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I. East County Environmental Justice Collaborative (ECEJC)

Environmental Problems:
Contra Costa County is second only to Los Angeles in having the highest concentration of oil refineries and chemical factories in California, and residents of Bay Point are exposed to multiple sources of toxic pollution. These include: 1) three of the county’s industrial facilities that handle large amounts of toxic chemicals, including ammonia, hydrochloric acid and hydrogen fluoride; 2) a facility that makes industrial adhesives that has had two chemical accidents that resulted in recommendations that nearby neighbors take shelter indoors to protect themselves from the toxic smoke; 3) a chemical plant that was abandoned in 1998, leaving toxic contamination in and around its building for four years until it was taken over in 2002 by the State Department of Toxic Substances Control’s Emergency Response Unit.

Acute exposures from industrial chemical accidents are not the only toxic threat to Bay Point residents. Chronic exposures to criteria and toxic air emissions such as ammonia, nickel and industrial solvents can also be attributed to these four facilities, along with associated commerce, especially diesel truck emissions. State Highway 4 runs adjacent to Bay Point, carrying approximately 60,000 cars and trucks per day. Bay Point, along with the rest of the Bay Area, is out of compliance with health-based standards for ozone and particulate matter. Diesel particulate matter is of particular concern because residents of Bay Point have a significantly higher risk of lung cancer than residents of the County overall. Bay Point’s childhood hospitalizations rate for asthma is also significantly higher than California as a whole.

Pollution in nearby San Francisco Bay/Delta has resulted in California EPA issuing fish consumption advisories for San Francisco Bay/Delta and local lakes. Recent studies of people that fish out of San Francisco Bay suggests that the social and ethnic makeup of Bay Point means that many Bay Point residents eat more Bay fish than is recommended by the State health advisories. The Delta also serves as the source of drinking water for Bay Point residents. Until recently, the level of disinfection byproducts in the drinking water served by the local private water company was just barely in compliance with water quality standards, and was two to eight times higher than that of the drinking water served to nearby communities by public water districts, even though it came from the same source.
Illegal dumping also plagues Bay Point. The community’s nearby proximity to a municipal landfill attracts haulers to its isolated fringes who either don’t want to pay the tipping fees or arrive after hours. Many low-income renters are not provided garbage service by their landlords, which leads to garbage being dumped in the community. The high foreclosure rate in the community has led to blighted homes that attract more garbage.

**Collaborative Members:**
In CARE Level I, the Collaborative consisted of a community-public agency-academic partnership, namely:

**Contra Costa Health Services, Roxanne Carrillo (Cedrita Claiborne)**
Contra Costa Health Services has served as project lead for the Collaborative throughout the CARE I Project. CCHS staff had been very active in community organizing activities in Bay Point since 2002. CCHS staff organized both adult and youth groups identifying community concerns related to health and the environment and implementing action plans to address these issues. CCHS staff brought a variety of leadership skills, including the ability to educate the public, engage youth and adults in organizing activities, develop curricula, engage key decision-makers, and maintain the on-going presence and leadership needed to succeed in developing a strong, engaged action team. CCHS Hazardous Materials Ombudsman provided important technical expertise on environmental hazards, including, data collection, health risks, and regulatory structure; developed training materials; presented information to residents on specific topics; and participated in program planning and development meetings on a regular basis.

**Bay Point Partnership, Elaine Pendergrast**
This group provided comprehensive outreach to the broader Bay Point community. They were an important liaison to the Partnership’s member agencies and groups regarding Collaborative goals and activities.

**Bay Point Promotoras, Estela Cerda**
Promotoras provided translation of curricula and materials in Spanish and interpretive services at meetings and community events. They provided outreach to Spanish-speaking members of the community.

**African American Health Conductors, Evelyn Dodson**
Health Conductors provided outreach to English-speaking Bay Point residents and assisted in activities at community meetings and events.

**University of San Francisco, James Fine**
UCSF staff and students provided expertise in guiding the development of the Environmental Justice 101 and Introduction to Toxins curricula and the Bay Point Community Perception Exposure Survey and Bay Point Environmental Action Project (LEAP) Toxic Exposure Assessment. UCSF staff and students provided overall guidance and participated community meetings and events.

