

# Regional Equity Atlas 2.0 Project Indicator Selection Process Summary



Spring 2012

## Introduction

The Regional Equity Atlas 2.0 Project is a collaborative effort to develop an online mapping tool that will examine how well different populations across the Portland metro region are able to access the resources and opportunities necessary for meeting their basic needs and advancing their health and well-being. By illuminating the region's "geography of opportunity", the project will provide a powerful tool for promoting greater regional equity through policy and planning.

The project is being co-managed by Metro and the Coalition for a Livable Future (CLF), a coalition of over 100 organizations dedicated to promoting sustainable development and social equity in the region. Research support is being provided by Portland State University's Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies (IMS). Government agencies from local jurisdictions across the four-county metro area as well as a broad range of community partners are also participating in the project.

The project builds on CLF's first Regional Equity Atlas, published in 2007. It will use Metro's Context Tool (an innovative mapping application) to map the distribution of resources and opportunities across the region and the extent to which the benefits and burdens of growth are shared equitably by different demographic groups and neighborhoods. Users will select the data that they want to map from a menu that will include demographic indicators as well as indicators that measure access to:

- Quality education
- Economic opportunity
- Affordable housing
- Parks and natural areas
- Healthy environment
- Food
- Transportation
- Services
- Health care
- Democratic participation
- Community

Stakeholders from across the region will have free access to the online mapping tool and will be able to develop customized maps to meet their needs. Users will be able to customize the layers of the map to explore the intersection between different access indicators, demographic indicators such as income and race, and a range of key outcomes. The resulting maps will enable stakeholders to identify structural disparities and provide insights into how we can promote greater regional equity through strategic investments, planning, and public policy.

Once the mapping tool has been developed, CLF will develop educational materials to enable a broad range of partners and community members to use it effectively. CLF will sponsor a series of workshops to introduce partner organizations and community members to the mapping tool and to engage them in using it to explore equity issues from the perspective of their own communities and constituencies. CLF will also provide support to partner organizations interested in exploring equity conditions in their communities more deeply through a community-based participatory research process.

Public agencies and decision-makers will be encouraged to use the mapping tool to help inform a wide range of planning and policy decisions, such as where to locate new housing, transit, parks, and other amenities, and where to most effectively target public and private investments. Community partners will be supported in using the mapping tool to develop policy recommendations and action plans to reduce disparities and increase regional equity.

## Overview of Indicator Selection Process

The selection of indicators is critical to any mapping project, not only because the indicators shape the information that users will be able to glean from the maps but because the indicators make a clear statement about the project's priorities. The selection of indicators for the Regional Equity Atlas 2.0 Project was particularly complex because while maps can play a powerful role in illuminating disparities, they are only able to capture some of the dimensions of regional equity. There are many important aspects of equity and opportunity that are not effectively addressed through maps, either because the data is not available, not "mappable", or because the issues are not spatial or geographic in nature. To deal with these complexities, CLF spent nine months researching and gathering input on potential indicators through a multi-step process that included the following components:

- **Lessons from Atlas 1.0:** CLF and IMS analyzed the lessons from the first Atlas project to assess which indicators should be included in Atlas 2.0 as well as gaps in the first Atlas that should be addressed through new indicators. CLF also gathered input via an online survey from 258 stakeholders.
- **Literature Review:** CLF reviewed national and local examples of indicator projects as well as relevant research by academic institutions and think tanks.
- **National Expert Interviews:** CLF conducted phone interviews with nine national experts from Policy Link, the Kirwan Institute, Opportunity Agenda, King County, and other leaders in the fields of regional equity and opportunity mapping. Additional experts provided input via e-mail.
- **Local Expert Interviews:** CLF reached out to dozens of local issue experts to get their input on indicators and data sources within specific topic areas. This process included meetings with key workgroup leaders from the Greater Portland-Vancouver Indicators Project (now called Portland Pulse) in an effort to insure Atlas 2.0's alignment with that project.
- **Work with Key Stakeholders:** CLF worked closely with key stakeholder organizations such as the Coalition of Communities of Color to align the Atlas' indicators with those organizations' recent work on equity issues.
- **Menu of Indicators:** CLF developed an 80-page compendium of potential indicators summarizing the information gleaned through the previous steps in the process. They also created a shorter sample menu of indicators for use during the broader stakeholder engagement process.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:** CLF gathered in-depth input from more than 350 key stakeholders across the four-county metro region through 19 focus groups, dozens of one-on-one conversations, presentations to eight coalitions and networks, and written input from 195 people.
- **Data Source Research:** IMS and CLF researched data sources for all of the potential indicators identified in the 80-page compendium as well as additional indicators suggested by stakeholders during the engagement process. Each indicator was then critically analyzed to determine which ones were feasible to map.
- **Advisory Committee:** CLF analyzed all of the input gathered through the stakeholder engagement process as well as the data source research to develop a refined menu of indicators. This menu was presented to an 18-member project Advisory Committee to provide final input into the selection and prioritization of the indicators.

A list of the stakeholders and issue experts who participated in this process is included in the appendix.

## Key Findings from Stakeholder Engagement Process

The findings from this extensive information-gathering process would take several hundred pages to adequately summarize (and are in fact currently summarized in several hundred pages of internal notes and spreadsheets). In an effort to provide a high-level overview of some of the key findings, this section briefly summarizes the input that was gathered through the stakeholder engagement process.

