

Finding Procedural Justice in Baltimore's Department of Public Works

Structures of power and governance hold significant sway over the process and outcome of decision-making in local governments. An assessment of the processes involved in environmental decision-making (Dietz and Stern, 2008) and structures of governance (United States Census Bureau, 2016; National League of Cities, 2016) can aid an understanding of how public administration decisions are made, and help to dismantle structural power imbalances. To the same end, the presence and impact of procedural justice must also be considered (Holifield, 2001). Holifield defines procedural justice as “referring to the access of citizens to environmental decision-making processes that affect their environments” (Holifield, 2001, 81). The incorporation of procedural justice emphasizes public participation as an integral part of decision-making processes that will impact communities at large. In order to engage in publically beneficial outcomes, governmental institutions must welcome and create space for the idea that “all decisions in a democracy involve public participation” (Dietz and Stern, 2008, 11).

While methods of decision-making and public participation are often discussed, there is a lack of focus on the incorporation of procedural justice within the context of local governance structure. To this end, the City of Baltimore will be used as a case study to examine how the structure of city government and the incorporation of city-level public participation impacts procedural justice. The entirety of the case study will be grounded in a historical context and will address the social institutions that shaped modern day Baltimore. An analysis of Baltimore's Public Works Department will add to the discussion, and contextualize the limitations facing and facilitated by local level governance institutions. This analysis will assess how procedural justice

is incorporated into environmental and social decision-making processes, and the importance of access to public participation in decisions that impact communities at large. By addressing the strengths and weaknesses within Baltimore City's structure of governance, this paper reveals how decisions within the Public Works Department can be more inclusive of public opinion and provide a better forum for diverse voices. Ultimately, this paper aims to address the questions: How is management power distributed within Baltimore City's Public Works Department? How does the City of Baltimore provide procedural justice within its public and environmental services?

Literature Review

Environmental Decision Making

Processes of environmental decision-making function within hierarchical power structures, ultimately resulting in planning or policy choices that impact community function within local environments. "Environmental problems demand difficult choices," often requiring balancing the opinions of many, and mediating a precautionary approach against a drive for economic development and progress in order to account for community needs and opinions (Renn et. al., 1995). Approaching environmental decisions requires recognition of the need for scientific or expert knowledge of environmental functions, but also the opinions and values of diverse communities directly affected by changes to where they live, work and play (Dietz & Stern, 2008). Typically, environmental decisions are facilitated via a scientific approach (Gregory et. al., 2012), however this method falls short in two regards: First, the notion of "objective" science is not always popular, nor accepted, and second, it neglects local knowledge in favor of a systemic approach (Renn et. al., 1995). The scientific approach can therefore be

limiting and perpetuate a cycle of decision-making dependent on the powerful few. Operating on a federal level, and aiming to challenge this power structure, the U.S Environmental Protection Agency is seeking to integrate “stakeholders,” or informed individuals and groups, and scientific knowledge. By employing the collective knowledge of a wider stakeholder group this tactic gathers feedback for approaching problem solving and defining alternative solutions, thus leveling out power structures (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 1983)

Acting as an alternative to science based decision-making, structured decision-making tackles environmental management challenges by offering a more holistic approach. Structured decision-making is a “collaborative and facilitated application of multiple objective decision making and group deliberation methods” which attempts to provide management and policy solutions (Gregory et. al, 2012, 6). The process of structured decision-making emphasizes the establishment of trust between stakeholders with the intention of fostering mutual learning and continued access to information, along with intentions of consistency and transparency (Gregory et. al, 2012, 1) Structured decision-making is unique in that it accounts for the values and feelings of participant opinions, while seeking to define a solution via a consensus approach, rather than just exchanging opinions. In contrast to the science based approach, as Gregory et. al explain, success within consensus decision-making is achieved when the final decision “reach[es] beyond the last common denominator of a universally supported plan and, instead, [delivers a plan] that is creative and demonstrably effective, that will survive further scrutiny from a wider audience, and that is likely to prove robust over time” (5). In this manner, collective solutions establish a foundation for a more widely accepted action-plan, and ensure that public opinion is valued and essential to the decision-making process. While structural and consensus-based decision making processes seek to challenge hierarchical power structures, Cole and

Foster (2001) theorize that decision-making processes only further already existing social stratifications and access limitations (2001,104).

