

FOCUS

**ENERGY
POLICY
AND THE
POOR**

Perspective

President Carter's complex and comprehensive energy conservation proposals have stimulated a major national energy debate. A crucial part of the debate, as far as the Joint Center and its constituents are concerned, must focus on the impact any such proposal will have on society's poor. That is why earlier this month we sponsored a roundtable discussion on "National Energy Policies: Impact on Minorities and the Poor," and why this issue of FOCUS carries two articles on energy.

If there is one lesson we learned from the individuals who responded to our invitation to the meeting, it is that there is little general agreement on what affect President Carter's proposals (if implemented) will have. The administration maintains that the impact on inflation would be negligible. Others produce facts and figures to show that the program is inherently inflationary and, as such, would create severe hardships on those with little discretionary purchasing power.

Participants in the discussion argued on both sides of the employment question. Some believed Carter's proposals would mean more jobs, others argued it would mean less. Some believed that the proposed tax on gasoline would cause real hardships for the poor, while others thought the tax would be no problem.

Obviously it is too early to determine the full economic impact of a program that may be substantially changed by Congress. Nevertheless, blacks, other minorities and the poor, must begin to explore not only the possible consequences on the poor, but also the steps that might be taken to minimize hardships.

We believe that the time has long since passed when large segments of Americans were content to let decisions affecting their lives and livelihood be made by others in the name of efficient and effective government. In the past, most of us have always had to play catch up — remonstrating, objecting, speaking out — long after policies and programs had been set in concrete. It might be too late even now for the disadvantaged to have a real impact on energy legislation, but we think it is a process that must be tried.

The energy issue is a particularly complicated area of public policy information, depending, as it does, on scientific data and sophisticated economic crystal ball gazing. But in another sense it raises a question which anyone can understand and for which no special background or training is required. The question is one of fairness.

It is to the credit of President Carter that he addressed this aspect of the energy crisis head on. He declared at the outset that one of the principles of a new energy plan is that the United States must solve its energy problems in a manner that is equitable to all regions, sectors and income groups. Carter said:

"No segment of the population should bear an unfair share of the total burden, and none should reap undue benefits from the nation's energy problems. Particularly . . . the poor and those on fixed incomes should be protected from disproportionate adverse effects . . ."

Is the plan fair? Does it cushion the poor from unnecessary suffering? What are the alternatives to increased gasoline prices? Why, for example, is there little mention of public transportation in the plan? How will the tax rebate system affect those with limited disposable income who may not be able to afford to wait until the end of the year to recover money spent on higher gasoline? How much will the proposal as a whole cost families with incomes at or below the poverty level? What extra compensation will be provided?

These are only some of the hard questions raised by the President's proposal. The answers provided will affect all Americans, but most especially those who have the least say in what happens at the federal decision making level. It is our intention at the Joint Center to stay abreast of what is going on, to push for answers, to voice our views and those of our constituents and to provide information on issues of concern to minorities and the poor.

Eddie N. Williams
President

FOCUS

Copyright © 1977 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc. The monthly newsletter of the **Joint Center for Political Studies**, 1426 H Street, N.W., Suite 926, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 638-4477. JCPS is a private non-profit and non-partisan organization which provides research, education, technical assistance and information for the nation's black and other minority elected officials. Its objectives are to respond to minority group aspirations to participate in the political process, and to enhance their effectiveness at every level of government. The Joint Center does not fund or participate in voter registration, lobbying or campaigning. JCPS is funded by foundations, other organizations, and private gifts. Contributions are tax exempt.

president: Eddie N. Williams
vice president: Eleanor Farrar
director of administration: Francis Chaney
director of development: Kathleen Vander Horst
director of fellowships: Milton D. Morris
director of information services: Brenda D. Neal
special assistant to the president: Malachi Knowles
focus editor: Oliver W. Cromwell

Board of Governors

Louis E. Martin, Chairman — President, Sengstacke Publications, Chicago

Hon. Edward W. Brooke — U.S. Senator from Massachusetts

James E. Cheek — President, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Kenneth B. Clark — President, Clark, Phipps, Clark and Harris, New York

Wendell Freeland, Esq., Pittsburgh

Charles V. Hamilton — Wallace S. Sayre Professor of Government, Columbia University, New York

Samuel C. Jackson, Esq., Washington, D.C.