### How could this project support your work?

---

Stakeholders were asked how the project would support or align with their work. Key themes included:

- It will help to inform the location and delivery of services to high need populations.
- It will help to inform decisions about where to allocate funding for new or enhanced public services and amenities.
- It will save local government agencies and nonprofits time and money by creating a centralized repository of key data and maps.
- It will inform local government planning efforts such as Consolidated Plans, needs assessments, scenarios planning, and strategic initiatives.
- It will help to inform decisions about where to locate affordable housing projects to insure that residents have access to resources and opportunities that will improve their life chances.
- It will provide data that nonprofits and government agencies can use in grant proposals to demonstrate disparities and levels of need.
- It will support more effective conversations across jurisdictions about regional disparities and regional equity.
- It will inform decisions by local government and advocacy organizations about what kinds of policy changes or strategic investments will have the greatest impact on regional equity

### Which resources and opportunities are most important?

---

The written input form asked, “Which resources and opportunities do you think are most essential for enabling people to meet their basic needs and advance their health and well-being?” The 136 respondents who answered this question prioritized the available answer choices as follows:

- Housing 71%
- Transportation 68%
- Food 65%
- Economic opportunity 60%
- Services 55%
- Healthy environment 54%
- Education 50%
- Parks and natural areas 49%
- Livability 29%
- Democratic participation 26%

## Input on specific indicators

A long list of potential indicators emerged from the stakeholder engagement process. The indicators that were suggested most frequently and seemed to have the greatest support among multiple groups of stakeholders are listed below:

### Education

| Indicator                               | Potential measurements  |
|---|---|
| Teacher qualifications                  | Teacher experience  |
| Class size                              | Class size and/or student-teacher ratio   |
| School success rate                     | Schools meeting/ not meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)   |
| Instructional opportunity               | Minimum number of instructional hours per year  |
| Course offerings                        | Availability of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate  |
| School discipline                       | School discipline disaggregated by race   |
| Cultural competency                     | Teacher diversity; presence of cultural competency policies   |
| Early childhood education               | Location/ affordability of Head Start and other early childhood education                                 |
| Racial/ ethnic composition of school    | Race of students by school; languages spoken at home by school  |
| Arts education                          | Availability of art, music, theater and/or dance classes in schools                                       |
| Community schools                       | SUN schools and other community school programs providing after school services and programming           |
| Proximity to school/ school walkability | Proximity to nearest elementary school  |
| Parent involvement                      | Levels of parent involvement including financial donations to local school foundations and volunteer time |
| Outcome: Test scores                    | Test scores in 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 8 <sup>th</sup> , and 11 <sup>th</sup> grades                            |
| Outcome: Graduation rates               | Graduation rates by cohort by school  |
| Outcome: Post-secondary enrollment      | Percent of graduates from each high school who enroll in higher education, technical training, etc.       |

### Economic Opportunity

| Indicator                                    | Potential measurements  |
|--|---|
| Proximity to accessible jobs                 | # jobs within 5 miles appropriate for workers with associate's degree or below  |
| Proximity to living wage jobs                | Location of living wage jobs by job type and industry   |
| Transit access to jobs                       | Accessibility of low skill jobs by transit at different times of day  |
| Business creation                            | Growth in businesses over 5-year period, disaggregated by the demographics of business owners and types of businesses |
| Workforce training                           | Location of workforce training, community colleges, and employment-related services                                   |
| Educational attainment                       | Levels of educational attainment of adults in workforce   |
| Commuting and job location patterns          | Where do the employees of local employers live? Where do neighborhood residents work?                                 |
| Small business                               | Location/ growth of small businesses, disaggregated by the demographics of business owners and types of businesses    |
| Investment of public dollars by neighborhood | Maps showing the distribution of public investment dollars and/or jurisdictions' budgets by neighborhood              |
| Contracting                                  | Who benefits from government contracts? What is the rate of MWESB contracting?  |
| Job creation                                 | Where are tax dollars going for development projects and what kind of job creation is happening?                      |

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Regulatory processes     | Regulations that impact the climate for economic development and investment |
| Available land           | Land available for commercial, residential, and industrial development      |
| Outcome: Employment rate | Employment rate disaggregated by race                                       |

## Housing

| Indicator                         | Potential measurements  |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Housing affordability             | Distribution of owner occupied and rental housing by cost                                       |
| Housing cost burden               | Share of renters and owners spending over 30% of income on housing                              |
| Publicly-subsidized housing       | Location of publicly subsidized housing units and Section 8 broken out by target population     |
| Change in affordability over time | Change in housing costs over time   |
| Change in availability over time  | Change in vacancy rates and/ or availability of rental units over time                          |
| Gentrification                    | Patterns of gentrification, neighborhoods at risk of gentrification                             |
| Fair housing                      | Loan denials by race and income; fair housing complaints  |
| Accessible housing                | Single story housing (as a proxy for housing accessible to seniors and those with disabilities) |
| Quality housing                   | Quality of housing stock (e.g. toxics exposure, lead-based paint, mold, pests, etc.)            |
| Rental vs. ownership rates        | Percentage of renters vs. owners in each neighborhood   |
| Regulatory access                 | Codes and regulations that support affordable, high quality, fair, and accessible housing       |
| Utility costs                     | Household utility costs   |
| Outcome: Ownership gap            | Minority homeownership gap  |
| Outcome: Housing + transportation | Housing + transportation cost burden  |
| Outcome: Foreclosures             | Foreclosure rate or foreclosure risk score  |