**Bay Point Gateway High School, Benita Shaw-Malone**
Gateway High School is the local alternative education high school program, and the only high school in Bay Point. Staff and teachers encouraged students to engage in and remain active in the CARE I project by allowing CCHS to teach an Environmental Justice class for two years and by supporting Collaborative projects. The school also provided meeting space for this class and other community meetings. Students conducted the Exposure Survey in the Bay Point community, prepared materials, and presented at community events. Students also chose the added project of designing and planning a drought resistant garden at their school, as a way to create a more attractive, positive environment as well being a regional model of integrated-pest management and ecological design.

**Community Awareness and Emergency Response (CAER), Tony Semanza**
CAER provided ECEJC access to reach an expanded audience for outreach activity and assisted the Collaborative in accessing and partnering with local elementary schools.

**Contra Costa Interfaith Supporting Community Organization (CCISCO), Adam Krugel**
CCISCO staff provided outreach to local faith-based communities and groups.

**Contra Costa ACORN, John Adams**
Contra Costa ACORN joined the Collaborative in 2008. This group was invited to join because of their expertise in community organizing and advocacy and their established regional networks.

**Center for Human Development (CHD), Elaine Pendergrast**
CHD provides a fiscal agent role for the Collaborative and participated in program development and support.

**Todos Unidos, Angel Lujano**
Todos Unidos provided outreach and partipated in classes and events.

**La Clinica de la Raza, Maria Reyes**
La Clinica provided translation and interpretive services at community events.

Prior to receiving EPA funding, many of the above groups worked together, primarily on health education campaigns and resource development related to food and health access and the development of youth programs. This prior shared experience provided a solid foundation and framework from which to develop and launch our Collaborative’s environmental justice work.

The Collaborative engaged vulnerable community members through our grassroots approach. Through the diversity of the groups in the Collaborative, we reached and engaged monolingual Spanish speakers and immigrants, the African-American community, low-income residents, and at-risk youth.

EPA Project Officer Periann Wood provided key leadership and assistance throughout the project. She attended several key meetings and community events and provided guidance, clarification, and assistance in accessing a variety of EPA resources. She provided suggestions and feedback regarding the CARE Roadmap, additional tools and approaches, and was very supportive of our process, progress, and efforts.
Barriers Encountered:
During the two years of funding for our project, the downturn of the economy was a challenge, as Collaborative partners at times had to shift their focus to other program areas. This challenged the Collaborative leadership, and also affected the availability and participation of some residents. Some long-term residents had to return to their home countries; others had to seek employment and meet other family needs, and were therefore less available for project activities. We overcame these challenges by adding a new member to the Collaborative (ACORN), and by engaging in renewed outreach activities. We provided support to residents regarding coping with the economic conditions and information on community resources to obtain financial relief, and redoubled our efforts to obtain and maintain the participation of residents throughout the project.

The Collaborative worked to improve relationships by addressing issues directly and holding Steering Committee meetings on a monthly basis, with phone and email consultation as needed. We formed Planning Committees and met weekly to outline and develop responsibilities and tasks of each partner in advance of large community events. CCHS is involved in a number of collaboratives and community-based partnership throughout the county, including the Contra Costa Asthma Coalition and the Bay Area Environmental Health Collaborative (BAHEC). Through these and other efforts, CCHS and our partners have extensive experience working in diverse coalitions to achieve important community-based goals and initiatives.

II. Bay Area Latino Environmental Action Project (LEAP)

The East County Environmental Justice Collaborative (ECEJC) identified toxic risks and set priorities by using several different methods. Through our process, we progressively narrowed our focus and selected specific environmental justice issues to tackle. We then developed campaigns and plans for action projects, based on a prioritization of risks and considering a variety of factors including the interest of community resident leaders and feasibility.

