. I would appreciate information and suggestions from anyone acquainted with and interested in this issue, which continues to raise very serious legal and political problems for rent control advocates. Any Network members can help tenant activists in California by contributing to the campaign against an anti-rent control state constitutional amendment written by the real estate lobby, which spent \$2 million to put it on the June 3, 1980 ballot. If you can, send money to: No on Proposition 10, 2647 East 14th St., Oakland, CA 94601.

PUBLIC SERVICE SCIENCE CENTRES: New Public Service Science Centres have been funded by the National Science Foundation for Boston and Appalachia. In Boston, the Neighborhood Network for Community Science and Technology will provide 'neutral' forums in which understandable and reliable information about the scientific aspects of public policy issues will become more widely available to citizens and their organizations and representatives. The focus will be on future energy needs and supplies, environmental impacts, planning for public school facilities, banks and credit availability, neighborhood change, and the location of community residences. In Appalachia, Science in the Public Interest will coordinate up to nine public service science programs, concentrating on issues relating to land uses, transportation, energy conservation, and alternative energy resources. For more information on the NSF's Science for Citizens Program, write to NSF Forms and Publications, Washington, D.C. 20550, and ask for publication number SE 80-64.

THE GREEN MACHINE NEEDS YOUR HELP! from Sylvia Stern, Los Angeles. An innovative plan for a low-cost housing rental project in Venice, California, has received authorization by the City of L.A. and federal grant monies for a feasibility study which is now being conducted. The "Green Machine", as the experimental multi-family project is called, is a 72 ft. high, 3-story pyramid of housing spaces conceived by Venice resident and avant-garde architect Glenn Small. The self-contained structure is the latest effort in Southern California to combine high-density living with ecological principles to cut the cost of dwellings. The city has donated the 200' x 200' lot situated near the ocean. The key to this plan is the purchasing of used recreational travel trailers and small modular housing units which will sit on the 26' x 26' pads. Visually the "Green Machine" appears as a trellis with a blunted top covered with foliage. It is a frame holding separate sections for 24 housing units, with a central enclosed greenhouse and 24 private housing pads or platforms open to the outside. The units could be mobile homes, trailers, modular housing or other small structures with each tenant occupying his own space on the pyramid.

Energy and environmental considerations would be reflected in such systems as those for solar heating, water recycling, irrigation, a methane decomposition process from garbage and greenhouses for growing food and shade-giving decorative plants. The Green Machine is designed to serve as a model for future inexpensive, environmentally sound housing in the U.S. and elsewhere. It could be called a vertical trailer park with private living pads and pedestrian greenhouse streets for children to play on.

The project is seeking assistance with the sociological aspects—i.e. the advantages and disadvantages of this experiment, first, to the prospective tenants who will be of mixed age groups and will be sharing common spaces; and, secondly, to the surrounding community that will be accepting this project in their environment.

Papers and references are being sought for this segment of the feasibility study by Prof. David Stea and Sylvia Stern of U.C.L.A. Graduate School of Architecture & Urban Planning. Please contact: Sylvia Stern, 2220 Ave. of the Stars, #2405W, Los Angeles, CA 90067. Phone: (213) 277-0800.

ECONOMIC AND EMPLOYMENT PLANNING FOR WOMEN AND MINORITIES: (from Tobi Lippin, 819 Raskin Place, Greensboro, N.C. 27403). "I'd like to see the Network focus more on economic and employment planning, particularly with the increase in the number of women in the work force and the impact that economic development has on women. Example—building a hotel or convention center to revitalize an area. It will mean more jobs, but what type, for whom and at what level? Are planners advocating for affirmative action in jobs and business contracts associated with projects they plan? Are women and minorities benefiting from housing rehab, not only by perhaps moving into the new or rehabed units, but are they learning construction skills—are they the workers?? Which contractors are doing the building—the good ole' white boys?"