Eddie N. Williams — President, JCPS

JCPS energy roundtable discussion

By Ellis Cose

Mr. Cose, a columnist for the Chicago Sun-Times, is presently serving a one-year fellowship at the Joint Center.

The moment man lit his first kerosene lamp, or burned his first lump of coal, he struck a deal with the devil. The terms were very simple: Man would have so many years to burn fuel, and if at the end of that time he could find no alternative source of energy then he would perish.

The "energy crisis" is just that simple. Yet it is also much more complex than that. For there is a crisis within a crisis, a crisis that revolves around the poor family that may very well be faced with making the decision between buying heating oil or food, a crisis that revolves around the wage earner who finds that energy costs are eating up a larger proportion of his weekly check.

For while it is true that the world is running out of non-renewable energy, it seems just as true that it is running out faster for some than for others.

On May 12, 1977, the Joint Center for Political Studies sponsored a roundtable discussion on the energy crisis and the poor. The roundtable was designed to take a preliminary look at the impact of the energy shortage on a constituency routinely ignored in the national energy debate — and yet, a constituency disproportionately affected by the proposed solutions.

The roundtable, which brought together 12 experts in the field of energy or public policy, was held at the Brookings Institution and chaired by Joint Center president Eddie N. Williams.

The tone for discussion was set by Jeff Copeland, an energy correspondent for Newsweek, who said, "I guess one question is, 'Is there an energy crisis?' . . . I can't give you an answer to that question . . . But I think there can be little disagreement that there is an energy crisis in one sector of our economy, and that is for poor people."

After quoting from a long list of statistics showing the rising cost of oil, gas, electricity and other forms of energy, Copeland concluded that "(President) Carter's plan is inherently very dangerous for poor people." Dangerous mostly, he added, because it depends so much on higher prices, with no real guarantee that the poor will be able to foot the bill.

A succession of speakers painted an even gloomier picture. Robert Meskunas, of the National Council for Community Action, spoke of the high energy taxes perhaps leading to a society where "tens of thousands of Americans . . . will no longer be able to drive to work, take their families on Sunday excursions, drive their kids to school . . ."

Frank Pollara, of the AFL-CIO, warned that a Carter-type plan would mean the loss of anywhere from 200,000 to 300,000 jobs.

Energy Policy Impact on Poor

Projections varied on the ultimate impact of the President's proposals, but virtually all participants agreed that those at the bottom of the economic ladder would suffer most. Aside from any benefits derived from a weatherization program, and possible financial gain from rebates, the administration appears to have relegated the energy-related problems of the poor to the back burner.

Should the energy proposals have dealt with the special problems of the poor? "I think the problem with poor people and high energy prices is exactly the same as (with) poor people and high food prices, high medical prices, high costs of education, and high costs for transportation," said Denis Hayes of Worldwatch Institute. "Poor people don't have enough money."

The solution, he suggested, was perhaps to redistribute income so as to "abolish poverty."

Hayes' solution was more radical than most suggested, but it helped drive home the point that the energy crisis affects the poor more than others precisely because the poor are generally more affected by society's problems than the nonpoor.

Concerns of the poor inevitably are given short shrift when the attention of the nation is focused on what it perceives as a much larger problem.

An Organized Coalition

Most suggestions embodied one central theme: the need for organization. Benefits and sacrifices, said Hayes, "will be determined on the basis on who swings effectively on Capitol Hill in the immediate future."

Rufus McKinney, of Southern California Gas, disputed the oft-stated assumption that the poor and energy producers must be on opposite sides of the fence.

"I think it's wrong," he said, "to go to Capitol Hill and say to a member of Congress, well, if something is advocated by an energy person, therefore that must be antithetical to the interests of the poor."

McKinney stated that in the state of California, labor and energy producers had even managed to work out a coalition of sorts: "It is the American Federation of Labor, and other labor groups, who are now in the process of trying to turn Governor Brown around on the question of the need for developing additional supplementary energy supplies for California. It is because they can see the employment indication of the failure to produce energy resources in that state, and the impact this is going to have on the economy of California."

Organizations, however, are not created in a vacuum. And the problem with the energy crisis is that many people who would like to organize are not at all sure of what it is that they should organize about.

