600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503-797-1700
503-797-1804 TDD
503-797-1797 fax

www.oregon**metro.gov**

Metro | *Memo*

Date:	June 6, 2014
To:	Tom Hughes, Council President
	Sam Chase, Councilor
	Carlotta Collette, Councilor
	Shirley Craddick, Councilor
	Craig Dirksen, Councilor
	Kathryn Harrington, Councilor
	Bob Stacey, Councilor
From:	Tim Collier, Director of Finance and Regulatory Services
Cc:	Martha Bennett, Chief Operating Officer
	Scott Robinson, Deputy Chief Operating Officer
	Senior Leadership Team
	Finance Team
	Council Policy Coordinators
Re:	**Councilor Amendment to the FY 2014-15 Budget**

Attached is an amendment request to the FY 2014-15 budget from Councilor Chase along with a management response outlining a proposed work plan.

The amendment will be reviewed and discussed with Council at the work session on June 10, 2014, and will be considered for vote at the Council meeting on June 12, 2014 prior to adoption of the budget on June 19, 2014.

Short Title: Metro Workforce Housing Implementation

Overview

Hardworking families, seniors, and people with disabilities should be able to afford housing and still have enough money for groceries, medicine, and other basic needs. Yet too many of our residents lack housing options in the region and are forced to choose between paying for rent, medicine, or food. These consequences have enormous implications to the public in terms of financial, social, and environmental costs.

For these reasons, Metro has a long-standing role in planning to ensure housing opportunities are available through local and regional actions[i]. Among these planning documents is the Housing Choice Task Force Implementation Strategy, which encouraged the Metro Council to take a more active role in advancing the production of workforce housing throughout the region. While some of the recommendations outlined in this strategy were implemented, several of them did not receive attention or the resources needed to see them though.

This proposal aims to reinforce Metro's role in advancing regional housing goals. By implementing the objectives outlined below Metro will build capacity for immediate action and lay the foundation for work in the near future.

Objectives
1. **Implementation of best practices**
   o **In partnership with community based organizations, develop and operate education and technical assistance program for cities and counties concerning the tools available for workforce housing development**
      ▪ Develop and deliver education and technical assistance program exploring tools like tax deferrals and exemptions, SDC waivers, tax credits, streamlined permitting, accessory dwelling units, flexible codes, parking requirements, equity mapping tools and more. Provide technical assistance to implement policy changes to codes, permitting, and other jurisdictional programs.

      ▪ Look at existing models for SDC waivers and determine how it can be replicated in other jurisdictions (Are the cost of the waiver program picked up by the jurisdictions' general or other fund, or are they spread to other development projects); look at SDC policies generally across the region and impact on affordability (i.e. some SDCs are $40k for a permit)

      ▪ Work could be accomplished through a variety of efforts: solicit RFP to support consortium of community-based organizations for implementation of education services program and technical assistance that works with local jurisdictions' decision makers and senior staff.

2. **Altering state and local policy**
   o **Explore whether changes can be made to strengthen timelines for LUBA and LCDC land use decisions, so that workforce housing can be developed on a predictable and reliable timeline**
      ▪ Work with local jurisdictions and stakeholders to develop strategies for strengthening timelines at local level

      ▪ Partner with private and non-profit developers to explore statewide strategies to improve LUBA/LCDC timelines

   o **Determine feasibility of expedited UGB expansions in jurisdictions with track record or future plans for workforce housing implementation**
      ▪ Funding and UGB expansion priorities should be set for jurisdictions that incent and advance the region's workforce housing goals. Policy options should be developed for Council consideration exploring processes that might allow local jurisdictions and their stakeholders to trigger UGB expansion for property owners that meet voluntary inclusionary housing targets.

   o **Support the Community Planning and Development Grants Program and advisory committee's recommendation to develop criteria that encourages social equity through the development of workforce housing**

3. **Resource development**
   o Develop long-range strategy for increasing funding for workforce housing development akin to our efforts to build resources for transportation and other infrastructure needs.