INDIAN PLANNING CONSORTIUM OF CENTRAL CALIFORNIA VOLUNTEER BANK: IPCCC would like to develop a bank of professional volunteers (planners, lawyers, architects, engineers, business managers, marketing specialists, communication fields, construction trades, etc.). If you can contribute a few hours of your time to assist Central Calif. Indian people in developing their communities and economy, contact: IPCCC, 1044 Fulton Mall, Rm. 411, Fresno, CA 93721, (209) 266-9818. Let them know your interests and skills and they will match them with a particular project.

SYLLABUS EXCHANGE FOR TEACHING URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN: from J. Gilderbloom. "I'm currently teaching a class called the 'Sociology of Urban Planning and Design' at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and I would be interested if any Network members teaching similar sounding courses could send me their class syllabus. In return, I will send a copy of mine. Contact, John Ingram Gilderbloom, Sociology Dept., UC Santa Barbara, CA 93106, or call (805) 961-3314 (Office) or (805) 685-3771 (Home).

COURSE OFFERING: The Bartlett School of Architecture and Planning, Univ. College London, Development Planning Unit, is offering

the following courses between April and August, 1980: I. April 21-July 11, *A Special Programme on Housing in Development (SP8OH)*; II. June 16-20, a *One-Week Workshop on Assistance to Local Housing Groups*, this course will also be included in SP8OH; and III. July 21-Aug. 7, a *Three-Week Seminar on Sites and Services and Settlement Upgrading Projects and Programmes*. Applications are still being accepted for all courses in January, 1980. "Anyone interested in any one or combination of these activities should write at once to the coordinator," John F.C. Turner, Development Planning Unit, Bartlett School of Architecture & Planning, Univ. College London, 9-11 Endsleigh Gardens, London WC1H 0ED.

CRIME AND COMMUNITY STUDIES: from Pat Ashton, "a colleague who is in criminology and I are attempting to put together a course and a book on crime and community. We would like to go beyond the rather simple notion of community patrols to examine the real possibilities for community crime prevention and community justice. Although we are just beginning this project, my sense is that there is very little written on this issue from a radical/critical/Marxist perspective. We would very much like to hear from others who may have information on this subject or who share our interests. Pat Ashton, Soc. & Anthro. Dept., Indiana Univ.-Purdue Univ. at Fort Wayne, 2101 Coliseum Blvd. East, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46805.

COMMUNITY DESIGN FOR FAMILY USE: Linda Hollis writes: "I recently returned to my native Washington, D.C. area with another social planner/feminist, Vivian Barry, to begin working on a photo exhibit tentatively called "Community Design for Family Use." We plan to illustrate physical aspects of Washington neighborhoods, both present and past, which help or hinder resident children and their caregivers. We would be interested in hearing from interested/knowledgeable persons. I can be reached at 4002 Rose Lane, Annandale, Va. 22003.

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING RESOURCE CENTER: from Eugene, Oregon. "We are five low-income neighborhoods in the city of Eugene who come together to address our common housing problems, and as a result of this, we have started a neighborhood housing resource center. As a non-profit neighborhood organization, staffed by volunteers, we are concerned with a wide range of local housing issues that revolve around displacement, urban density, tenant rights, neighborhood housing development corporations and projects, low-income housing advocacy, etc. We are presently in the process of collecting relevant information, educating ourselves, and contacting other national organizations and foundations in the hopes that they might provide us with some of the materials we need. We are also interested in learning about any successes and failures of other housing groups; we don't want to re-invent the wheel." Please forward to Neighborhood Resource Center, P.O. Box 30053, Eugene, Oregon 94703.

BOOK REVIEWS:

Beginning with this issue, we will run short, summary book reviews of planning related work. We receive books from time to time from authors, which frequently deserve such treatment. At the current time, we are farming them out to Collective members, but in the future we welcome unsolicited reviews (short, please, or we may have to ask you to cut). Authors, please send us a copy of your recent work. Beginning next issue we will list books received; anyone interested in reviewing a certain book can simply write to us and we will send it to you in return for the review. First come, first serve.

Capital and Communities: (Reviewed by David Wilmoth).