Lenneal Henderson, of the Joint Center, called for a "special index" monitoring the energy status of the poor community, an index that would be put together by various groups pooling resources and data. Such data could at least make clear what it is that the poor need to be concerned about.

Only then can the advocates of the poor hope to get significant results from swinging their bat on Capitol Hill.

Participants in the roundtable, entitled, "National Energy Policies; Impact on Minorities and the Poor," included Copeland, Henderson, Meskunas, Hayes, Pollara, McKinney, Richard Saul of the Community Services Administration, Judson Parker, of the Federal Energy Administration, Larry Young, representing Congressional Black Caucus Chairman Parren Mitchell (D-N.Y.), Keith Bodden, representing Rep. Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.), Joel Darmstadter of Resources for the Future, and Leonard Bower of the American Petroleum Institute.

Energy policy and the poor

By Lenneal Henderson

Lenneal Henderson, Ph.D., is on leave from the faculty of the political science department at Howard University and is serving as associate director of research at the Joint Center.

In his first major energy message, President Carter asked the nation to wage "the moral equivalent of war" against "the greatest challenge our country will face during our lifetime." In poor and minority communities the energy crisis is potentially as devastating as war itself. Dwindling energy supplies and soaring energy prices threaten the health of these communities. Minority business and economic development will be retarded by increasing energy costs and unstable energy supplies. Future improvements in employment, transportation, housing, social services and health are dependent on stable prices for natural gas, electricity and fossil fuels. As with most major crises in America, the energy problem is disproportionately harmful to minorities and the poor.

Studies have proven that minorities and the poor use less natural gas for home heating and cooking, less elec-

to the rising cost of energy because many of them are unemployed or living on fixed incomes. Regressive utility rate structures, especially for electricity, reward large energy consumers and penalize low-income groups and others who use less energy. Since low-income communities do not have the flexibility to reduce their utilization of energy, they are especially hard hit by utility pricing policies. Churches, community organizations, centers for the elderly, day care centers and other community institutions, faced with rising energy costs, will either have to reduce the quality of the services they provide or increase the cost of those services to the poor. (An increase of 27 percent in the Consumer Price Index for fuel and utilities from Fall 1973 to Fall 1976 was more than double the increase in the overall index).

The President's energy package awaits Congressional scrutiny and although there is no solid consensus on the meaning of these proposals for minorities and the poor, several observations are possible.

Taxes and Prices

Carter's price and tax proposals are the most

Carter Energy Proposals

President Carter's April 20th energy proposals have profound implications for poor and minority communities. Carter's program is a complex and delicate balance of conservation, taxation and energy development. The impact of each element on the lives of the poor is significant. Among the major elements of the Carter program are:

- Gradual increases in crude oil prices, which are designed to discourage oil consumption. U.S. produced crude oil prices would rise from the current average price of \$8.25 per barrel to the average world market price of about \$13.65 by 1980.
- Gas-guzzling automobiles that fail to meet federal

tricity for lighting and appliances and less gasoline for transportation than the more affluent. According to the 1975 Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies' Lifestyles and Energy Surveys, poor households consumed an average of 61 million BTU's of natural gas and electricity annually, whereas, households in higher income brackets used an average of 101 million BTU's. Also, minorities and the poor have smaller homes and fewer rooms to heat, fewer energy-consuming appliances, and fewer automobiles. Energy-consuming luxuries such as mobile homes, yachts, dishwashers, long-distance vacations and private aircraft are not possessions of low income families. Energy use in poor and minority households is primarily for essential home heating, lighting and basic transportation to and from work.

Paradoxically, although the poor and minorities have less income for the purchase of energy, a larger portion of their family budgets are expended for necessary energy products. According to the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, the poor spend almost 21 percent of their budgets for energy compared to 9-12 percent for upper income persons. The poor are particularly vulnerable

gas mileage standards will be taxed. Purchasers of smaller, less fuel-consuming automobiles will be rewarded with tax rebates.

- Federally-imposed gasoline consumption targets would be established and would allow a gradual rise in usage until 1980, followed by a decline after 1982. National consumption that exceeds these targets will result in a 5 cent per gallon federal tax which could rise to a maximum of 50 cents per gallon by 1989.

- Natural gas prices would increase from \$1.45 to \$1.75 per 1,000 cubic feet. Higher-priced gas produced within states would also be subject to the \$1.75 ceiling.

