

**“VISIT MY COMMUNITY”:
THE NEED TO EXTEND ENVIRONMENTAL
JUSTICE TO THE COUNTRYSIDE**

Vagel Keller

A friend in a university history department recently told me he agrees with some of his colleagues that history as a profession has become irrelevant to our society. In the context of Pennsylvania’s environmental history I am forced to agree. How else to explain the regression of environmental policies dealing with the exploitation of natural resources in this Commonwealth over the past two decades, or the persistently low air and water quality in western Pennsylvania due to the manufacture of coke and the production of electricity at coal-fired plants? From the loosening of restrictions on longwall mining in the 1990s through the regulatory shenanigans surrounding development of the Marcellus shale today, the fact that Pennsylvania has been through this sort of thing before seems to have escaped everyone. There is no evidence that history has informed—let alone influenced—policies now in place or under consideration, whether due to willful ignorance by our government or a failure by historians to enter the debate.

One reason for this collective amnesia might be what historian Samuel P. Hays called “environmental lethargy,” a self-congratulatory feeling afflicting politicians, elites, and activists after the transformation of the national environmental regulatory framework following Earth Day in 1970. He coined the term in an essay he delivered at a conference, “Pittsburgh’s Environment: A Historical Perspective,” held in that city during September 2000. In contrast to the generally upbeat theme of the conference (the edited volume produced by the conference was titled *Devastation and Renewal*), Hays scolded those groups—and his audience of historians—for failing to alter the region’s stunted “environmental culture,” resulting in plans for economic development that lacked “a vigorous voice to define regional environmental aspirations.” Not to single out western Pennsylvania, he decried the problem as characteristic of other regions where “remnants and traditions of the old economy and the traditional culture organized around activities of an earlier time still dominate.”¹

In fairness, environmental historians have made some progress in documenting the long and checkered history of public policies dealing with the extraction and consumption of fossil fuels here. Joel A. Tarr’s *The Search for the Ultimate Sink*, a compilation of his articles published in 1996 on the evolution of regulations and technologies dealing with municipal and industrial wastes, included several examples from Pennsylvania’s past.² In 1998 Christine Meisner Rosen’s article, “Costs and Benefits of Pollution Control,” dealt with the judicial response to industrial pollution in three industrial Mid-Atlantic states: Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey.³ Although the bulk of the cases in both of these works dealt with manufacturing rather than extraction, each revealed the overwhelming economic and political power that the coal industry wielded in thwarting antipollution initiatives aimed at it until well into the twentieth century. Oil extraction has also received attention, including articles by Brian Black and Paul Sabin on the oil industry in the late nineteenth century that appeared in the autumn 1999 special issue of *Pennsylvania History*.⁴

But it is hard to refute Hays’s criticism completely, especially when in 2000 Pennsylvania was one of only six states where the acreage of state parks had actually shrunk since 1970.⁵ Given the mild-mannered public response to the predictable degradation of the rural environment from the expansion of longwall mining and the present ambivalence toward “fracking” in the Marcellus shale, the entire state seems to fit his model. I believe that longwall

mining and natural gas extraction from the Marcellus shale are the two most significant environmental issues facing Pennsylvanians today, if not the Mid-Atlantic region in general. Moreover, these issues are more difficult to address because their impacts fall overwhelmingly on rural communities and small towns in regions where Hays’s “remnants and traditions of the old economy” still persist. Therefore, the problem appears to be not so much a failure by historians to address important issues as a lack of attention by our audience to what we have to say. Consequently, we need to frame our scholarship in a way that focuses the public’s attention on the historical background of critical issues facing the state’s rural communities. I suggest that an approach framed by the topic of environmental justice, expanded beyond its traditional focus on race and class, might be the answer.

Historical study of the environmental justice movement stems from the work of sociologist Robert D. Bullard, the “Father of Environmental Justice,” whose seminal book, *Dumping in Dixie* (1990), analyzed the response of grassroots African American community organizations to “environmental discrimination.” The movement emerged as a result of the uneven social benefits from new environmental regulations in the 1970s and ’80s that privileged affluent, predominantly white communities at the expense of poor and minority communities. “African American communities—regardless of their class status—were considered to be throw-away communities,” wrote Bullard, and he described *Dumping in Dixie* as “an effort to develop common strategies that are supportive of building sustainable communities of African American and other people of color.”⁶ The book encompassed rural as well as urban subjects with a case study of small, unincorporated African American residential communities in the petrochemical corridor south of Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Zoning ordinances, shaped in the interest of more affluent, mostly white communities, led to chemical plants being built literally next door to some African American homeowners’ properties.