## Healthy Environment

| Indicator                | Potential measurements   |
|--------------------------|--|
| Air quality              | Proximity to sources of air pollution; concentrations of air toxics                                    |
| Compromised environments | Proximity to toxic waste, brownfields, and superfund sites   |
| Green infrastructure     | Density of tree canopy and other sources of neighborhood greening                                      |
| Water infrastructure     | Base layer showing rivers, flood plains, streams, etc.   |
| Water quality            | Water access and water quality   |
| Climate change           | Geographic areas most vulnerable to impacts of climate change  |
| Vacant land              | Vacant and undeveloped land (as a tool for analysis, not as a measure of a healthy environment per se) |

## Parks and Natural Areas

| Indicator                              | Potential measurements  |
|--|---|
| Publicly accessible parks              | Proximity to publicly accessible parks  |
| Publicly accessible natural areas      | Proximity to publicly accessible natural areas  |
| Natural areas without public access    | Proximity to natural areas without public access  |
| Regional trails                        | Proximity to walking trails   |
| Recreation facilities                  | Proximity to publicly-funded community centers, aquatic facilities, sports fields, gyms, etc. |
| Greenspaces with limited public access | Proximity to school fields, golf courses, cemeteries, etc.                                    |
| Land bank                              | Proximity to areas set aside for future park or natural area development                      |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Publicly accessible regional parks        | Proximity to larger regional parks   |
| Greenspace quality and development        | Levels of greenspace development and availability of usable recreation space such as playgrounds, playing fields, etc. |
| Accessible parks, trails, and playgrounds | Parks, trails, and playgrounds accessible to adults and children with disabilities                                     |
| Access to water recreation                | Proximity to boat launches and access points to bodies of water  |

## Food

| Indicator                   | Potential measurements   |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Proximity to food stores    | Proximity to supermarkets and grocery stores   |
| Proximity to fresh food     | Proximity to farmer's markets, produce stands, farm stands, produce markets                  |
| Subsidized food             | Proximity to retail food establishments and farmers' markets that accept food stamps and WIC |
| Community gardens           | Locations of community garden sites (possibly coded by size or by availability of plots)     |
| Supplemental nutrition      | Locations of food pantries, meal programs, summer food program sites, etc.                   |
| Unhealthy food              | Density of liquor stores, convenience stores, and fast food restaurants                      |
| Farms                       | Acreage of active farmland dedicated to food production                                      |
| Affordable food             | Access to affordable food by store   |
| Culturally appropriate food | Access to culturally appropriate food as defined by residents' needs                         |
| Healthful food              | Access to healthful food by store  |

## Transportation

| Indicator                         | Potential measurements  |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Public transit access             | Density of transit within ¼ mile, measuring transit by both frequency and trip options    |
| Public transit quality and safety | Quality of service, transit stop amenities, transit reliability, transit stop safety      |
| Connectivity                      | Network analysis showing what resources are within a 20-minute drive, bike ride, or walk  |
| Walkability                       | Presence and need for sidewalks, crosswalks, curb cuts, etc.                              |
| Car ownership                     | Car ownership rates   |
| Slope and elevation               | Grid layer showing steepness of slope for streets and sidewalks                           |
| Bikability                        | Density of bike routes by type, bike safety, bike infrastructure                          |
| Transportation safety             | Crash data analyzed separately for cars, bikes, and pedestrians by seriousness of crash   |
| Mobility access                   | Para-transit lift requests and fixed-route ramp deployments; ADA accessible transit stops |
| Outcome: Transportation costs     | % income spent on transportation  |
| Outcome: Commute patterns         | Average commute time and mode of transit  |
| Outcome: Transit usage            | Demographics of transit users and usage rates   |

## Services and Amenities

| Indicator                 | Potential measurements  |
|---------------------------|---|
| Public services           | Libraries, fire stations, government offices, post offices, etc.                              |
| Human and social services | Homeless services, senior services, services for people with disabilities, veterans' services |
| Retail services           | Key retail services (restaurants, hardware, Laundromats, etc.)                                |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Financial services              | Proximity to banks, financial institutions, credit unions                             |
| Sub-prime financial services    | Proximity to pay day loan and check cashing businesses                                |
| Child care                      | Proximity to licensed child care facilities   |
| Arts                            | Proximity to formal arts and culture institutions and public art                      |
| Culture                         | Access to informal, community-based and culturally appropriate arts and culture       |
| Recreation                      | Proximity to recreation and community centers   |
| Libraries                       | Proximity to libraries  |
| Technology                      | Wireless and broadband infrastructure   |
| Emergency services              | Emergency response times  |
| Culturally appropriate services | Proximity to culturally appropriate services and amenities                            |
| Service affordability           | Affordability of key services like child care, recreation, technology                 |
| Service usage rates             | Demographic and geographic analysis of service usage (banks, community centers, etc.) |