Environmental and Procedural Justice

The incorporation of environmental, distributive, and procedural justice within environmental decision-making creates access to hierarchical power structures, and defines space for the diversity of values and voices within shared environments. Holifield (2001) debates the true definition of environmental justice, and the valuation of its various interpretations by traditional environmental movements, the federal government and grassroots organizations. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, “the goal of environmental justice is to ensure that *all* people, regardless of race, national origin or income, are *protected* from *disproportionate impacts* of environmental hazards” (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Justice, 2000, added emphasis). Holifield critiques that while government definitions and actions regarding environmental justice are diverse, they do not encompass the “radical environmental populism” made famous by grassroots movements because they tend to focus on distributive justice, like the relation to environmental hazards such as toxins (Boone et. al., 2009). While the above definition may be vague for the purpose of enforcing federal environmental policy, it remains a powerful tool within political rhetoric because of its appeal to moral obligations (Holifield, 2001).

Examining traditional cases of environmental justice, Boone et. al., argue for the incorporation of distributive and procedural justice in order to ensure equitable environmental decisions. Just distribution is defined as the “equal distribution of benefits and burdens among individuals or groups” (Boone et. al. 2009, 769). Such a function is valuable for providing

equitable services, yet does not account for pre-existing social privileges or access that affected populations might already benefit from, thus not considering the “needs, choices, and merits” of communities when distributing amenities or disamenities under equitable intentions. Despite playing a key role in the definition of environmental justice, distributive justice remains exclusionary to some by virtue of its function. Often, communities most impacted by distributive justice do not have political clout and are not involved in decision-making. This shortfall points to the importance of incorporating procedural justice in order to ensure that political processes involved in distributive justice acknowledge the social hierarchy and power embedded in decision-making institutions, and establish the need for procedural equity within said institutions (Boone et. al., 2009). Again, key to the definition of environmental justice is procedural justice, “referring to the access of citizens to decision-making processes that affect their environments” (Holifield, 2001, 81). Procedural justice encourages active participation and the integration of many opinions in environmental problem solving. If provided within decision-making processes, it can deliver access to isolated power structures and offer a means of inclusion within administrative and institutional processes.

Perceptions of procedural fairness (Daneke, et. al., 1983), viewed as an encouraging or preventative factor to procedural justice, greatly impacts the reactions and responses of those receiving the impact of environmental decisions. A lack of procedural fairness is viewed as the result of unfair procedural processes rooted in positions of power, and can alter opinions in a negative manner regarding the social settings and decision-makers involved in the process. Alternatively, adequate levels of procedural fairness within procedural processes lend a sense of legitimacy and encourage approval of decisions and decision-makers. While it is applaudable and necessary to incorporate procedural justice as a means of achieving environmental justice, a

challenge arises when one considers various methods to implement and provide procedural justice to local communities.

Public Participation in Decision Making

Public participation functions alongside procedural justice and works to solidify a public voice within environmental decision-making. Since the rise of socio-economic public programs, public participation received considerable attention as a method for providing “administrative due process.” The establishment of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) provided a framework for the integration of public opinion via the following policies:

1. Giving adequate notice for all rule-making activities.
2. Providing opportunities for written inputs into rule-making.
3. Establishing procedures for judicial review and citizen redress in the event of “arbitrary” and “capricious” administrative decisions (Daneke, 1983, 13)

Essentially, public participation and policies like the APA seek to broaden the expression of the public voice while “operationaliz[ing] various ill-defined concepts of democracy and consumer sovereignty” (Daneke, 1983, 12). Here, public participation becomes key to democracy and a representative government.

Similarly, Renn et. al. define public participation as “forums for exchange that are organized for the purpose of facilitating communication between government citizens, stakeholders and interest groups, and businesses regarding a specific decision or problem” (1995, 2). In this manner, public participation encourages environmental discourse that contextualizes decision-making within a risk society that demands continual communication between

knowledgeable, consenting social groups and larger regulatory institutions, which hold responsibility for mediating public risk (Beck and Ritter, 1992; Renn et. al, 1995; Pellow, 2007). Here, public participation maintains environmental discourse and encourages equal representation, peer discussion, and consensual solutions (Renn et. al, 1995). It seeks to reflect collective social values, provide a route of social change, shape political public support and protect the interests of citizen participants. These goals are achieved through advisory committees, boards and councils, public town meetings, and engagement with administrative offices, to highlight just a few (Chess & Purcell, 1999).