Historical scholarship on the background of the emergence of the environmental justice movement has, so far, focused on blighted communities populated by poor and ethnic minorities in the post–World War II era. Andrew Hurley’s *Environmental Inequalities* (1995), for example, documented how the needs of industry outweighed the social costs of locating waste dumps near working-class neighborhoods in Gary, Indiana, whose demographics changed over time from economically and ethnically diverse to overwhelmingly low income and African American.⁷ This racial focus is

in keeping with Bullard's *Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots* (1993) and policy-related literature on the subject, such as an article by Robert Collin and coauthors Timothy Beatley and William Harris in "Environmental Racism: A Challenge to Community Development," published in the *Journal of Black Studies* the same year as *Environmental Inequalities*.⁸ But the focus of Collin, Beatley, and Harris on "Environmental Racism" bespoke an important narrowing of the scope of obstacles faced by inner-city minority community development groups since the experience of African Americans in Gary during the 1970s. At that point, Hurley concluded, "deepening environmental inequality" was only one of many worsening social ills that also included "growing inequalities in employment, housing, education, and health care." But by 1995, according to Collin, Beatley, and Harris, while there was still a long way to go in redressing those nonenvironmental ills, at least the ethic that informed municipal planners now "focused on issues of equity," an important opening for minority community organizers. Environmental planners, however, had not yet come around to that way of thinking. Rather, they continued to apply "a blatantly utilitarian view of what constitutes correct use of the environment" while disregarding "social or distributive equity in environmental planning."⁹

This ethical lag among environmental planners in Pennsylvania has, theoretically at least, begun to close since 2001, when an Environmental Justice Work Group (EJWG) in the state's Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) presented its report. Specifically targeting "minority and low income communities," the EJWG defined environmental justice as meaning "no group . . . including racial, ethnic or socioeconomic groups, will bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental impacts" from economic development or government programs and policies.¹⁰ However, there remain a number of problems with the state's EJ program: perhaps foremost among them is the official assumption that land-use decisions must necessarily entail environmental degradation. Shouldn't policy-makers be aiming to prevent, or at least minimize, environmental impacts in general based on historical lessons? Of course this presupposes that historical analysis plays a role in environmental planning. Joint efforts by the DEP and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC), cited by Joel Tarr in his introduction to the autumn 1999 special issue of *Pennsylvania History*, may, indeed, have "helped to advance the cause of state environmental history."¹¹ But the timelines, chronicles, biographies, and archival catalogs those efforts have produced have yet to yield the kind of

analytical background needed to begin the task of shaping a collective vision for Pennsylvania’s environmental future.

It is partly because of these historiographical shortcomings that Pennsylvania’s EJ program is inadequate to meet the needs of the communities most at risk—rural communities and agricultural townships—in the headlong drive to exploit Pennsylvania’s remaining coal reserves and the newly discovered natural gas deposits in the interest of so-called energy independence. The focus of EJ programs on poor and minority communities is certainly justified; even today people of color in Ascension Parish, the principal area of Bullard’s rural Louisiana case study, are still three times more likely than whites to be subjected to releases of toxic chemicals.¹² But the paradigm for understanding the socioeconomic component of environmental inequality now needs to expand to account for an imbalance between the power of major corporations and that of small towns and rural communities to influence public opinion and political action not seen in this country since the Gilded Age. Indeed, the EJWG considered including “coalfield communities” as a separate category but could not reach consensus, a *de facto* admission that rural Pennsylvanians are on their own in quest of environmental justice.

A comprehensive environmental history of Pennsylvania—or any Mid-Atlantic state—will reveal that coal patches are not the only rural communities to have experienced environmental degradation from industrialization. The list would include also an array of rural manufacturing industries that expanded and intensified in the late nineteenth century. Opportunistically sited near their sources of raw materials and fuel, and connected to distant markets by the expanding national railroad system, they formed rural industrial districts whose environmental impact mirrored their urban counterparts. Their demise between World War I and World War II created industrial brownfields problems for rural communities similar to those faced by urban manufacturing districts during the late twentieth century.¹³