### Health Care

| Indicator  | Potential measurements  |
|--|---|
| Availability of medical care                       | Density of hospitals, primary care physicians, and dentists                           |
| Availability of affordable health care             | Locations of community and public health clinics for uninsured or low-income patients |
| Accessibility of subsidized care                   | Density of health care providers that accept Medicaid and/or Medicare                 |
| Availability of affordable mental health care      | Locations of mental health services for uninsured or low-income patients              |
| Availability of affordable dental care             | Locations of dental care services for uninsured or low-income patients                |
| Availability of culturally appropriate health care | Locations of culturally appropriate health care providers                             |
| Access to preventive care                          | Rate of well-child visits   |
| Lack of access to preventive care                  | Use of ER for preventable problems  |
| Lack of access to health care                      | Use of ER by uninsured patients (mapped by patient address)                           |

### Democratic Participation

| Indicator                            | Potential measurements  |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Geographic access to decision-making | Proximity to government offices, seat of government                             |
| Public involvement opportunities     | Does jurisdiction provide opportunities for impacted communities to have input? |
| Community capacity                   | Presence and capacity of neighborhood and community organizations               |
| Government responsiveness            | Do government agencies have policies and procedures for incorporating input?    |
| Outcome: Voter registration          | Voter registration rates  |
| Outcome: Voter participation         | Voter participation rates   |
| Outcome: Diversity of participants   | Diversity of participation in public decision-making                            |
| Outcome: Diversity of leadership     | Diversity of leaders in public offices and advisory committees                  |
| Outcome: Influence                   | Are residents able to impact public decision-making?                            |

### Community

| Indicator           | Potential measurements  |
|---------------------|---|
| Safety and security | Crime rates, homicide deaths, and/or calls to 911                         |
| Safety and security | Racial profiling, over-policing of people of color, police accountability |



|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Community spaces         | Community centers, schools, granges, and other indoor gathering places                 |
| Nonprofit activity       | Density of non-profit activity   |
| Faith-based institutions | Density of faith-based institutions  |
| Cultural sites           | Location of cultural and historic sites as defined by the community's residents        |
| Social capital           | Comprehensive map of a community's assets, networks, trust, capacity, and institutions |
| Stability                | % of vacant houses   |
| Stability                | Length of time people have lived in the same place                                     |

### Demographic and Population Indicators

| Indicator                      | Potential measurements   |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Population density             | Density of residents in each neighborhood  |
| Residential + employee density | Density of residents and employees in each neighborhood  |
| Income                         | Median income  |
| Poverty                        | % of population in poverty   |
| Student poverty                | % of students eligible for free and reduced lunch by school  |
| Race/ ethnicity                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maps for each Census race category</li> <li>• A composite map of Populations of Color</li> <li>• School race and language data</li> </ul> |
| Age                            | Maps for 0-5, 5-17, 18-44, 45-64, 65+  |
| Gender                         | % male/ female   |
| Household type                 | Families, single adults, single intergenerational households, etc.   |
| Disabilities                   | % with disabilities, broken out by type of disability  |
| Educational attainment         | Levels of adult educational attainment   |
| Non-English speakers           | Low English proficiency households   |
| Immigrants                     | % foreign born; % recent immigrants  |
| Health insurance               | % without health insurance   |
| Car access                     | % of households without access to a vehicle  |
| Homeless                       | # of sheltered and unsheltered homeless  |
| Veterans                       | % veterans   |

### Health Outcomes

| Indicator                    | Potential measurements                                |
|------------------------------|---|
| Obesity Rates                | % adults qualifying as obese based on Body Mass Index |
| Asthma Rates                 | Adult and child asthma rates                          |
| Diabetes Rates               | Adult diabetes rates                                  |
| Cardiovascular Disease Rates | Cardiovascular disease rates                          |
| Birth Outcomes               | Infant mortality, pre-term births, low birth weight   |
| Mortality Rate               | Age-adjusted mortality rate                           |
| Life Expectancy              | Life expectancy                                       |

## Priority Indicators

The indicators that emerged from the stakeholder engagement process were carefully analyzed and researched in an attempt to identify potential data sources and methodologies. Not surprisingly, many of the indicators were ultimately not feasible to map due to the limitations of available data. Based on an analysis of the available data, CLF developed a menu of indicators that was presented to an 18-member Advisory Committee in January 2012 for input. The Advisory Committee prioritized the potential indicators, resulting in a final list of priority indicators. IMS conducted further analysis of potential data sources for several new indicators suggested by the Advisory Committee, resulting in some necessary modifications to the prioritized list.

Note: While the list below reflects the final list of priority indicators, further refinements to the list may still be necessary based on data source limitations or capacity issues, so the list of indicators will not be final until the mapping tool is complete.