Barry Bluestone and Bennett Harrison have just finished a thorough study of the causes and consequences of private disinvestment in the US. With strong data and clear analysis, they convincingly break down three myths: a) that capital flight is a limited regional problem with little impact on people and communities, b) that unregulated capital mobility is essential and beneficial to the entire economy, and c) that tax incentives and other government giveaways to big business will rectify in short order whatever imbalance does exist.

On the extent and consequences of capital mobility, they find that the amount of disinvestment in communities around the country has been

seriously underestimated and badly interpreted by corporate apologists, that capital outmigration happens in the sunbelt as well as the frostbelt. In particular, giant conglomerates have been responsible for a disproportionate number of closings, and—contrary to the conventional wisdom—quite often close down viable and profitable establishments if other corporate priorities loom larger. Yet plant closings and jobs lost are just the tip of the iceberg: heart disease, suicide, mental anguish, child abuse, unemployment, health insurance and public assistance, and public and private mental health institutions, all are part of the very real personal and social trauma that accompany plant closings.

The lack of public power and resources to tackle these effects has so far largely precluded most direct responses to the economic waste and human suffering caused by capital flight, even when social costs far outweigh private gain. So far as any problem at all is recognized by government, it has drawn a typically inadequate 'welfare' response. The authors locate the historical origins of this situation in the revolution in transportation and communications, the evolution of the product cycle, the growing centralization and concentration of the giant multiregional and multinational corporation, the post World War II American domination of the world economy, and the contradictions inherent in this new 'interdependence'. More immediately, the authors note that corporate management finds workers' 'social wage' entitlements increasingly unnecessary, movements for union influence at the workplace increasingly unacceptable, and even locally profitable establishments increasingly expendable in terms of corporate financial strategy. The authors skillfully expose the latter practice, one which does not conform to the popular image of a 'runaway shop': through "overmanaging" their subsidiaries, milking them of their profits, subjecting them to at best strenuous and sometimes impossible performance standards, interfering with local decisions about which the parent's managers are poorly informed, and quickly closing subsidiaries down when more profitable opportunities appear.

They also show how local jurisdictions around the country, in a 'virtual stampede', are offering business subsidies to keep firms from moving out. Yet ironically, the sacrifice of social wage victories, the shifting of tax burdens from corporations to workers, and outright subsidies to industry are all promoted in the name of providing jobs for the unemployed and the destitute! Even so, the authors show how these expensive subsidies don't accomplish their aims, are enormously expensive in terms of foregone tax revenues, and end up being no more than windfall profits for the largest corporations.

So how can we deal with capital mobility? One approach would be to monitor and direct the flow of private capital in order to provide community stabilization and worker security. Companies should at a minimum be required to give prior notice of plant closings and to pay government-mandated severance payments to workers as a 'redevelopment' fee to the localities. A public balance sheet should replace private balance sheets as a standard for decisions.

The report is available from the Progressive Alliance, 1625 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 452-4804, at \$20 for over 300 pages.

PUBLICATIONS

MAKING CETA WORK: Scott Bernstein and James Pitts have written a useful policy analysis and manual about CETA, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. It is especially focused on the neighborhood level, describing clearly what is and is not possible through CETA, and how to put CETA into productive applications of neighborhood development and alternative technology. Write to Committee on Unemployment and the Future of Work, 111 N. Wabash, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

NEW PUBLICATION: *Southern Exposure* has a new publication entitled "Building the South" about building and communities in the South. They are also interested in hearing from anyone in the Network who shares their interest in continuing the research started in this issue, particularly in areas like the corporatization of home building; union busting and industrialization of the construction process; concentration in all aspects of the building industry, with special attention to materials procedures. For further info contact c/o Jackleg Project, Highlander Center, Box 370, Route 3, New Market, TN 37820; and for a copy of the book, write to *Southern Exposure*, P.O. Box 531, Durham, NC 27702.