While the function of public participation engages in the redistribution of decision-making power it also presents challenges to public administrators. Charged with finding solutions to environmental problems, public participation aids administrators in gathering information and consensus of opinions and gaining support for policies. Inclusion of public opinions leads to perceptions of better quality and legitimacy in decision-making (Dietz & Stern, 2008, 10). However, public opposition commonly obstructs the implementation of policies, leading to a challenge of political structures and resulting in future unwillingness to incorporate public participation (Renn et. al, 1995). On the other hand, public participation presents an exclusionary challenge to individuals who do not have access, knowledge or time to engage in forums intended for public opinions. This brings to light the question: Who should benefit from public participation? Those who are attempting to carve out a space for the public voice, or administrators seeking to gain strategic political support? Interestingly, public participation can be analyzed via consensual and conflict approaches, and when both approached are integrated, public participation can both stabilize society through consensus and facilitate social change via conflict (Renn et. al, 1995).

Existing literature demonstrates a lack of attention to what causes lack of access to decision-making and public participation within local governments. Most scholarly attention is focused on various methods of decision-making (Dietz & Stern, 2008; Gregory et. al., 2012; Renn et. al., 1995) and forms of public participation (Chess & Purcell, 1999; Daneke, 1983; Renn et. al, 1995), while there is a definite lack of attention regarding the isolation of larger structural insufficiencies within local government and public services that ultimately fail to provide procedural justice. While focusing on Baltimore City and its Department of Public works, this research will contextualize these larger discussions and aim to expand upon existing knowledge within the local city governments. Additionally, this research will focus on addressing the causes of procedural inequities and structural insufficiencies, rather than focusing solely on the consequences of the resulting issues and limitations.

Baltimore Case Study

Social Disenfranchisement and Disempowerment

Within Baltimore City, historical patterns of aggression and exclusion via social processes and institutions have led to the disempowerment and disenfranchisement of city residents, most particularly residents of color. The advent of the Great Migration, spanning from the 1890s to the 1970s greatly altered the demographic fabric of the United States as black communities left the rural south and migrated to the industrial north (Zeiderman, 2006; Pietela, 2010; Zeiderman, 2006) By the 1970s, around seventy-five percent of the United States' black population lived in major urban areas (Zeiderman, 2006). Rather than deconstructing hostile race relations, Zeiderman argues, this transition period only furthered socially divisive binaries

(2006). In residential areas, homeowner aggression against the perceived danger of growing black communities and other racial and ethnic minorities created formal and informal means of segregation and discrimination. Via city ordinances of the early 1910s, the city of Baltimore became the first municipality to sanction block-by-block segregation, claiming its benefits for Baltimore's welfare (Boone et. al., 2010). Exclusionary and race-based covenants, considered legal in court, were maintained by neighborhoods and the real estate industry. While race-based segregation was later prohibited by a 1917 Supreme Court decision, no restrictions existed to stop informal institutions from enforcing segregation practices. However, as Pietela notes, while "racial segregation became a cornerstone of real estate activity," "zoning provided further enforcement tools" (2010, 53). Zoning offered a legally enforceable means of separating "residential, industrial and commercial" city functions and maintaining racial hierarchies (Pietela, 2010, 53).

With the institution of the Home Owners Loan Corporation (HOLC) in 1933, zoning officials mapped the demography's of cities nation wide and constructed new landscapes based on risk assessment. The process was explained as a means of protecting property value and evaluating the risk of financial loans. While credited and applauded with bringing needed stability back after the Great Depression, the operation relied upon social stigmas and racial stereotyping, and employed the argument of eugenic superiority to mask the maintenance of white privilege, in order to redefine neighborhood property value and establish loan-risk models. In Baltimore, like other urban areas, the process of redlining (Pietela, 2010; Boone et. al., 2010) and solidifying interpretations of race, class and ethnicity reinforced social bigotry, both within the real estate industry and financial institutions. Processes of redlining contributed to an advent of white flight to Baltimore County, further isolating the City of Baltimore from political power

and leaving behind a legacy of prejudice that has enabled disempowerment, disenfranchisement and distrust of institutions.