### Education:

- Teacher experience
- Class size
- School success rate: schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress
- Course offerings: schools with Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate classes
- School discipline disaggregated by race
- Early childhood education
- Racial/ ethnic composition of school
- Languages spoken at home by students
- Arts education
- Proximity to schools/ school walkability
- Outcomes: test scores and graduation rates

### Economic Opportunity:

- Density of jobs appropriate for workers with associate's degree or below
- Density of living wage jobs appropriate for workers with associate's degree or below
- Transportation to jobs: number of jobs available to households within Transportation Analysis Zones
- Industrial lands for development
- Workforce training programs and community colleges
- Educational attainment of adult population
- Commuting and job location patterns
- Outcome: Employment rate

### Housing:

- Housing cost (and changes over time)
- Location of publicly-subsidized housing and Section 8 by type
- Fair housing: loan denials by race and income
- Accessible housing: single story housing (as proxy)
- Rental vs. ownership rates
- Outcomes: minority homeownership gap, housing + transportation cost burden, foreclosures, homelessness

### Healthy Environment

- Air quality

- Compromised environments: proximity to brownfields, toxic waste, etc.
- Green infrastructure
- Water infrastructure and quality
- Vacant land

### **Parks and Natural Areas**

- Publicly accessible parks
- Publicly accessible natural areas
- Regional trails
- Regional parks
- Recreation facilities
- Greenspaces with limited public access
- Greenspace quality (level of development, amenities)
- Water access points

### **Food**

- Proximity to full-service grocery stores and supermarkets
- Proximity to fresh food: farmer's markets, produce stands, etc.
- Subsidized food: food retailers that accept food stamps and WIC
- Community gardens
- Supplemental nutrition: food pantries, meal programs, etc.
- Unhealthy food: liquor stores, convenience stores, fast food

### **Transportation**

- Public transit access measured by density of transit based on frequency and trip options
- Safety and quality of public transit stops
- Walkability: presence of sidewalks
- Bikability: density of bike routes by type
- Car ownership rate
- Transportation safety: crash data for cars, bikes, and pedestrians
- Mobility access: Para-transit lift requests and fixed route ramp deployments
- Outcomes: commuter patterns

### **Services and Amenities**

- Public services: locations of libraries, fire stations, post offices, government offices
- Human and social services
- Retail services: proximity to restaurants, hardware, Laundromats, etc.
- Financial services: proximity to banks, financial institutions, credit unions
- Arts: proximity to public arts and arts and culture institutions

### **Health Care**

- Availability of medical care: density of hospitals, primary care physicians, dentists
- Availability of affordable health care: community and public health clinics for uninsured and low-income patients
- Availability of subsidized care: density of health care providers that accept Medicaid and/or Medicare
- Access to preventive care: rate of well-child visits; use of ER for preventable problems
- % of population with health insurance

## Democratic Participation

- Voter registration rates
- Voter participation rates

## Community

- Community spaces: community centers, schools, granges, indoor gathering places
- Faith based institutions
- Social capital: community groups, neighborhood organizations
- Stability: % of vacant houses

## Demographic and Population Indicators

- Population density
- Income (including median income, poverty rate, students eligible for free and reduced lunch)
- Race/ ethnicity
- Age
- Household type
- Educational attainment
- Non-English speakers
- Immigrants

## Health Outcomes

- Obesity rates
- Asthma rates
- Diabetes rates
- Heart disease rates
- Birth outcomes

As noted in the introduction, there are many important aspects of equity that simply cannot be depicted through maps, either because the data is not available, the issue is not “mappable”, or the issue is not spatial or geographic in nature. CLF’s Regional Equity Atlas 2.0 website will attempt to incorporate as many of these aspects of equity as possible through additional tools that will complement the maps. These include:

- **“Phantom buttons”:** Key indicators that are critical to defining equitable access to a particular resource but which are not mappable will be listed along with a brief summary of why the indicator is an important component of the equity equation and why it was not mappable for this project.
- **Summary data:** The Atlas website will include summary data at a county level for key indicators for which neighborhood level data is not available. Whenever possible, the summary data will be disaggregated by race and income.
- **Case studies:** When it is not possible to collect comprehensive data that would enable us to map an indicator at a regional scale, CLF will work with student groups and other interested partners to explore the possibility of conducting smaller-scale case studies in key neighborhoods.
- **Community-based participatory research:** CLF will provide training and technical support to partner organizations interested in engaging their grassroots members in conducting community-based participatory research to examine issues of concern to them.
- **Links to other research:** The Atlas website will include links to external research reports, case studies, Photo Voice projects, and other relevant projects that provide insights into the Atlas findings as well as into indicators that we are unable to map.

## **APPENDIX: STAKEHOLDERS WHO PROVIDED INPUT INTO INDICATOR SELECTION<sup>1</sup>**

### **Project Advisory Committee**

Julia Meier, Coalition of Communities of Color  
Sam Chase, Coalition of Community Health Clinics  
Midge Purcell, Urban League  
Rey Espana, NAYA  
Jim Labbe, Audubon Society  
Beth Cohen, Oregon Food Bank  
Marcelo Bonta, Center for Diversity and the Environment  
Kalpana Krishnamurthy, Western States Center  
Mary Anne Harmer, Regence  
Alejandro Qeral, Northwest Health Foundation  
Tim DuRoche, World Affairs Council  
Andree Tremoulet, Washington County  
Kari Lyons (alternate: Betsy Clapp), Multnomah County  
Ben Visser, Clackamas County  
Brendon Haggerty, Clark County  
Ted Reid, Metro  
Dan Rubado, Environmental Public Health, State of Oregon  
Tricia Tilman, Office of Multicultural Health, State of Oregon

### **National experts**

Jason Reese, Kirwan Institute  
Nerissa Kunakemakorn, Opportunity Agenda  
Kalima Rose, Policy Link  
Tom Bryer, University of Central Florida  
Claudia Hernandez, STAR Index  
Richard Gelb, King County  
Ken Thomsen, Local Democracy Collaborative  
Matt Leighninger, Deliberative Democracy Consortium  
Jim Diers, University of Washington (author of Neighbor Power)  
Scott Winn, Race and Social Justice Initiative, City of Seattle  
Clive Jones, Alliance of Information and Referral Specialists  
Bill Griffith, National Minority Quality Forum  
Martin Cohen, Local Arts Index

*Note: Additional national experts provided input via e-mail*

---

<sup>1</sup> This list only includes individuals who provided substantive and direct input on the project. It does not include stakeholders who provided input solely via the online survey or issue experts who provided data. Participants in focus groups and presentations who provided their names are listed individually. In some cases, particularly presentations to networks and coalitions, names of each individual participant are not available.