- Tax rebates would be allocated to homeowners who insulate their homes. Homeowners would receive a 25

controversial aspects of his energy package. Increases in fuel oil and natural gas prices and the effects of big car and stand-by gasoline taxes may not only accelerate inflation but may also strain the household budgets of the poor. Since the poor are relatively low-energy consumers and use energy basically for essential needs, special provisions should be made to avoid penalizing them. Both the direct and indirect impact of energy price and taxation provisions on the purchasing power of the poor must be considered.

The auto industry may obviate the big car tax by decreasing the price of big cars and increasing the price of American-produced small cars. But auto producers are likely to pass increased energy-related production costs to consumers, thereby, making new car purchases difficult for the poor. The inability of low-income persons to purchase new, energy-efficient cars results in higher auto fuel costs. The stand-by gasoline tax does not include allowances for low-income persons driving to work in older, larger and less energy-efficient vehicles, nor for large minority families dependent upon a big car. Big car and stand-by taxes should recognize the essential dependency of poor families on older automobiles.

Also, increases in natural gas prices will result in increased housing costs. It may not be enough to give tax credits and rebates at the end of the tax year.

Housing

Increases in natural gas and electricity prices may exacerbate the housing problems of minorities and the poor. The poor would remain eligible for insulation and weatherization assistance now provided for by Title IV of the 1976 Energy Conservation and Production Act. However, minorities and the poor cannot afford the costs of installing solar energy, and the Carter energy package provides no direct incentives to home builders and landlords in low-income communities to convert to solar energy systems. Community solar energy plants could provide low-cost energy to the poor, stimulate minority business involvement in solar heating, and extend minority community participation in energy decision-making. In any event, the current and future design and construction of low and moderate income housing must also include energy-efficient features and technology which reduce waste and cost. Rehabilitation, homesteading and other

percent income tax credit on the first \$800 spent on home insulation and a reduced percentage on the next \$1,400. Homeowners would also receive a 40 percent tax credit on the first \$1,000 spent for solar heating devices and a 25 percent credit on the next \$6,400 they spend for such devices.

- Inverted utility rate structures maintained by gas and electric companies and regulated by state public utility commissions would be drastically altered. "Promotional rates", which provide discounts to industrial and commercial users, would be replaced by "peak load" pricing policies which charge all energy users higher prices during the day and lower prices at night.

housing and community development programs will need review in order to include energy conservation provisions for minorities and the poor.

Jobs

The Carter administration originally estimated that the new energy program would create from 125,000 - 150,000 new jobs. Many of these new jobs will be created by new energy agencies in the federal, state and local governments. Others will result from the gradual conversion to coal, solar, nuclear, geothermal and other energy sources. Currently, only 6.8 percent of the jobs in gas and electricity, coal mining, oil producing and other energy-related industries are held by minorities.

Although utility and major oil and coal companies will be the source of many new jobs, union domination of these industries and traditional discriminatory hiring practices may minimize employment opportunities for minorities in energy industries. Also, job training programs funded by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act will need to stress energy-related job skills. Vocational, secondary and post-secondary schools must include more basic and rigorous energy education programs.

Transportation

Carter's gasoline conservation proposals create a greater need for public, particularly urban, mass transit systems. New rapid rail systems in such metropolitan areas as San Francisco and Washington, D.C. must not only facilitate suburban access to the city but also minority access to public transportation. More stations must be located in low-income neighborhoods. Under the 1974 National Mass Transportation Act, the federal government for the first time will subsidize operating costs for mass transit systems. For cities with substantial low-income populations whose fiscal woes may frustrate capital acquisition, the federal government should subsidize a greater share of the cost of rapid transit development. Also, a reduction of new highway construction within cities will discourage auto use and congestion in central cities.

Minority Business Development

Few minority businesses are involved in energy production or conservation. Many find it difficult to obtain contracts or subcontracts from larger energy-related firms. Given the no-growth implications of the new energy

- Industries now using oil and gas as primary fuel sources would be required to convert to coal usage by 1979 or incur a tax. Utilities are not subject to the tax until 1983 and industries that must use gas, such as fertilizer manufacturers, would be exempt.