The environmental history narrative should also tell the story of the rise of the conservation movement and antipollution agitation—largely aimed at rural industrial polluters—through the early and mid-twentieth century. In Pennsylvania, the political power of conservationists, underpinned by broad public concern for domestic water supplies, resulted in the Purity of Waters Act of 1906, followed by the more effective Clean Streams Act of 1923. However, enforcement of those statutes shifted the disposal of industrial effluents from waterways to impoundment lagoons. Exposure to the adverse

environmental effects of rural industrialization, therefore, became limited to the people who lived closest to the manufactories.¹⁴

In applying the environmental justice model to building a historical background for the problems facing rural Pennsylvania today, three principles of Bullard's proposed "Framework" are applicable:

Equal protection from environmental degradation

Prevention of harm

Placing the burden of proof on polluters and dischargers

To what degree, historians might ask, has the trajectory of environmental regulation tended toward or away from those principles? Further, we might adapt Bullard's observation that efforts to achieve environmental justice are complicated by the competing interests of environmentalists, social justice advocates, and economic boosters. Boosters often "convinced minority leaders that environmental regulations were bad for business," which he labeled "job blackmail." (In the rural context we might substitute "labor advocates" for "social justice advocates.")¹⁵



FIGURE 1: One of many such billboards sponsored by CONSOL Energy (originally Consolidation Coal) touting coal in western Pennsylvania. This one, situated on US 119 in Indiana County, highlights the Homer City powerplant, one of the dirtiest in the nation and the number 2 polluter in Pennsylvania, whose smoke plume is visible through the trees. (Photo by the author.)

Historical analysis of rural industrial communities during the early twentieth century, therefore, seems to lend itself to the environmental justice model. Enforcement of antipollution regulations pushed by conservationists had the same effects as those pushed by environmentalists fifty years later. Just as Bullard observed of African American communities in 1990, the outcome "appears to have driven unwanted facilities toward the more vulnerable groups."¹⁶ Further, the model can inform the study of those communities after the demise of their industrial base, as they grappled with the loss of income and the problem of cleaning up rural brownfields, as well as socioeconomic, political, and cultural changes they have experienced since then.

We might organize our study around the different regulatory frameworks in which these changes took place and the degree to which they displaced the negative effects of pollution from one social group to another. In Pennsylvania, for example, enforcement of the Purity of Waters Act of 1906 depended on a handful of fish wardens and left adjudication to local magistrates in rural communities dominated by the industrial polluters the law purported to regulate. The Clean Streams Act of 1923, although crafted in the spirit of cooperation with industry, nevertheless elevated enforcement to a Sanitary Water Board with authority to refer complaints to the Attorney General. Subsequent reauthorizations of the Clean Streams Act, especially after World War II, yielded a long list of industrial wastes prohibited from being dumped into the state's waterways, with acid mine drainage finally making the list in 1967. As environmental values led to a federal regulatory framework based on coercion in the early 1970s, state-level regulations followed suit to the benefit of postindustrial rural communities—that is, until changes to the law in the 1990s.

The case of Washington County, Pennsylvania, where bedroom communities for metropolitan Pittsburgh waxed as the coal mining and steel industries waned, is a potentially rich example. Pennsylvania's Bituminous Mine Subsidence and Land Conservation Act of 1982, which specifically enjoined mine operators from causing subsidence damage to homes and noncommercial buildings, facilitated the transition to suburban residential land use. More stringent than existing federal statutes that essentially applied only to surface mines, the state law effectively blocked longwall mining under a substantial portion of the county. Then came the federal Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAct), which for the first time on a national level required operators of underground mines to at least repair or replace structures and water supplies damaged by subsidence. Under pressure from powerful

energy interests in southwestern Pennsylvania, Governor Tom Ridge and a supportive General Assembly crafted Act 54 under the guise of bringing the state's regulations on underground mining into conformance with EP Act guidelines. Since then,

Farmers have lost their springs and pastures, making the operation of a family farm nearly impossible. Businesses have had crucial property undermined and destroyed. Families have been forced to live with constant construction while the mining industry attempts to make "good enough" repairs that never return homes to what they were before being undermined. And communities are being destroyed as family after family decides to leave and sell its home to the mining industry, which then lets the property deteriorate.¹⁷

Numerous attempts by environmental activist groups allied with rural property owners have failed to generate the political will to overturn Act 54, while western Pennsylvanians are subjected to massive public relations campaigns by the coal industry.