INFORMATION EXCHANGE SERVICE: The U.S. Dept. of the Interior Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service has an *Information Exchange Service* which depends on an informal network of contributors to continually expand its collection and contribute to the improved delivery of recreational/cultural services in the U.S. The info exchange service provides abstracts and order forms for *Free*, HCRS materials, abstracts and ordering info for materials produced by Federal, state and local government agencies; private organizations, educational institutions, etc, a calendar of events and other relevant notices. For more information write to HCRS, 400 G St., N.W., Wash., D.C. 20243.

CHILDREN IN HOUSING: The Fair Housing for Children Coalition has just released its report on the "Extent and Effects of Discrimination against Children in Rental Housing," covering five California cities. Copies can be ordered for \$4 from the coalition at PO Box 5877, Santa Monica, CA 90405.

REVIEW: (from Michael Appleby) The *Citizen Participation News-magazine* is a bi-monthly publication which is definitely worth receiving. It's a good up-to-date source on who's doing what, the issues and current resources in the field of citizen participation. At \$12 per year it's well worth the money. **TO ORDER, PLEASE WRITE TO:** Citizen Participation, Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155.

NEIGHBORHOOD INFO: (from Diane Benjamin, Center for Neighborhood Technology, 570 W. Randolph St., Chicago, IL 60606.) *The Neighborhood Works* is a twice-monthly information service which not only abstracts and reprints from an extensive array of other publications, but also features regular cover stories, "reproducible features" giving basic technical information for use by individuals or community groups, book reviews, and current funding opportunities.

HOUSING: National Association of Housing Cooperatives (1012 14th St., N.W., Wash., D.C. 20005, (202) 628-6242) has published an *Action Agenda* representing cooperative housing issues at the fed. gov't. level that it believes should be considered in developing national housing policies and programs. The *Agenda* contains 3 parts: 1) General Policy Actions, 2) Cooperative Development & Conversions, and 3) Housing Operations.

PLANNING AND POLICY: The Michigan State University Librarians publish a *Guide to Planning and Policy Resources*. To receive a copy write to: Beth J. Shapiro and Linda Naru, Urban Policy and Planning Library, Michigan State University Libraries, East Lansing, MI 48823.

FILMS ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZING: (from Valerie Harris, N.Y.) A number of films with the tantalizing titles of *An Urban Dilemma*, *People's Firehouse #1*, *Simpson Street*, *Redevelopment*, *Homefront*, *Break and Enter*, *We the People*, and *The Case Against Lincoln Center* are available from Third World Newsreel, 160 Fifth Ave., Suite 911, New York, N.Y. 10010, (212) 243-2310. Write for a brochure.

COMING EVENTS AND CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR A DEMONSTRATION AT THE 1980 DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION "COALITION FOR A PEOPLE'S ALTERNATIVE IN 1980: In March of 1980, representatives of various progressive organizations gathered in Youngstown, Ohio to discuss some form of action that should take place at the 1980 Democratic Convention this August. At the conference, an Interim Committee was formed, a draft of Principles of Unity was discussed and work committees were set up to get the word out about the planned action in an attempt to broaden the range of groups and people involved. Specifically, the majority of those present in March agreed to call for a "multi-national, multi-racial, multi-issue demonstration on Sunday, August 10, 1980 at the site of the Democratic National Convention in New York City. A decision on a particular keynote speaker or speakers has not been made final due to the difficulty in finding one particular speaker who can represent such a myriad of organizations. For more information, contact: Coalition for a People's Alternative in 1980, 29 W. 21st St., 2nd floor, New York, NY 10010. Tel: (212) 242-3270.

WORKSHOPS: at the Policy Training Center. During the spring several workshops are offered. Topics include: Working Inside the System: Contradictions and Strategies for Change; Proposal Writing; Alternative Policies for the Aging; Media Reporting; Supervisory Skills; Community Development. If you would like more info on workshops or if you would like to be put on the mailing list, please call or write: Policy Training Institute, 4 Nutting Road, Cambridge, MA 02138.