- To implement and coordinate this massive energy program, Carter proposes a consolidation of more than 50 energy-related federal agencies into a new Department of Energy. This new cabinet-level agency would combine regulatory, conservation, research and development and energy-monitoring functions and is designed to facilitate implementation of the energy program.

program, tax incentives and other government stimuli should be used to increase the involvement of minority firms in energy industries.

Energy Administration and Policymaking

The development of a new energy agency provides opportunities for increased minority involvement in energy decision-making. Since there are no provisions for citizen participation in the new agency, minority lawyers, natural and physical scientists, economists and social scientists should seek employment in the new agency. Although many minorities now working in the Federal Energy Administration, the Federal Power Commission, the Energy Research and Development Administration, the Interior Department and other agencies will be transferred to the new energy agency, more minority workers are needed.

Certainly, a more comprehensive assessment of the impact of current and future energy policies on minorities and the poor is necessary. Opportunities for addressing the energy needs of these citizens are greatest now when energy reorganization and reassessment is taking place. Waiting until all programs are in place may make responsiveness to these needs more difficult.

Zero-base budgeting

By Peter Sarant

Mr. Sarant is Director of Management Analysis at the U.S. Civil Service Commission and author of the book Zero-Base Budgeting in the Public Sector: A Pragmatic Approach, to be published in September 1977 by Addison-Wesley.

In the few months since President Carter has been in the White House, the technique of zero-base budgeting (ZBB) has received an increasing amount of attention. During the presidential campaign, Carter pledged to institute ZBB in all federal departments and agencies if elected.

Barely a week passes when we don't see the term ZBB bantered about in the press. And the budgeting technique has been the subject of conversation on numerous television talk shows.

Although ZBB has yet to become a reality, heads of executive departments and agencies have been asked by the President to develop a zero-base budgeting system within their respective agencies. Seminars on ZBB are being offered to budgeting experts and managers throughout the federal government.

What is ZBB?

The Office of Management and Budget describes ZBB as a management process that provides for systematic consideration of all programs and activities in conjunction with the formulation of budget requests and program planning. In other words, it is a budgeting technique which combines budgeting, planning and operational decision-making into one process.

Unlike traditional budgeting where the emphasis is on the incremental request (the increase over last year's appropriation), zero-base budgeting requires the justification of all expenditures needed to support any given program.

Peter Pyhrr, in his book on the subject, defines it as a system whereby each governmental program, regardless of whether it is a new or existing program, must be justified in its entirety each time a new budget is formulated. Thus, ZBB subjects existing programs or activities to the same kind of detailed analysis usually reserved for new programs. And budget items in a program are examined at several different funding levels, from zero on up.

If correctly used, ZBB could become a large factor in improving the economic plight of poor and minorities in this country.

During the Nixon and Ford administrations, federal spending for social programs declined significantly. And it is fair to say that many of the programs that were funded failed to meet their intended goals.

Under the ZBB concept, federal managers must justify their current programs. If certain on-going programs are found to be unnecessary, or fail to meet their goals, then those program resources could be traded off and used for funding new social programs without any increase in the federal government's budget. Using the ZBB system, each program is broken down into several levels of performance and funding. Any level of a program may be rejected without causing the entire program to go out the window.

Objectives

The principal objectives of zero-base budgeting are to:

- Involve managers at all levels of the budget process
- Justify the resource requirements for existing activities as well as for new activities
- Focus the justification on the evaluation of "discrete programs" or activities of each decision unit
- Establish, for all managerial levels in an agency, objectives against which accomplishments can be identified and measured
- Assess alternative methods of accomplishing objectives
- Analyze the probable effects of different budget amounts or performance levels on the achievement of objectives
- Provide a credible rationale for reallocating resources, especially from old programs to new programs
- Rank program or activity levels in order of priority.

Sunset Legislation

In March, the Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations held hearings on the "Sunset" bill (S 2) which calls for a congressional review of government programs and the reauthorization of their funding at least every five years.

Under the proposed bill, congressional committees would evaluate whether the merits of a program justify its continuation or whether the program should be terminated (fade into the sunset). If a program is found to merit continuation the appropriate committee would decide whether it should continue at a level less than, equal to, or greater than the existing level. The bill also establishes guidelines for the sunset reviews and calls for an assessment of the impact of eliminating the program or funding it at a lower level.