On November 28, 2007, the ECEJC organized a kick-off event to educate the Bay Point community on the basic concepts and principles of Environmental Justice and how these issues relate to the Bay Point community. More than 50 residents attended. This community forum was also used as a means to get residents interested in attending upcoming educational classes. Bay Point residents presented on the top four environmental justice issues that they had determined were a high priority: pesticides in fish, illegal dumping, water quality, and potential risks of industrial accidents. Residents also provided an introduction to environmental justice and other toxic exposure risks.
The first step following the kick-off event was to develop a comprehensive toxic chemical exposure assessment necessitated by the fact that Bay Point residents are threatened by multiple sources of toxic pollution. Concurrently, in cooperation with students from the local alternative High School, the Collaborative developed and implemented a Community Perception and Exposure Reduction tool with 144 Bay Point households to gain a better understanding of resident concerns around toxic pollution. The tool was five pages in length, and covered environmental issues in the community, in the home, in the workplace, and questions related to personal health. Teams of Gateway High School youth, staff from the Promotora program, CCHS staff, and USF staff and students conducted the survey door-to-door in four quadrants of Bay Point.

The information from these two research efforts was used to train students from Gateway High School to understand the basic elements of Environmental Justice and the toxic risks in their community. We provided a series of seven classes that covered the basic concepts of environmental justice, toxicology, and risk assessment/risk management, and an overview of the Bay Point-specific environmental exposure data.

These students, along with Bay Point residents also trained in a similar manner, presented this information to the larger Bay Point community in a Community Forum on May 28, 2008. After the presentation, the 85 residents in attendance engaged in an exercise to prioritize the issues that were of most concern to them. The highest priority issues identified were: 1) drinking water quality, 2) air quality and 3) illegal dumping.

The Collaborative then conducted five skill-building practice sessions with five of the high school students and five adult residents to present the findings of the research and the outcome of the community forum to a broader Bay Point audience. The students and...
adult residents made 17 presentations to local organizations. Among others, presentations were made to Bay Point Municipal Advisory Council, Bay Point Community Advisory Panel, Soul to Soul (an African-American support group), Bay Point Partnership, Bay Point Action Team, and Gateway High School staff and parents. During these presentations, issues and concerns raised by the audiences were recorded and reported back to the Collaborative.

The next step in Level I was to develop a comparative risk assessment of the three priority issues identified at the community forum. Working closely with staff from EPA’s Region 9 Office, the Collaborative developed a comparative risk assessment covering six areas: ambient air quality, indoor air quality, accidental chemical releases, illegal dumping, drinking water quality, and water availability. Detailed presentations on the concept of risk assessment and the results of this comparative risk assessment were made to the Gateway High School students, community residents, and Collaborative members.

Throughout the time period that the CARE Level I project was being implemented, collaborative members and residents also had been focusing their efforts on reducing their health risks from the relatively high levels of disinfection by-products in their drinking water. They had been advocating to the California Public Utilities Commission and Department of Public Health that they deserved to receive drinking water from their private vendor with the same low level of disinfection by-products and fluoride protection as that provided by municipal water districts using the same source water to nearby communities. The private water company finally violated their disinfection by-product standard in the first quarter of 2008 and was put under a compliance order by the State Department of Public Health. At the same time the Collaborative was going through its final prioritization effort, the company decided to come into compliance with this order by shutting down their outdated treatment system and purchasing treated water from the nearby public water district. Thus, one of the main issues the community had previously been most concerned about had been significantly resolved, which is why it was not ranked as high in the final prioritization.

In February 2009, Collaborative members and community residents participated in two comparative risk ranking exercises and chose priority issues to work on in a CARE Level II project. The comparative risk ranking incorporated information about potential health impacts, long-term environmental impacts, quality of life concerns, population vulnerability, and uncertainties and data gaps. In this first session, the order in which
participants ranked the relative risk from highest to lowest was outdoor air quality, drinking water quality, illegal dumping, indoor air quality, accidental releases, and water availability. In the second session, participants chose which issues they wanted to address in the CARE Level II project considering the comparative risk ranking as well as feasibility, political pressure/support, cost effectiveness/funding, timeliness, community support, institutional support, and the need for social and regulatory change.