## **Local stakeholders, issue experts, and partners**

### **Non-Profit Organizations**

David Rebanal, Chris Kabel, and Alejandro Queral, Northwest Health Foundation  
Marcelo Bonta and Queta Gonzalez, Center for Diversity and the Environment  
Martha McLennan and Tim Collier, Northwest Housing Alternatives  
Steve Messinetti, Habitat for Humanity Portland/ Metro East  
John Miller, Oregon ON  
Robin Boyce, Housing Development Center  
Jesse Beason, Proud Ground  
Dee Walsh, Reach CDC  
Sarah Stevenson, Innovative Housing  
Steve Rudman, Home Forward  
Sean Hubert, Central City Concern  
Nick Sauvie, Rose CDC  
Leah Greenwood, ACES  
Mary Kyle McCurdy and Tara Sulzen, 1000 Friends of Oregon  
Alan Hipolito and Tony DeFalco, Verde  
Kathie Minden, People for Parks  
Amy Gilroy, Noelle Dobson and Steve White, Oregon Public Health Institute  
Heidi Guenin and Claudia Arana Colen, Upstream Public Health  
Carrie Vanzant, Sea Mar CHC  
Sam Chase, Jacqueline Chandler, Laura Raymond, Coalition of Community Health Clinics  
Lisa Cline, Wallace Medical Concern  
Kate Messina, Rosewood Family Health Center  
John Duke, Outside In Medical Clinic  
Owen Lynch, West Burnside Chiropractic Clinic  
Ted Amman, Central City Concern  
Suzy Jeffreys, North by Northeast Community Health  
Sophia Tzeng, Essential Health Clinic  
Jo Ann Hardesty, CLF Board  
Scott Chapman, Sierra Club  
Blythe Pavlik, SE Uplift  
Sherri Bennett, YWCA Clark County  
Brian Clayton, Columbia River Economic Development Council  
Margaret Butler, Portland Jobs with Justice  
Sarah Pope, Stand for Children  
Sue Hildick, Chalkboard Project  
David Mandell, Children's Institute  
Nichole Maher, and Donita Frye, NAYA  
Vinay Prasad, and Lisa Schaffner, Regence  
Chris Dennett, Environmental Entrepreneurs Northwest  
Mark Stephan, Center for Social and Environmental Justice at Washington State University Vancouver  
Susan Peithman, Bicycle Transportation Alliance  
Ellen Johnson, Housing Land Advocates

Linda Nilsen-Solares, Project Access Now  
Joseph Santos Lyons and Jon Oster, OPAL  
Michael Mellick, Central City Concern  
Nancy Ferry and Dan Floyd, Bridges to Changes  
Valerie Burten, Luke-Dorf  
Erika Silver, Human Solutions  
Frank Squeglia, Recovery Association Project  
Brian Benson, Laura Koch and Alison Graves, Community Cycling Center  
Chris Rall, TA America  
John Mullin, Oregon Law Center  
Bandana Shrestha, AARP Oregon  
Vicki Hersen, Elders in Action  
Mary Hanlon, Northwest Community Capital Fund  
Ron Rubino, Legal Aid Services of Oregon  
Jackeline Luna Acosta and Victor Salinas, Latino Network  
Pam Phan, Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Youth Planning Team  
Ron Ruggiero and Felisa Hagins, SEIU  
Liesl Wendt, Jessica Gardner, Troy Hammond, Matt Kinshella, 211info  
Jeff Hawthorne, Regional Arts and Culture Council  
Michael Szporluk, Disability Rights Fund  
Cody Goldberg, Harper's Playground  
Carla Danley, Portland Commission on Disabilities  
Lavaun Heaster, Portland Commission on Disabilities  
Caitlin Wood, Portland Commission on Disabilities  
Chris Logan, Portland Commission on Disabilities  
Joe VanderVeer, Portland Commission on Disabilities  
Roger Anthony, Vision into Action  
Midge Purcell, Urban League of Portland  
Ramsey Weit, Community Housing Fund  
Karin Kelley-Torregroza, Vision Action Network  
Karen Shawcross, Bienestar  
Heather McCarey, Westside Transportation Alliance  
Steve Mollinax, Bridle Creek Stewards, SWNI Parks Committee  
Eric Lindstrom, TRK/ Fans of Fanno Creek  
Ed Kerns, Lents environmental activist  
June Mohler, Troutdale Parks Advisory Committee  
Sue Marshall, Audubon, Tualatin Riverkeepers, OLCV  
Esther Lev, The Wetlands Conservancy  
Matt Clark, Johnson Creek Watershed Council  
Linda Peters, WC-CAN  
Ted Labbe, Depave  
David Cohen, Friends of Tryon Creek  
Bob Sallinger, Audubon  
Tresa Horny, Oregon League of Conservation Voters