State and Local Government

President Carter's enthusiasm for zero-base budgeting is triggered by his use of the technique while governor of Georgia. He claims that by using ZBB he was able to take Georgia from a budget deficit to a budget surplus.

It is likely that the nation's governors will be watching closely to see what impact ZBB could have on their states. And governors who may decide to use ZBB will have to conduct a zero-base review on aid to their local governments.

Much of the \$60-billion in federal grants and aids to states is used to fund programs that impact on the poor and minority communities. These programs have become major factors in the national economy.

It seems important that black elected officials understand the concept of ZBB and how to use it to get the most for their constituents.

As ZBB is instituted at the federal level it seems likely that similar reviews will be made at the state level.

In fact, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental relations suggested that: "Parallel reviews at state levels could be encouraged by direct invitations from Congress to the state legislatures urging advance preparations and involvement in the congressional review process."

Young Receives Support of Black Caucus

Following a May 9 meeting with Andrew Young, the Congressional Black Caucus released a statement in strong support of the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Young has received criticism from some quarters for the out-spoken manner in which he discusses foreign affairs.

The statement said: "Ambassador Young's willingness to speak out with candor, truthfulness and insight has brought a refreshing openness to the conduct of our foreign policy. It is a measure of his success in discussing, with the public, matters formerly debated behind closed doors, that concerted efforts have been undertaken to undercut his position and strength . . ."

The caucus added that President Carter's support for Young's efforts was "well justified."

And the statement commended the Congress for defeating an amendment which would have reduced Young's staff. The amendment was introduced by Rep. Robert E. Bauman (R Md.) who called the vote on the amendment "a referendum on what Young has said and done." The amendment was defeated by a 91-318 House vote.

The Caucus statement concluded by saying that, "We know, and Andy Young knows, that change comes only through struggle. His courageous efforts to bring about change in the nation's foreign policy and to better the condition of people throughout the world deserve the nation's respect and support."

JCPS Receives Grant to Study Blacks in Congress, 1870 - 1977

The Joint Center for Political Studies has received a \$66,000 grant from the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration (ARBA) to compile historical and biographical data on the 45 black Americans who have served in the United States Congress from 1870 - 1977.

This data is designed to be the basis for the production of a documentary film designed to inform the general public of the contributions of these legislators to our nation.

Dr. Lenneal Henderson, on leave from the faculty of the political science department at Howard University, will head the six-month research project. The study will involve a major literature search and over 100 interviews with people who can provide background information not only on the political and personal lives of black congresspersons but also on the climate in which they were elected and served.

Brooke Introduces Bill for New Department

Senator Edward Brooke (R Mass.) introduced a bill May 9 designed to create a cabinet-level Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

Under the proposal, Brooke said, the new department would consolidate the environmental and resource management functions of the Interior Department, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the National Oceans and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). It would also be responsible for matters related to coastal zone management and marine mammal protection, which is

currently under the Commerce Department control and for matters related to wetland areas, estuaries and offshore structures now under the authority of the Department of Agriculture and the Army.

Brooke said these concerns have been "scattered and uncoordinated," and added: "It is both my basic political concern that the conservationist viewpoint find clear expression in government and my management-related concern regarding the efficiency with which our resource management and environmental protection programs are run that leads me to advocate the creation of a new department."

Brooke said Carter's proposal to create a new Department of Energy would usurp many of Interior's present responsibilities, leaving Interior with a "scattering of resource management functions which in no way will be comprehensive or all-inclusive."

JCPS Announces Budgeting Institutes

The Joint Center for Political Studies will sponsor local government, finance and budgeting institutes in eight different locations throughout the country over the next several months. These institutes, made possible by a grant from the U.S. Civil Service Commission, will cover such topics as local revenue generation, preparation of operating budgets, preparation of capital budgets, bond financing and line item and performance budgeting techniques. Enrollment in the institutes will be by invitation only for a limited number of minority elected and appointed officials. Confirmed dates are: Charleston, W. Va. (June 30 - July 2) and Little Rock, Ark. (July 21-23). Locations and dates for the other budgeting institutes will be announced upon confirmation. For further information, contact Bill Ellis at the Joint Center.

Carter Signs Public Works Jobs Bill

President Carter on May 13 signed into law a bill authorizing an additional \$4-billion for an emergency public works jobs program. The bill (HR 11) is the first component of the President's plan to stimulate the economy.