The resulting highest-ranking issue was indoor air quality, followed by illegal dumping, outdoor air quality and drinking water quality. Collaborative members and residents identified possible projects for each issue, and considered the pros and cons of choosing different projects. Proposed solutions focused on outreach and educational approaches to empower residents to take action for themselves, rather than on initiatives to change the policy or practices of agencies or industries responsible for specific toxic exposures. The final consideration of the prioritization process was that while the CARE Level II application should focus on activities that would help residents reduce their exposure to indoor air pollutants, opportunities should also be taken to provide educational materials about key outdoor air quality, illegal dumping and water quality issues, as well to pursue policy issues that arise during the process.

The process that the ECEJC used to reach a formal agreement included educational classes, data analysis, group ranking exercises, and presentation of findings to local organizations and through Community Forum events. The residents voted on what was important to them and prioritized action steps throughout the process.

**LEAP Toxic Reduction Strategies:**

The ECEJC developed a Toxic Reduction Plan prior to applying for EPA CARE Level II funding. Goals and activities flow directly from the prioritization effort of our Level I project described above. Measurable project goals and tracking methods include the following:

**Goal 1:** Conduct 50 initial and follow-up Toxic Exposure Reduction home visits.
*Expected outcome:* Eight percent of residents visited will commit to making at least one change in their home as a result of the visit. Sixty percent of residents visited will make at least one change in their home between the first and second visit.
*Tracking measurement:* A home assessment checklist will be used before and after the visits to quantify changes and determine level of commitment.
*Measurement of environmental results:* The reduction of the amount of toxic chemicals used as a result of the changes made will be calculated.

**Goal 2:** Educate 300 households via community workshops to provide information on specific toxic exposure reduction topics.
*Expected outcome:* Forty percent of the residents attending the workshop will commit to making at least one toxic exposure reduction change in their home.
*Tracking measurement:* A post-workshop evaluation tool will be used to measure commitment and follow-up phone calls will be made to positive responses to confirm changes.
**Measurement of environmental results:** The reduction in the amount of toxic chemicals used as a result of the changes made will be calculated.

**Goal 3:** Provide broad-based toxic exposure reduction educational information to 1,000 homes via door-to-door “Neighborhood Blitzes”.

**Expected outcome:** Thirty percent of the residents contacted will commit to attending one of the 6 workshops offered.

**Tracking measurement:** Evaluation forms collected at the residents’ door will be compared to workshop attendance lists to determine compliance with commitment.

**Measurement of environmental results –** The number of residents that said they would attend workshops will be compared to the number that attended.

**Goal 4:** Collect data on “green” product availability at ten local stores and work with five of these to increase and/or expand product lines.

**Expected outcome:** The five stores chosen to work with will add at least three green products or promote at least three less-toxic products identified by residents as desired.

**Tracking measurement:** Store inventories of relevant products will be tracked pre and post project, input of residents’ interest in alternative products will be collected during home visits, workshops, and door-to-door visits will be compiled, and the amount of the targeted products sold during a 6-12 month period will be collected.

**Measurement of environmental results:** The difference in toxicity between the alternative products sold and the more toxic products they replaced, and the increase in less-toxic products promoted will be used to determine the reduction in toxic exposure resulting from the amount alternative and promoted products sold.

**Goal 5:** Identify and develop a campaign around one toxics exposure reduction policy change.

**Expected outcome:** Develop an Action Plan for one policy change that will positively reduce residential toxic exposure and present this action plan to the relevant stakeholders.

**Tracking measurement:** The consensus-based approach used to determine the policy to change will be documented.

**Measurement of environmental results:** The reduction in resident exposure from the implementation of the proposed policy will be calculated.

The ECEJC raised awareness and built support for action by educating the broader Bay Point community through our two well-attended workshops and in the 17 presentations that community members made to local organizations. Additionally, we engaged in a variety of outreach activities to garner new and ongoing involvement of residents throughout the process.

The ECEJC built momentum early on through our advocacy around the issue of drinking water quality. Water quality is an issue that affects every household in Bay Point regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, or socio-economic status. Since the drinking water in Bay Point had higher THM’s than the neighboring communities, even though the raw water came from the same source, residents could understand the inherent environmental injustice in the situation. We were able to use this as a tool to organize people around clearly understandable and achievable goals. We were able to keep momentum going
because there were so many residents active and willing to stay involved in actions to advocate for change related to the critically important issue of safe drinking water.