Baltimore City Governance Structure

Incorporating histories of disenfranchisement and disempowerment alongside Baltimore's structure of government provides a secondary means of understanding how residents remain isolated from power structures. Going back to its origins, Baltimore City was incorporated in 1797, and later separated from Baltimore County in 1851 (Maryland State Archives, 2016). The state of Maryland is divided into a county municipality governance structure, with Baltimore City functioning as the only independent city government (U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 2016). Further defining the power of local governments, Dillon's law, established in 1868, defines the role of local government authority, and rules that municipal powers are limited by state sanctions. This means that state governments, like Maryland's, control the level of power local governments can possess, and influence the "local government structure, methods of financing its activities, its procedures and the authority to undertake functions" (National League of Cities, 2016). While the State of Maryland defines the autonomy of local governments, said governments retain discretion over structural, functional, fiscal and personnel decision-making. Generally, structural power is left to the choice of local authority. In Baltimore, this method of governance has led to lack of political credibility and cause for corruption. Unlike many other cities, "Baltimoreans still live in a "boss" system where almost all hope, credit and blame end up singularly associated with the mayor" (Levy, 2009). On State drafted diagrams defining the hierarchy of the Baltimore City's executive branch, the position of mayor remains at the top, only held accountable to voters, but otherwise controlling

the four offices of Administration, Community Resources, Land Use & Environment, and Public Safety (Baltimore City, Maryland, 2016).

The presence of a mayoral system, where the mayoral office orchestrates and approves all final decisions, facilitates a local governance structure that becomes less about public opinion and more focused on private interests and which parties can offer the best incentive to speed along policy decisions. Alternatively, a council-manager local governance structure is more common, where a cooperative, power-balance functions to oversee policy and operational decisions (Levy, 2009). Rather than inviting corruption and privileging some voices over others, the council-manager structure benefits the interests of the public by “insulat[ing] day-to-day management from the intrusion of politics” (Levy, 2009). Such protection is essential considering that politics are embedded within hierarchical and prejudiced power structures, and often act to exclude the voices of those with less access to power. Ultimately, this structure provides a more balanced alternative to a purely authoritarian mayoral presence, and seeks to address power imbalances that perpetuate inaccessibility to decision-making processes.

Opportunity and Access for Public Opinion

An analysis of Baltimore City’s opportunity and access for participation reveals that the City Council could better facilitate more public participation in decision-making processes. Boone et. al. write, “Cities are the product of thousands of individual and collective decisions, made in the context of larger social and economic cycles, environmental limitations and possibilities, and politics” (2010, 777). This perspective is certainly true, when one considers the legislative process followed by the Baltimore City Council in the orchestration of passing or amending bills. As defined by the Office of the Council President, the process consists of nine

stages in the following order: New bill, first reading, assigned to committee, hearing, second reading, third reading, vote, sent to the Mayor, bill becomes law (Office of Council President, N.d.). The majority of the work in this step-by-step process is completed among Council Committees. The Office of the Council President does recognize the role of citizen engagement, noting, “The legislative process is a public process!” and emphasizing that “Your participation is important. You can participate by submitting written or oral testimony either before or at a public hearing” (Office of Council President, N.d.). The recommendations provided by the City Council for engaging in the function and processes of the decision making, however, are limited. Their recommendations focus on actions such as submitting written or oral testimony, writing letters to council members, submitting comments on legislation, or attending hearing and asking questions (Office of Council President, N.d.). In this manner, the council hearing stage becomes the main opportunity to make an impactful statement regarding community and personal beliefs, while the Council members and their respective committees carry out the remaining stages of the process.

The suggested methods for public participation in City Council decision-making present serious limitations. A certain level of knowledge is needed to understand not only the issue at hand, but also the decision-making or legislative process. While informational factsheet publications, like the one available online through the City Council’s website (Office of Council President, N.d.), are helpful for directing citizen mobilization and organization one must first have the time and resources to access such material, and second to act upon the information and spend time devoted to writing constructive legislative comments or attending a public hearing. Both of these options for participation operate on the assumption that all concerned citizens know where to direct their concerns, and how to capitalize and amplify their voice as a citizen. Additionally, the manner of public involvement suggested by the Office of Council is very

reactionary in its engagement with the public. Rather than employing public engagement techniques to influence the creation of policy and citywide decisions in a precursory manner, the City only seeks public commentary post-policy creation. Therefore, one can argue that the structure of Baltimore City council is lacking in opportunities to access decision-making processes and demonstrate public opinion prior to the creation of policy. While citizens are encouraged to maintain their “voter” power as the electors of local government leaders, within the hierarchy of public administrative decision makers it is clear that the city does not maintain consistent access to public decision-making.