Beth Cohen, Eric Sopkin, Arturo Caro, Jon Stubenvon, and Sharon Thornberry, Oregon Food Bank  
Mark Maggiora, Americans Building Community  
Erika Johnson and Warren Neth, Urban Abundance  
Anna Curtin and Trudy Toliver, Portland Farmer's Market  
Mary Postlethwait and Amber Baker, Village Gardens, Janus Youth Programs  
Kaely Summers, Adelante Mujeres  
Alison Warren, Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon  
Emily Gottfried, Oregon Area Jewish Committee and Oregon Faith Roundtable Against Hunger  
Robyn Johnson, Partners for a Hunger Free Oregon  
Serena Wesley, Self Enhancement, Inc

### **Portland State University**

Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies Board  
Sheila Martin, Meg Merrick, and Diane Besser, Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies  
Charles Rynerson, Population Research Center  
Alan de la Torre and Margaret Neal, Institute on Aging  
Renee Bogin Curtis, Community Environmental Services  
Scott Ellis, MURP  
Lisa Bates, School of Urban Studies and Planning  
Mary King, Economics Department  
Angela Spencer, Cradle to Career Initiative

### **Jurisdictions**

#### **Metro**

Ted Reid  
Clint Chiavarini  
Mark Bosworth  
Kathryn Sofitch  
Mike Hogle  
Andy Cotugno  
Chris Deffebach  
Paul Couey  
Nuin-Tara Key  
Ben Sainsbury  
Ronda Chapman-Duer  
Sabrina Gojil  
Stacey Triplett  
Janet Bebb  
Tommy Albo  
Matthew Hampton  
Amy Rose  
Heath Brackett  
Molly Vogt  
John Williams



## **Washington County**

Andree Tremoulet, Washington County Office of Community Development  
Kimberly Armstrong, Washington County Office of Community Development  
Toby Harris, Washington County Environmental Health  
Jennie Proctor, Washington County Office of Community Development  
Val Valfre, Washington County Housing Services  
Kathleen O'Leary, Washington County Public Health  
Kimberly Repp, Washington County Public Health  
Betty Merritt, Commission on Children and Families  
Andrea Nelson, City of Beaverton  
Diana Stotz, Commission on Children and Families  
Dan Rutzick, City of Hillsboro  
Margot Barnett, OSU Extension Services  
Kelly Jurman, Washington County Health and Human Services  
Jeff Hill, Washington County Disability, Aging, and Veteran Services  
Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks District  
Steven Roberts, Washington County Land Use and Transportation  
Sue Omel, Washington County Public Health  
Sia Lindstrom, Washington County Administrative Office  
Amanda Garcia-Snell, Washington County Public Health Chronic Disease Prevention  
Victoria Saager, Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation

## **Clackamas County**

Trell Anderson, Housing Authority of Clackamas County  
Ben Visser, Housing Authority of Clackamas County  
Barbara Smolak, Public and Government Affairs  
Nancy Newton, County Admin  
Teri Beemer, Behavioral Health  
Mike McCallistar, DTD-Planning  
Brenda Durbin, Social Services  
Gary Schmidt, Public and Government Affairs  
Karen Buehrig, DTD-Transportation  
Chuck Robbins, Community Development  
James Wilson, H3S  
Michelle Healy, North Clackamas Parks District  
Carl Poston, North Clackamas Urban Watershed Council  
Brian Hodson, City of Canby  
Kami Kehoe, Clackamas River Water District  
Deborah Rogge, City of Molalla  
Susan Hansen, Hamlet of Molalla Prairie  
Nancy Grimes, City of Tualatin  
Markley Drake, Council President, City of Happy Valley  
Bob Reeves, Villages at Mt Hood

Judy Carson, West Linn  
Jeff Gudman, Lake Oswego City Council  
Ann Lininger, Clackamas County Board of Commissioners  
William Wild, Oak Lodge Sanitary District  
Jeremy Pietzold, City of Sandy  
Wilda Parks, North Clackamas County Chamber  
Heather Kibbey, Mayor, City of Rivergrove  
Toby Forsberg, Clackamas Fire District # 1 - C4 representative  
Tori Cummings, City of West Linn

### ***City of Portland***

Kate Allen, Portland Housing Bureau  
David Sheern, Portland Housing Bureau  
Jennifer Devlin, Bureau of Environmental Services  
Anne Nelson, Bureau of Environmental Services  
Amanda Fritz, Portland City Commissioner  
Antoinette Pietka, Portland Housing Bureau  
Afifa Ahmed-Shafi, Paul Leistner, Brian Hoop, Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement  
Linda Dobson, City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services  
Jennifer Scott, Auditor's Office  
Kali Ladd, Mayor's Office  
Abigail Cermak, City of Portland Brownfield Program  
Randy Webster, Portland Parks and Recreation  
Danielle Brooks, City of Portland  
April Bertelsen, Portland Bureau of Transportation  
Michael Prothe, Portland Housing Bureau