A comprehensive environmental history of Pennsylvania would reveal that Act 54 in effect turned the clock back more than a century to the founding of the balancing doctrine by which courts weighed the social costs of pollution against the economic benefits of the polluter to society. Not surprisingly, this legal interpretation often favored industry over the individual, especially in Pennsylvania. Indeed, as historian Nicholas Casner explained, the balancing doctrine resulted from a case in which a local court denied a farming family's request for an injunction against a mine operator who had contaminated their water supply. The state Supreme Court ultimately supported that decision, finding "trifling inconvenience to particular persons must sometimes give way to the necessities of a great community." During the 1990s, proponents of Act 54 pointed out that it "for the first time provided for replacing water supplies damaged by underground mining [and] put in place a 'you break it, you fix it' rule." This notion is nonsense, of course, since the 1982 law had effectively prevented those problems in the first place. Moreover, private citizens still bear the legal costs incurred in battling large corporations, and history shows whose legal team is the better paid. Act 54 resurrected the balancing doctrine, reborn as the utilitarianism described by Collin, Beatley, and Harris.¹⁸

The perverse irony and cynicism of Act 54 has, so far, avoided exposure despite widespread criticism of its adverse impacts on Pennsylvania's

rural landscape. Perhaps if it had been seen as a case of environmental injustice the story might have garnered broader public sympathy. The same might be said of the latest industry to take advantage of Pennsylvanians' collective amnesia: natural gas exploration in the Marcellus shale. A case similar to that of Washington County is taking shape in Susquehanna County to the northeast, where drilling is expanding rapidly.

End of Country, a chronicle of freelance writer and Susquehanna County native Seamus McGraw's experience, is a poignant insider's look at what has happened (and continues to happen) to the landscape and the social fabric of the author's birthplace since "land men" from natural gas companies began to buy drilling leases. The county is one of the most rural in the state. Its population of only 43,356 is overwhelmingly white, and its poverty rate of 12 percent, about average for the state's rural counties, is well below the EJ threshold.¹⁹ Outside of a few towns and hamlets the landscape has for generations been home to small, marginally viable family-owned dairy farms. McGraw describes the experiences of rural property owners, among them his mother, as they struggled with deciding whether or not to grant drilling leases. After a great deal of research, including interviews with government officials and representatives from the industry, McGraw and his sister advised their mother to sign a lease for \$250,000 and the possibility of much more if gas was discovered.

The ambivalence that permeates McGraw's story suggests that environmental historians have a role to play in informing future decisions by property owners elsewhere in the state. Another of his subjects, the elderly widow of a dairy farmer, found that rising energy, feed, and fertilizer costs coupled with federal price fixing on milk made it impossible to keep the farm, a deathbed promise to her late husband. Accepting a drilling lease meant she could avoid foreclosure and stay on the land, but not without threatening its viability as a farm.²⁰ We might ask ourselves whether historical investigation of government policies on energy, agriculture, and the environment that put people in such situations fits within the framework of environmental justice.

As with environmentally degrading activities in urban settings, the historical questions surrounding coal mining and drilling for oil and natural gas in rural Pennsylvania deal with the rights of property owners versus their responsibilities. These questions are complicated by the state's common law separation of surface rights and subterranean mineral rights. The ability to offset drilling rigs from targeted underground areas in the Marcellus shale can change a good neighbor into a bad one. The issues that McGraw and



FIGURE 2: Marcellus shale drilling rig near Blairsville, Indiana County. The hilltop is surrounded on three sides by residential streets, with some homes located within 100 yards of the rig. In the distance, a plume of smoke rises from Edison International's coal-fired electric powerplant at Homer City. (Photo by the author.)

his subjects grappled with highlight the fact that surface property owners still fall under the archaic “rule of capture” doctrine. Formalized by the state Supreme Court in 1899, it holds that “every landowner or his lessee may locate his wells wherever he pleases, regardless of the interests of others.” In its conclusion, the court asked and answered its own sinister question: “What, then, can the neighbor do? Nothing; only go and do likewise.”²¹

And so it remains today. The tiny borough of McDonald, population 2,281 and situated astride the boundary between Allegheny and Washington counties, was long tied to coal mining in the surrounding countryside and the railroads that served that industry. But today those mines are a distant memory, and McDonald is in the middle of a verdant rural landscape that has become a popular retreat for city dwellers and suburbanites who flock to a system of hiking and biking trails following abandoned railroad grades. It is also in the midst of rapidly multiplying drilling rigs probing the Marcellus shale. As this article was being prepared, a McDonald resident wrote to the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* “regarding the recent poll results that the majority

of people in Pennsylvania feel the economic benefits of Marcellus Shale outweigh any environmental concerns.” He asked,