It is important not to consider Baltimore’s structure of governance in isolation, but to also draw from case studies exemplifying similar limitations in other communities. In their analysis of Buttonwillow, a largely Latino community in California, Cole and Foster (2001) demonstrate the harsh reality of exclusion from public opportunity to participate in local government advisory committees. In Buttonwillow, restrictions due to lack of representation and lack of access to resources caused the community to be excluded from decision-making processes regarding a waste facility expansion. Further, the exclusion of community representation negatively impacted desire for future participation by community members. It is startling when one considers that Baltimore’s limited opportunities for inclusive decision-making and public participation processes mirror those of Buttonwillow. An examination of Baltimore City’s Department of Public Works demonstrates that the department services are subject to similar weaknesses of administrative due process and incorporation of public voices.

Department of Public Works, Decision Making, and Water Rates

The Public Works Department of Baltimore provides utility services to city neighborhoods, including water and sewer management, recycling, sustainable energy, and engineering and construction. The City charter declares: “The Department shall have charge of the water supply of the City and of all the properties, reservoirs, streams, pumping and filtration stations, pipes, apparatus and equipment appurtenant thereto and shall exercise all the powers and perform all the duties connected with the operation thereof and the supplying of water to the City.” (Baltimore City. Department of Legislative Reference, 2016b) Assuming these responsibilities, the Department’s mission statement reads: “We support the health, environment, and economy of our City and the region by providing customers with safe drinking water and keeping neighborhoods and waterways clean” (Baltimore City. Department of Public Works, 2016a). The services provided are essential to the daily functions of the City and contribute significantly to the public and environmental health of the region. The provision of said public works services, along with public safety costs, make up around 66% of municipal expenditures in Maryland (Baltimore City. Department of Legislative Services, 2013, 7). On average, Maryland municipal governments spent \$542.5 million or 42.6% of their fiscal 2012 budget on Public Works services (Baltimore City. Department of Legislative Services, 2013, 14). In comparison, the Department of Public Works total agency budget for 2016 was \$992,901,103, which is no small-scale operation (Baltimore City. Department of Public Works, 2016a).

While the function of the Department of Public Works is clear, departmental decision-making processes are decidedly not. From an outsider perspective, communication of department initiatives with the intention of public engagement is lacking. The Department of Public Works website provides some information regarding press releases, public notices, and project announcements, as well as their annual report which marks their project progress (Department of

Public Works, N.d). These resources do not provide information on ways to engage in decision-making processes, further maintaining the lack of transparency on how decisions are arrived at. The main outlet for public opinion appears to be facilitated by the hearing stage of the legislative process at City Council, which discussed policy options and allows a platform for residents to voice their thoughts to decision-makers. As deduced from the Department of Public Works and the City Council website, hearing dates and times are posted online, but are not otherwise widely published or advertised unless they receive reactive coverage from media new outlets. Here, one can ask: how does the lack of information sharing and discussion over collaboration, or lack thereof, restrict the incorporation of voices that might not be heard otherwise? How does this impact community perception? These frustrations can be seen in the recent water shut-offs and water rate hikes the Department of Public Works approved in an effort to modernize Baltimore's drinking and sewer water infrastructure.

Over the past two years Baltimore residents experienced significant changes in their water services, including water-shutoffs and water rate hikes. While these changes are part of a larger plan to improve City water infrastructure, their implications have raised an all too familiar call for environmental justice. Within the past year, 25,000 customers with outstanding bills amounting to larger than \$250 received notices announcing an end to their water service if their bill goes unpaid (Broadwater, 2015; Wenger, 2015). The shut-offs are a direct effort at trying to regain \$29.5 million in overdue water bills (Broadwater, 2015), \$15 million of which is credited to the overdue bills of large businesses (Hill & Shah, 2015; Broadwater, 2015). City Council President Bernard "Jack" Young states that the shut-offs are a reasonable solution, noting "I like it better than them taking people's houses and putting them into foreclosure," Young said. "If you don't pay your [Baltimore Gas and Electric] bill, they cut you off. If you don't pay your cable

bill, they cut you off. We can't continue to allow people to not pay their water bills”

(Broadchurch, 2015, original edits). However, his reasoning fails to address the issue of water as a human right (Harris & Miroso, 2011; Subramaniam & Williford, 2012), and does not consider alternative solutions for addressing the negligence of lack of corporate actors in the bill paying system. The impact of the water shut-offs is especially pertinent for low-income water customers who do not have the ability, access, or means to counter administrative decisions and speak out against said changes (Hill & Shah, 2015).