### ***Multnomah County***

Betsy Clapp, Multnomah County Health Department  
Kari Lyons, Multnomah County Health Department  
Rebecca Stavenjord, Multnomah County Health Department  
Janine Leaper, Multnomah County Office of Sustainability  
Matt O'Keefe, Multnomah County LPSCC  
Ben Harper, Multnomah County GIS  
Joe Partridge, Multnomah County Emergency Management  
Alison Goldstein, Multnomah County Health Department  
Heather Heater, Multnomah County Health Department  
Olivia Quiroz, Multnomah County Health Department  
Katie Lynd, Multnomah County Office of Sustainability  
Melissa Balding, Multnomah County Office of Sustainability  
Caren Baumgart, Multnomah County Domestic Violence Office  
Patty Doyle, Multnomah County Sun Service System – Anti Poverty  
David Hanson, Multnomah County Aging and Disability Services  
Sonali Balajee, Chair's Office

Matt Davis, Environmental Health  
Melissa McKinney, Multnomah County Health Department Community Disease Services  
Stephen Chater, Facilities  
Moriah McGrath, Health Assessment and Evaluation  
Ben Duncan, Multnomah County Environmental Health  
Tera Wick, Multnomah County Health Department  
Jim Gaudino, Multnomah County Health Department Community Epidemiological Services  
Jean Fike, EMSWCD  
Erika Sokes, WMSWCD

### ***Clark County***

Peggy Sheehan, City of Vancouver  
Jean Akers, City of Vancouver Parks and Recreation  
Ken Pearrow, GIS, Clark County  
Bob Pool, GIS, Clark County  
Brendon Haggerty, Clark County Public Health  
Karen Evans, Clark County Community Services  
Colete Anderson, Clark County Community Planning  
Oliver Orjiako, Clark County Community Planning  
Long Vue, Clark County Public Health  
Klaus Micheel, SW Washington Agency on Aging and Disabilities  
Mike Reardon, SW Washington Agency on Aging and Disabilities  
Kate Budd, Clark County Community Services  
Pete Munroe, Clark County Community Services  
Holly Gaya, Clark County Neighborhood Outreach  
David Kelly, Southwest Washington Agency on Aging and Disability Services  
Kelly Sills, Clark County Board of County Commissioners  
Jill teVelde, Clark County Food Systems Council

### ***State of Oregon***

Dan Rubado, Oregon Environmental Public Health Tracking  
Sarah Armitage and Aida Biberic, Oregon DEQ  
Christian Kaylor, Employment Department  
Ken Rosenberg, Maternal and Child Health Epidemiologist, Oregon Public Health Division  
Cyreena Boston Ashby, Deputy Director, Economic and Business Equity, Governor's Office  
Andrea Hamberg, Oregon Health Authority  
Heidi Wormwood, DHS - SNAP Policy  
Dawn Myers, DHS - SNAP Program

### ***Community Members***

Guy Trombley, Consultant  
Dana Brown, Consultant  
Emma Colburn, Heritage Mapping Project  
Noelle Studer-Spevak, Orange Splot

James Hillegas, Independent Historian  
Dave Hardesty  
Victoria Demchak, CLF volunteer  
Helen Ying, Metro candidate  
Nancy Stevens, health research consultant  
Sanjeev Balajee, former ONI Performance Measure Coordinator  
Clackamas County CPO leaders  
Washington County CPO leaders  
Clark County Neighborhood Association leaders  
Mike Vanderveen, Second Stories and East Portland Action Plan  
David Hampsten, Hazel Wood Neighborhood Association and East Portland Action Plan  
Ellison Pearson, East Portland Action Plan  
Matteo Luccio, East Portland Action Plan  
Colleen Gifford, Gateway EcoDistrict and East Portland Action Plan  
Tom Lewis, Centennial Community Association and East Portland Action Plan  
Jeremy O'Leary, TPD and East Portland Action Plan  
Carol Chesarek, natural resources activist

### **Focus Groups and Input Sessions**

CLF Summit Presentation (9/14/11)  
Center for Diversity and the Environment Forum (10/27/11)  
CLF Board (11/3/11)  
Coalition of Communities of Color (1/9/12)  
Oregon ON Portland Policy Council (12/14/11)  
Coordinating Committee to End Homelessness (11/16/11)  
Washington County government agencies (9/19/11)  
Washington County HSSN (11/2/11)  
Clackamas County government agencies (11/2/11)  
Clackamas County C4 (1/5/12)  
Clackamas County Housing Action Network (12/14/11)  
Clark County nonprofits and government focus group (12/9/11)  
Clark County nonprofits and government focus group (12/15/11)  
Multnomah County government agencies (11/4/11)  
Multnomah County staff (1/12/12)  
Transportation and Health Equity Network (11/3/11)  
Food access focus group (1/13/12)  
East Portland Action Plan leaders focus group (12/16/11)  
Aging focus group (12/12/11)  
Coalition of Community Health Clinics Board (12/12/11)  
Portland Commission on Disabilities Public Outreach and Awareness Committee (1/18/12)  
Disabilities focus group (1/6/12)  
Natural Resources Working Group A (1/12/12)  
Natural Resources Working Group B (1/26/12)  
Parks focus group (1/4/12)

Washington County nonprofits and local government (1/3/12)

Washington County nonprofits and local government (1/9/12)

Equity Strategies Workgroup (1/10/12)

Advisory Committee (1/30/12)

### **Surveys**

2010 Initial CLF stakeholder survey on Indicators: 258 respondents

2011 Input form and web-based survey on indicators: 195 respondents