Our project was able to secure success with Golden State Water by maintaining a consistent and strong voice, by, requesting meetings to keep up pressure, and getting community members to testify at meetings about water quality and customer service issues. In addition to working to achieve cleaner drinking water, we advocated for the need for a bilingual Customer Service Representative that spoke Spanish and for the Annual Water Quality Report to be translated into Spanish. Golden State Water did create such a position, and the Annual report was translated into Spanish. In addition, Golden State Water provided interpretation at a local Open House meeting, which had not been previously done. Resident leaders also submitted a letter requesting that the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) move a public hearing about the Bay Point drinking water rate increase to a location in Bay Point rather than Pittsburg. This request was granted.

The ECEJC did seek additional funding early on and successfully secured funds to work on environmental justice issues in the East County Corridor. The ECEJC was granted approximately $500,000 from the San Francisco Foundation to mobilize and organize residents around environmental justice issues in Bay Point, Pittsburg and Antioch.

The University of San Francisco, through the work of a graduate student, and the U.S. EPA, through the work of Risk Assessor Matt Lakin, provided the technical resources we used to support the project. Databases from the U.S. EPA, the California Air Resources Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the California Department of Public Health, the Contra Costa Hazardous Materials Program, the Contra Costa Environmental Health Department, the Contra Costa Lead Poisoning Prevention Program and the Contra Costa Asthma Program were used to develop a base report on the environmental issues impacting Bay Point residents. Matt Lakin used standard risk assessment methods to develop the comparative risk assessment.

**Outputs and Outcomes:**
The significant outputs of the project were the kick-off meeting, the community perception study, the Town Hall meeting, the series of 10 weeks of training classes, the 17 presentations to community groups, the completion of two risk-ranking exercises, and the development of plans for a drought-resistant garden at Gateway High School. More than 75 residents attended the community meeting, more than 200 residents received presentations on the priority topics, 15 Gateway High School students received training through the environmental justice class at school, and 25 residents attended community-based educational classes and training sessions. The materials developed include the Toxic Health Exposure Assessment, the teaching materials for the classes, and presentation materials, maps, and graphs used in the community presentations.

The most significant outcomes of this project are the “early win” of securing a cleaner source of drinking water for Bay Point residents, the development of a detailed work plan for attacking the highest priority issues identified by residents through the risk assessment
process, and the strengthening of the collaborative through the increased awareness and education of residents and partners.

We believe that the advocacy work of the collaborative was instrumental in convincing the private water company that provided drinking water to Bay Point to choose to shut down their outdated water treatment plant in response to their violations of state and federal water quality standards and instead purchase higher-quality water from the nearby public water system. This action secured a stable source of drinking water for Bay Point residents that tasted better, had lower levels of disinfection byproducts, and was fluoridated.

All of the goals outlined in our original grant plan were achieved. However, the project produced more outcomes than anticipated by organizing and mobilizing residents to work on more than one environmental issue at a time. The Gateway High School students went above and beyond the original scope of work by planning a drought resistant garden. The Gateway campus currently has no landscaping, which creates an austere and unwelcoming learning environment. The students identified the development of a garden and landscape plan with California native and drought resistant trees, shrubs and plants as a priority project. Through the generous contribution of a local landscape architect, we developed a comprehensive design for a landscape plan for the Gateway campus.

As designed, the Demonstration Garden will be a powerful regional model for showcasing how to utilize native and drought resistant plants and trees to create a beautiful and ecological campus environment, achieving reduced heating and cooling costs, utilizing integrated pest management techniques, and beautifying an under-resourced Bay Point educational program. Next steps will include securing funding and donations to implement the plan, and integrating phased implementation into the long-term development and maintenance plans of the school, class curricula and the school district.