Do the people questioned in these polls live in a community like mine where the local elementary school has to have a special evacuation plan in case of an accident at the gas well that is right across the street from the school? Would they feel the same way if *their* children had to experience this? Do these people have to look at multiple rigs throughout their township that have so many floodlights . . . they light up the surrounding area as if it were daytime and deal with the noise 24/7 in a rural setting? Would they still eat the beef and drink the milk from cattle that are seen grazing not far from huge open pit wastewater ponds?

The writer concluded with a challenge “to actually visit or live in a community where the gas drilling is taking place . . . and see if you feel the same way afterward.”²² Is this person among the majority or the minority in his own community? Does it matter?

Indiana County, another predominantly rural area with long ties to coal mining, is in a similar situation. Here, intensive coal mining has given way to recreational parks and rail trails traversing a rugged, rural landscape so recently abandoned by mine operators that land covered by waste piles has yet to be reclaimed and signs explaining the function of artificial wetlands for the treatment of acid mine drainage are an important part of the trail riders’ experience. Here, too, neighbor confronts neighbor over the decision to allow drilling in the Marcellus shale. Of particular interest is a case involving a family that agreed in March 2011 to lease a drilling site on its farm within a half-mile of Yellow Creek Lake, the “centerpiece” of 7,900-acre Yellow Creek State Park. Objections by neighbors allied with environmental activists against drilling so close to the park are pressuring the county’s commissioners to pass new, stricter zoning ordinances. But in responding to a *Post-Gazette* reporter, one commissioner observed, “The difficulty is to maintain jobs while protecting the environment. If we can find a balance there, that’s the decision we’d like to make.”²³ Balancing doctrine, meet job blackmail.

Historians have a role to play in influencing these debates and others on decisions about rural land use facing citizens and policymakers now and in the near future. By expanding the framework of environmental justice to encompass rural communities we might attract attention to our work from

outside the academy where it now languishes. This is not just a task for environmental historians; rather it calls for an interdisciplinary approach, as Christine Rosen called for in a 2005 essay in *Environmental History*. "We must investigate," she declared, "the business institutions, organizational structures, market forces, public policies, personality factors, cultural forces, and all other internal and external dynamics and constraints . . . that have determined how the business system has interacted with the natural world over time."²⁴ Within this framework, two viable topics around which to organize our analyses are the origins and life cycles of the balancing doctrine and the rule of capture throughout the history of environmental regulation. The public needs to be reminded of the degraded condition of rural landscapes by the end of World War II as a result of the traditional application of those doctrines over the previous three-quarters of a century.

Environmental scholars must also do a better job explaining the sea change in the public's attitude about rural landscapes that took place during the postwar period. The rise of an affluent working class and the growing popularity of outdoor recreation, Sam Hays wrote in his 1997 essay, "From Conservation to Environment," brought more people from broader socioeconomic backgrounds into contact with rural environments. The conjunction of widespread concern about pollution and a desire to increase the physical separation between home and work led to a major change in the way Americans saw their surroundings. By the 1980s, a significant cross-section of society began to question the assumptions of the balancing doctrine, and in the mid-1990s Hays observed that postindustrial rural residents saw their property's value as inextricably linked to the unaltered landscape around it, as well as to the continuity of their lifestyle.²⁵

In retrospect we can see that at the time Hays wrote those words the broad social consensus that had tipped the balancing doctrine in favor of the environment during the postwar era had already begun to erode. His essay followed the passage of Act 54 by three years; environmental lethargy was setting in. The "newer society, the newer economy, and the newer politics of the decades after World War II" that resulted in the envirocentric values of the 1980s seem to have been altered for the worse since our country's hegemony in the Middle East has eroded after 1991. By shifting the terms of the debate to the realm of environmental justice, historians might change the polling data on energy resource extraction back in favor of the environment. At the very least they will make environmental history relevant again in Pennsylvania.