Breaking ground in 2016, the Department of Public Works put into effect a three year plan to address the City's longstanding issues with water meters and billing, caused in part due to negligence on the matter by previous administrations (Department of Public Works, 2016a; Broadchurch, 2015). The plan will replace more than 400,000 water meters and provide more efficient metering technology with a monthly billing system, rather than a quarterly billing system (Department of Public Works, 2016a). The goal is to provide better service, and easily understandable and accessible information about water billing information. However, the approved plan will cause a 33% increase in water bills, plus an additional two fees intended for infrastructure improvements, increasing household bills overall by an average of \$170 when in full effect (Campbell, 2016). The burden of such dramatic rate hikes speaks largely to the lack of prioritization for public infrastructure maintenance and improvement projects by national governments at large. The argument here does not discount the fact that the improvements are necessary and beneficial to the community in the long run, but rather that improvement decisions were made without the continued input from community members, and the active participation of residents in the decision-making process.

While the implications of the upgraded services will advantage residents in the future, it is important to consider at what cost to current residents and at what cost of exclusion of participation in decision-making processes. In response to the changes, several public hearings have been held regarding the water rate increases, and residents testified against the change in prices before the plan was approved in August 2016 (Campbell, 2016) Resident Kim Trueheart gave testimony, declaring “Mr. Chow [Director of Department of Public Works] gets to determine the level of work that gets performed, he gets to determine how much gets charged for that work, and the prioritization of that work. I think that’s totally inappropriate. I think he needs some oversight and control, cause you guys [gesturing at hearing board] don’t do it, and so from a civilian perspective, resident perspective, allow us to participate in this process” (Campbell, 2016 [embedded video]). Opinions like Kim’s are not heard often enough, and therefore do not have the opportunity to create a balanced argument. Baltimore City residents have restricted means and lack access to platforms for voicing their opinions within the Department of Public Works, which present a direct denial of procedural justice.

Conclusion

The City of Baltimore’s Department of Public Works exemplifies a larger need for public participation in decision-making processes, especially when policy decisions impact communities at large. Broad analyses are needed to address structural governance imbalances and historical processes that are maintained by public exclusion from decision-making and perpetuate disempowerment, disenfranchisement and distrust. To correct structural imbalances of power city governments, like Baltimore, should foster and lead discussion on how to expand processes of procedural justice. Yet, despite more encompassing means of inclusion, even “one

unencumbered by the problems of mutual respect, representation, or access to material goods, will suffer from problems of legitimacy if its members feel coopted by the process” (Cole and Foster, 2001, 120). In this manner, public participation in decision-making for the purpose of providing procedural justice protects the legitimacy and relationship of trust between governing actors and residents, and ensures that communities do not become disenfranchised or feel disempowered. With the goal of increasing equitable representation in decision-making, governance agencies like the Department of Public Works must now consider how to create spaces and programs that encourage the incorporation of diverse opinions and lived experiences.

Lit Review Sources

Baltimore City. Department of Legislative Reference. (2016). *Article 24: Water*. Retrieved from

<http://ca.baltimorecity.gov/codes/Art%2024%20-%20Water.pdf>

Baltimore City. Department of Legislative Reference. (2016b). *Charter of Baltimore City*.

Retrieved from <http://ca.baltimorecity.gov/codes/01%20-%20Charter.pdf>

Baltimore City. Department of Public Works. (2016a) *Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2016*.

Retrieved from

http://publicworks.baltimorecity.gov/sites/default/files/DPW%20Annual%20Report_Fiscal%20Year%202016_2.pdf

Baltimore City. Department of Public Works (N.d.) *Public Information*. Retrieved from

<http://publicworks.baltimorecity.gov/pw-public-info>

Baltimore City. Department of Public Works (2016, July 26). DPW Requests Hearing to Review

Water/Sewer Rate Adjustments, New Rate Structure [Press Release]. Retrieved from

<http://publicworks.baltimorecity.gov/news/press-releases/2016-07-26-dpw-requests-hearing-review-watersewer-rate-adjustments-new-rate>

Baltimore City, Maryland. (2016). Maryland State Archives. Retrieved November 17, 2016,

from <http://msa.maryland.gov/msa/mdmanual/36loc/bcity//html/bcity.html>

Beck, U., & M. Ritter (1992). On the logic of wealth distribution and risk distribution. *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. London, GB: Sage Publications.