ANOTHER CUBA TRIP! (from Lewis Lubka, Grand Forks, N. Dak.). If you can't make the earlier trip, you can join a planner's tour of Cuba, August 16-23, 1980. Meet with national, provincial and local planners and planning faculty. See new towns and housing efforts. Time to explore beaches for recreation and doing your own thing. \$550 includes roundtrip from Miami, air-conditioned economy hotels, all meals and travel within Cuba. Contact: Anniversary Tours, 250 W. 57th St., New York, N.Y. 10019, (212) 245-7501, toll free outside New York State, (800) 223-1336. Or Lewis Lubka, 1706 11th Ave. No., Fargo, N. Dak. 58102, (701) 237-8822 or 232-2164.

ALTERNATIVE STATE AND LOCAL POLICIES CONFERENCE: Energy, Housing, Human Services, Food and Employment will be the key issues addressed at the 6th Annual Conference on Alternative State and Local Policies. The conference is scheduled for July 18-20 at the University of Pittsburgh. Progressive elected officials, union leaders and community activists from all over the country are invited to participate in this three-day event designed to examine innovative policy initiatives, organizing and legislative strategies at the state and local level. For further information and registration information contact: Ann Beaudry, Conference on Alternative State and Local Policies, 2000 Florida Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009; or call (202) 387-6030.

WOMEN IN PLANNING: The Women's School of Planning and Architecture has chosen Hood College in Frederick, MD for the location of their fifth session, July 23-30. Topics to be covered are: communities, housing and women, appropriate technology, economic development, access to money, feminist curriculum, mobility for women. Women of all ages and interests in environmental issues are encouraged to attend. Register by June 1. Send self-addressed stamped envelope to WSP, 2105 Erdman Ave., Baltimore, MD 21218.

TUFTS SUMMER INSTITUTE ON URBAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY: Tufts University will hold seven three-day Institutes during the months of June through August on the following topics: Effective Use of Electronic Media by Public and Nonprofit Groups (June 18-20), Banks and Community Reinvestment (June 30-July 2), Techniques of Planning for Neighborhood Change (July 7-11), Planning for Public Facility Re-Use (July 14-16), Planning for Disposal of Hazardous Wastes (July 21-23), Public/Private Partnership-New Opportunities and Techniques for Urban Development (August 4-6), and Citizen Participation for the 1980s: Consensus-Building and Community Conflict (August 10-15). For further information contact Prof. Robert Hollister, Chair, Department of Urban and Environmental Policy, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155. (617) 628-5000, ext. 727.

HEALTH TRAINING CONFERENCES—May 23-25 4-H Conference, Chevy Chase, MD and: June 14-16 Asilomar Conference Grounds, Monterey, Cal. These conferences will *not* be introductions to health care advocacy but will be specifically designed to strengthen the skills of persons already active or beginning to be active in the health planning system. Trainers and attendees will include some of the nation's leading consumer health advocates. For more info contact: The Consumer Coalition for Health, 1751 N Street, N.W., Wash., D.C. 20036.

TEACHING PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: The 3rd National Conference on teaching Public Administration: May 30-31, 1980, Evergreen State College, Olympia, Wash. The purpose of the conference is to provide for an interchange of experience and ideas centered around teaching issues in the field of public administration. For further information contact: Guy B. Adams, L1414, The Evergreen State College, Olympia, WA 98505.

CONFERENCE ON STRESS "STRESS AT WORK. . . YOUR INVISIBLE ENEMY": The Institute for Labor and Mental Health and various union locals will be sponsoring a conference on Occupational Stress at Merritt College, in Oakland on May 18, from 10:30 am to 6 pm. The conference will give workers an opportunity to discuss their stress related work problems to such government officials as Assemblymen Tom Bates and Elihu Harris, Mayor of Berkeley Gus Newport, Supervisor John George, City Councilwoman Flo MacDonald, and Councilman Wilson Riles, Jr. The conference is a response to the many leading social and health problems that can be caused by on-the-job stress. Legislators in attendance will be anxious to hear suggestions on such issues as: changes in the work-place to reduce the level of stress, and whether or not workers should get stress benefits. Interested persons should contact the Institute for Labor and Mental Health, 3137 Telegraph Ave., Oakland, CA 94609. Tel: (415) 653-6166.