NOTES

1. Samuel P. Hays, "Beyond Celebration: Pittsburgh and Its Region in the Environmental Era—Notes By a Participant Observer," in *Devastation and Renewal: An Environmental History of Pittsburgh and Its Region*, ed. Joel Tarr (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003), 193–215.
2. Joel A. Tarr, *The Search for the Ultimate Sink: Urban Pollution in Historical Perspective* (Akron, OH: University of Akron Press, 1996).
3. Christine Meisner Rosen, "Costs and Benefits of Pollution Control in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey, 1840–1906," *Geographical Review* 88, no. 2 (April 1998): 219–40.
4. Brian Black, "A Triumph of Individualism: The Rule of Capture and the Ethic of Extraction in Pennsylvania's Oil Boom," *Pennsylvania History* 66, no. 4 (Autumn 1999): 448–71. Paul Sabin, "A Dive Into Nature's Great *Grab-bag*: Nature, Gender and Capitalism in the Early Pennsylvania Oil Industry," *Pennsylvania History* 66, no. 4 (Autumn 1999): 472–501. See also Brian Black, *Petrolia: The Landscape of America's First Oil Boom* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).
5. Hays, "Beyond Celebration," 215.
6. Robert D. Bullard, *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1990), xiii–xvi.
7. Andrew Hurley, *Environmental Inequalities: Class, Race, and Industrial Pollution in Gary, Indiana, 1945–1980* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995).
8. Robert Collin, Timothy Beatley, and William Harris, "Environmental Racism: A Challenge to Community Development," *Journal of Black Studies* 25 (1995): 354.
9. Hurley, *Environmental Inequalities*, 182. Collin, Beatley, and Harris, "Environmental Racism," 354, 361.
10. Environmental Justice Work Group (EJWG), "Report to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)," June 2001. Pennsylvania's EJWG preceded similar initiatives in the neighboring states of Maryland (2001), New York (2003), and New Jersey (2004).
11. Joel A. Tarr, "The Environmental History of Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania History* 66, no. 4 (Autumn 1999): 445.
12. "Distribution of Environmental Burdens in Ascension Parish," Scorecard: The Pollution Information Website, http://scorecard.goodguide.com/community/ejsummary.tcl?fips_county_code=22005& (accessed November 17, 2011).
13. The EPA defines a brownfield as "real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant."
14. For a discussion of the Izaak Walton League's heavy influence in Pennsylvania and of the early outcomes of the Clean Streams Act, see Nicholas Casner, "Acid Mine Drainage and Pittsburgh's Water Quality," in Tarr, *Devastation and Renewal*, 99–103. Also see Tarr, *Search for the Ultimate Sink*, 358–59. I have also explored the outcomes of the Acts of 1906 and 1923 and the results of shifting the disposal of toxic liquid industrial wastes from waterways to land in "Forgotten Brownfields: Rural Industrial Districts in Pennsylvania, 1870–1930" (PhD diss., Carnegie Mellon University, 2005), 134–46.
15. Bullard, *Dumping in Dixie*, 9–10, 118–22.
16. *Ibid.*, 38.

17. PennFuture, "Drilling and Mining," <http://www.pennfuture.org/mining.aspx>.
18. Rosen, "Costs and Benefits of Pollution Control," 221; Casner, "Acid Mine Drainage, 98–99; James Seif, "Act 54 Letter of Transmittal," June 1999, <http://www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/deputate/minres/BMR/act54/act54transmittal.htm/BMR/act54/act54transmittal.htm> (accessed September 23, 2011).
19. CityData.com, http://www.city-data.com/county/Susquehanna_County-PA.html (accessed September 22, 2011). "Just the Facts: Rural Poverty," *Center for Rural Pennsylvania Newsletter*, March/April 2007, <http://www.rural.palegislature.us/news0307.html> (accessed September 23, 2011).
20. Seamus McGraw, *End of Country* (New York: Random House, 2011).
21. *Westmoreland and Cambria Natural Gas Company v. Dewitt et al.*, 130 Penn St. 235 (November 1899), quoted in Black, "Triumph of Individualism," 458.
22. "Visit My Community to See Drilling's Impact," Letters to the Editor, *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, September 1, 2001.
23. Sean D. Hamill, "Shale Gas Well Debate Takes a Nasty Turn," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, September 25, 2011, B-1, B-3.
24. Christine Meisner Rosen, "The Business–Environment Connection," *Environmental History* 10, no. 1 (January 2005): 77–78.
25. Samuel P. Hays, "From Conservation to Environment: Environmental Politics in the United States since World War II," in *Out of the Woods: Essays in Environmental History*, eds. Char Miller and Hal Rothman (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1997), 10–26.