Campbell, Colin. (2016, August 31). "Baltimore water, sewer rates to increase." [Embedded video

clip] *Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved from

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/maryland/baltimore-city/bs-md-ci-water-bill-increase-20160831-story.html>

Chess, C., & K. Purcell. (1999). Public Participation and the Environment: Do We Know What

Works? *Environmental Science & Technology*, 33 (16). 2685-2692. Retrieved from

EBSCOhost.

- Cole, L., and S. Foster. *Critical America: From the Ground Up: Environmental Racism and the Rise of the Environmental Justice Movement*. New York, US. NYU Press, 2000. ProQuest eLibrary. 24 October 2016.
- Daneke, G. (1983). Introduction. In Daneke, G., Garcia, M. W., & Priscoli, J. D (Eds). *Public involvement and social impact assessment*. (11-33) Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Department of Legislative Services. Office of Policy Analysis. (2013) *Structure of Maryland Government: Presentation to the Local and Regional Transportation Funding Task Force*. Retrieved from:
http://dls.state.md.us/data/polanasubare/polanasubare_intmatnpubadm/polanasubare_intmatnpubadm_annrep/Structure-of-Maryland-Local-Government.pdf
- Dietz, Thomas and Paul C. Stern (2008). *Public Participation in Environmental Assessment and Decision Making*. Washington D.C, US: National Academies Press.
- Gregory, Robin, Failing, Lee, Harstone, Michael. *Structured Decision Making: A Practical Guide to Environmental Management Choices* (1). Hoboken, GB: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. ProQuest eLibrary. Web. 24 October 2016.
- Harris, L., & Miroso, O., (2011). Human Right to Water: Contemporary Challenges and Contours of a Global Debate. *Antipode*, 44(3), 932-949. Retrieved from Wiley.
- Hill, M., & Shah, Z. (2015, April 2). Water is a basic human right, Baltimore. Retrieved from <http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bs-ed-water-bills-20150402-story.html>
- Holifield, Ryan. (2001) "Defining environmental justice and environmental racism." *Urban Geography*. 22 (1): 78-90.

Levy, David. (2009, December 6). "City's government structure encourages corruption."

Baltimore Sun. Retrieved from http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2009-12-06/news/bal-op.government06dec06_1_city-manager-strong-mayor-governments-council-manager-governments

Baltimore City, Maryland. (2016). Maryland State Archives. Retrieved November 17, 2016, from <http://msa.maryland.gov/msa/mdmanual/36loc/bcity/html/bcity.html>

National League of Cities. (2016). *Local Government Authority*. Retrieved from <http://www.nlc.org/build-skills-and-networks/resources/cities-101/city-powers/local-government-authority>

Public Participation with the Baltimore City Council. (N.d.) Office of Council President.

Retrieved from

<http://www.baltimorecitycouncil.com/sites/default/files/EffectiveTestimony.pdf>

Pellow, David (2007). Chapter 1: Environment, modernity, inequality. *Resisting Global Toxics*.

Boston, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Renn, O., Webler, T., & Wiedemann, P. M. (1995). Chapter 1: A need for discourse on citizen participation: objectives and structure of the book. *Fairness and competence in citizen participation: Evaluating models for environmental discourse*. (1-16) Dordrecht:

Kluwer Academic.

Subramaniam, M., & Williford, B. (2012). Contesting Water Rights: Collective

Ownership and Struggles against Privatization. *Sociology Compass*, 6(5), 413-424.

Retrieved from Wiley.

United States Census Bureau. U.S. Department of Commerce. (2016) *Lists & Structures of*

Governance. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/govs/go/population_of_interest.html

United States Environmental Protection Agency. Science Advisory Board (2001). *Improved Science-Based Environmental Stakeholder Process: A Commentary by the EPA Science Advisory Board*.

Wenger, Y. (2015, March 30). Residents protest city's planned water shut-offs. Retrieved from <http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/maryland/baltimore-city/bs-md-ci-water-protest-20150330-story.html>

Zeiderman, A. (2009) "Ruralizing the city: The great migration and environmental rehabilitation in Baltimore, Maryland." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*. 13. 209-235.