An earlier emergency public works program enacted over President Ford's veto in 1976 included \$2-billion for job-creating state and local public works projects.

Except in special circumstances, only those localities who applied for grants before Dec. 23, 1976 can be considered when the next round of funding becomes available.

Black elected officials should be aware that a provision in the bill requires that recipients of public works grants must use 10 percent of the funds for purchases from minority businesses in their area.

NBC/LEO Board Meeting

The National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials (NBC/LEO) will hold its semi-annual board meeting on June 11, 1977, in Tucson, Arizona. The NBC/LEO meeting will be held in conjunction with the 45th annual Conference of Mayors sponsored by the United States Conference of Mayors.

Continued on page 8

Continued from page 7

The Black Vote: Election '76 is now available. To obtain your copy of this authoritative source on black voting patterns in the 1976 elections, send \$5.00 to Publications department JCPS, 1426 H Street, N.W., Suite 926, Washington, D.C. 20005. On orders of three copies or more we will send a bill upon request but postage and handling charges will be added to the bill.

Black Judge Wins Oakland Mayoralty

Voters in Oakland, California elected the first black mayor of their city. Lionel Wilson, a Superior Court Judge, defeated Dave Tucker in the May 17 nonpartisan runoff election for mayor. Complete but unofficial returns showed Wilson with 42,640 votes (53.5 percent) to Tucker's 36,925 (46.5 percent).

Wilson and Tucker had been the two top vote-getters among 10 candidates in an April 17 election in which Wilson polled 44 percent and Tucker 38 percent of the vote. A runoff election was required since neither candidate received more than 50 percent of the vote.

Community Development Block Grants

HUD Secretary Patricia R. Harris recently announced a new "Community Development Block Grant Program" policy. The policy will supposedly make it easier to funnel federal funds to cities with large numbers of minority and poor residents.

The old formula tended to favor suburban communities and newer Sunbelt cities at the expense of the older, declining eastern and midwestern cities. The new policy also increases the block grant funds available and institutes a \$400 million "Urban Development Action Program" under which the Secretary can funnel money to cities suffering either physical or economic deterioration.

In announcing the changes, Harris cited the necessity for establishing "a program which targets funds to cities with the greatest need; and the most promise for improvement."

Update on Minorities in the Administration

As of May 17, President Jimmy Carter had appointed an estimated 7 more members of minority groups to top-level positions in his administration, bringing the total to 31, according to an up-dated survey conducted by the Joint Center. The original survey showed that 24 minorities had been appointed to high level positions. (See March FOCUS)

There are 229 presidential appointees and appointee-designates overall, according to White House figures. Members of minority groups make up 13 percent of the overall figure. There are 22 blacks, eight Hispanics and one Asian.

There are still a number of positions that must be filled and FOCUS will continue to provide a listing of minority appointees and appointee-designates as they are made. The names at this time are not meant to be all-inclusive. FOCUS will publish a complete listing when the presidential job filling process is completed.

Following is a listing of the most recent minority presidential appointees and appointee-designates who hold top-level ambassadorial and agency positions.

Department of State

Ulric Haynes, Jr., Ambassador to Algeria; Wilbert J. Le Melle, Ambassador to Kenya/Seychelles; Richard K. Fox, Ambassador to Trinidad/Tobago; and Terrence Todman, Assistant Secretary, Inter-American Affairs.

Department of Defense

Pierre Percy, assistant secretary of the Army for research and development

Department of Transportation

Quentin Taylor, Deputy Administrator, FAA.

Civil Service Commission

Ersa Poston, Commissioner

FOCUS

Joint Center for Political Studies

1426 H Street, N.W., Suite 926
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-4477

**ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED**

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify Focus of any change of address or title. YOU MUST INCLUDE YOUR OLD ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE along with your new address and zip code. No change can be made without this information.

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 44958
Washington, D.C.

**RETURN TO SENDER
UNKNOWN AT HOFSTRA
NO LONGER AT HOFSTRA**

1016602 30 430
MR PAUL SARNOFF
DIRECTOR
CTR FOR BUS & URBAN RES
HOFSTRA UNIV
HEMPSTEAD NY 11550

**Postmaster:
Form 3547 requested**

FIRST CLASS MAIL