FIRST WORLD REGIONAL SCIENCE CONGRESS: (from Ann Markusen, University of California, Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning) For the first time, the Regional Science Association has agreed to two Marxist sessions in its regular program. Due to the efforts of Frank Moulaert, Centrum voor Economische Studien, Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, Belgium, the two formal sessions plus two additional sessions put together across the radical/Marxist regional research community, will be held *June 14-16* at the Roscoe Pound Building, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, MA. The first formal session is entitled "Towards a Marxist Method of International and Regional Development" and the second "Fundamental Issues in the Theory of Production: The Dynamics of Capital in the National and International Systems". Last fall, at the annual Regional Science Association meetings in Los Angeles, papers by Bennett Harrison and Barry Bluestone, Ann Markusen and Erica Schoenberger and Al Watkins, chaired by Norm Glickman and commented upon by John Friedmann, drew a standing room crowd that didn't leave for three hours. All comers are invited to these sessions, which should prove equally exciting. Participants giving papers and commenting include Jose Luis Coraggio, Panagis Liossatos, Ann Markusen, Martin Smolka, Bob Cohen, William Goldsmith, Bennett Harrison, Doreen Massey, Frank Moulaert, Patricia Wilson Salinas, and Thierry Noyelle. I don't have the schedule for the informal sessions on hand, but they include more good theory and practice papers. For those of you who don't know what "regional" analysis and planning is, it's the political economy of changes in capitalism combined with the historically shaped cultural and social communities at the larger-than-urban scale which are the setting for many of the urban problems that planners deal with: fiscal crisis, economic decline, unemployment, spatial dynamics, migration. Please write to me if you are interested in coming and want to know the final schedule, which hopefully I will receive from Belgium soon.

MOBILIZATION AGAINST PROPOSITIONS 9 AND 10

The following letter was sent by the Bay Area Chapter of the PN to California members of the American Planning Association and members of the Planners Network:

We are writing to invite your participation in a final mobilization against Propositions 9 and 10. Both Propositions, should they pass, would have extensive negative social, economic and physical impact upon the communities in and for which we work. Cutbacks in social services and education under 9, and the imposition of statewide restrictions over locally initiated rent control ordinances under 10, increase the burdens upon those least able to bear them. We ask you to join us in opposing these propositions.

The Planners Network held a recent meeting in conjunction with the national conference of the APA. As those of you who attended may recall the people present urged the acting Steering Committee to promote continuing social as well as professional and political activities. Toward that end, we have arranged to meet at the facilities of the San Francisco Socialist School at 29 Twenty Ninth Street at 9:00 am on Saturday, May 31st. At that time we will meet for coffee and donuts and hear a brief update on the state of the 9 & 10 campaigns by Jim Schoch, member of the San Francisco Organizing Committee of the statewide 'No on 9'-Citizens for California. Following this brief meeting and social get-together, we will join members of public sector unions and others in a day of precinct walking and literature distribution aimed at defeating 9 & 10. We will then reconvene at 3:30 for wine, cheese and further socializing.

We hope you will join us.

Should you not be able to join in, we urge you to make whatever contribution you can to help defray the cost of this important campaign.

Many thanks for your support.

JOBS

STUDENT HOUSING CO-OP DIRECTOR: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR needed for rapidly expanding student housing cooperative at University of California at Santa Barbara. Experience with housing cooperatives and commitment to progressive social change important. Degree or its equivalent in business or a related field desirable. Advanced writing and communication skills necessary. Salary \$12,000-\$18,000 a year with benefits, depending on qualifications. Direct resumes and inquiries by May 1 to Marc Williams, 6503 Madrid Road, Apt. G, Isla Vista, CA 93017. Phone (805) 968-6321. [We received this since the March 20 newsletter and are printing it in case the position is still open.]

**P.O.Box 4671
Berkeley, CA 94704**

FIRST CLASS