Additional resources that the ECEJC brought to the project include in-kind support such as child-care, meeting spaces, translation and interpretation services, and technical support by other staff members not assigned to this project.
III. Reflection
The ECEJC’s collaboration and inclusive, participatory process was very important to the success of the LEAP project. Every partner organization/agency of the Collaborative participated in all major events, which contributed to achieving such positive and concrete outcomes. The ECEJC’s greatest achievements include being able to build the strong leadership skills of students at Gateway High School and the successful advocacy work the Bay Point residents achieved related to improvement of the quality and safety of drinking water in Bay Point. One of the greatest challenges for the project was being able to maintain the participation of residents during the current economic crisis. The financial burden of this crisis is real and palpable to the families of the resident leaders with whom we worked throughout the past two years. This economic downturn at times challenged our ability to maintain consistent participation in our classes and advocacy work. We have seen a dramatic increase in referrals for food stamps and Medi-cal, along with other resources referrals to local food banks, health clinics and mental health referrals. We have sought to link residents with important resources and support during this challenging time, and to provide community members with information about resources for assistance.

The ECEJC unfortunately did not have the opportunity to work with other CARE recipients. As previously mentioned, the ECEJC worked very closely with U.S. EPA Region 9 staff on several of our activities and events. We were able to successfully mobilize the media on our behalf to publicize our community meetings and events, to educate community members and local officials on the quality of the drinking water in Bay Point, and as a tool for an expanded group of key decision-makers to hear the voices of the community on environmental justice issues. Our Project Officer played an important role by participating in planned events, receiving feedback, opinions and direction to the project. Additionally, she was a great resource to the project because of she is a resident of the Bay Area and knowledgeable about a breadth of local environmental and policy issues. The LEAP project increased the capacity of our Collaborative in that all members provided their specific expertise and learned from the expertise of other member groups, thereby expanding the knowledge, skill base, and abilities of all involved.

IV. Next Steps
ECEJC is currently seeking additional funding to continue and expand upon the work and accomplishments of CARE I. We will apply for the next round of funding for a CARE Level II project. We will build upon the foundation created by our CARE Level I project by further developing the leadership capacity of local residents as we develop and implement action projects to reduce toxic exposure risks in the Bay Point Community.

When funding is secured, our project focus will include implementing the Toxic Reduction Strategies discussed above. The principal focus of our efforts will involve training community residents to conduct home assessments of indoor toxins. This topic was chosen because the priority issue from the ranking exercise was indoor air quality. Residents will complete a comprehensive in-home checklist, and will educate residents about toxins in and around the home. Residents will provide information regarding non-toxic and less toxic cleaning and other home products, radon, lead hazards, mold and moisture, environmental tobacco smoke, chemical toxins, allergens, combustion
products, pesticides, and take-home hazards from work. Comprehensive information will be given on ways to remediate these problems, as well as contact information for local resources and agencies that can provide further assistance. Follow-up visits will be conducted to assess the level of changes made as well as to provide further education and resources to encourage households to assess important indoor air quality issues. While indoor toxins will be the focus of the home assessments, we will also provide information regarding drinking water quality, water conservation, outdoor air quality, and illegal dumping.

In addition to in-home air quality assessments, we plan to conduct six community workshops on a variety of topics related to reducing environmental toxins in the home. To have broader reach in the community, we will also engage in intensive door-to-door outreach to Bay Point residents to provide them with information and resources about how to reduce their exposure to toxic risks in the home.

Another component of our next steps involves engaging the business community on issues related to the availability and use of green products in the Bay Point area, and we will work to secure the substantial participation of the business community in the development and implementation of Collaborative events, projects and campaigns. We will seek input from residents regarding which products they would be the most likely to purchase and utilize, and we will work with local businesses to stock and promote these products.

The final component of our CARE II proposal includes a process to identify and develop a campaign around one toxics exposure reduction policy change. Through our efforts in the various activities described above, we will support residents in a process of choosing one policy and will develop and implement a local action campaign.

V. Feedback and Follow-up

We would be happy to be contacted by EPA CARE headquarters staff to provide additional information about our project and how our work is progressing. It would be interesting and beneficial to learn more about how other CARE communities are progressing with their projects and efforts in addition to the participation in the National Training Workshops. One idea to strengthen the CARE program is to create a website or listserv that all CARE communities could use to post ideas, lessons learned, resources, and to solicit and give feedback, as we likely grapple with similar challenges and experiences, despite the differences inherent in individual projects and approaches. This could be a powerful mutual support tool and source of guidance and inspiration as we tackle challenging and exciting community-based environmental justice work.