Duration (put an 'x' in the appropriate line, for specific length write in the length)

___ ___ One-time   Specific length: _____X_____   ____On-going

Cost Estimate
Initial costs are estimated to be $200,000 for the RFP to implement education program over a two-year period (objective 1) in partnership with community based organizations, plus some internal staff time to manage and develop associated contracts. The foundational work described in objectives 2 & 3 may be accomplished utilizing existing staff in legislative affairs, planning, and the RISE team.

Funding Options
The budget for this effort could come from the Council Opportunity Fund balance remaining in FY 2013-2014 or from the new balance projected in FY 2014-2015.

Relationship to other programs
This effort will be informed and enhanced by Metro's equity strategy. Additionally, the work will advance in coordination with the extension and update of the Community Planning and Development Grants Program.

Stakeholders
Several of the objectives outlined in this proposal were developed with input from stakeholders working in non-profit affordable housing development, including the Oregon Opportunity Network, Northwest Housing Alternatives, and the Community Housing Fund, as well as stakeholders from the Home Builders Association. This approach aims to implement tools that will increase needed work-force housing in willing

jurisdictions while continuing to build an understanding about the importance of affordable housing in successful communities.

---

[i] The Regional Framework Plan (Framework Plan) articulates Metro's policy to increase housing choices throughout the region so that families of modest means are not forced to live concentrated in a few neighborhoods, and to effectively reduce the number of households paying more than 50 percent of their incomes on housing and transportation ("cost-burdened households"). The Framework Plan also includes the six outcomes that have been adopted by the region as characteristics of a successful region. Among these desired outcomes are that people have the ability to live in vibrant communities where they have easy access to everyday needs and that the benefits and burdens of growth are shared equitably. Title 7 in the Regional Functional Plan aims to reduce barriers to sufficient and affordable housing for all income levels in the region. Metro has worked with numerous partners to seek federal grants aimed at improving the link between affordable housing and the other key services that provide for community livability.

FY 2014-15 Management Response
Councilor Amendment Chase #1
Metro Equitable Housing Development Program

Program Purpose and Need

Over the past three decades, the Metro 2040 Growth Concept has led to investments that have made communities throughout the region into livable and thriving places, yet many residents in the region struggle to access the benefits of these investments. Too many people struggle with the basic need for housing choices and affordable options that allow them to have access to the services, amenities, and opportunities that exist in communities around the region. Providing affordable access to education, transportation, and employment is fundamental to accomplishing the region's shared vision.

For low-income families, the ability to live in an affordable home near good public transportation translates into improved access to healthcare, education and employment opportunities, and reduced commuting costs. On average, working families spend 57 percent of their incomes on housing and transportation. Locating affordable housing near transit can significantly reduce this financial burden.

Metro has historically played a role in affordable housing policy and development in partnership with community members, local governments, and housing developers. We have worked to advance key policy objectives and expand the region's toolbox for building a wide range of housing types and income levels. Metro also has a key role in partnering with communities to link affordable housing development to other key investments in transportation, parks and natural areas, and other community services.

Equitable Transit Oriented Development is a national best practice focused on creating equal opportunities for people of all incomes to capture the benefits of transit oriented locations. Communities around the country have worked to bring leaders from the business, government, nonprofit and philanthropic sectors together to collaborate on building and preserving affordable housing in neighborhoods where transportation investments are being made, to develop mixed income communities that allow for multi-generational access, and to advance best practices for funding and financing development projects in a wide range of market conditions.

The Portland Metropolitan Region continues to be a national leader in providing housing choices and affordable access to transportation and transit that other communities look to follow. Now, Metro has an opportunity to engage a wider range of partners to advance equitable housing development around the region from a policy, funding, and development framework.

Program Objectives

Build Partnerships- connect and enhance the region's network of philanthropic and community based organizations with business and government partners to promote information and access to a common base of knowledge of equitable TOD tools and resources.

Build Solutions- collaborate to create corridor-wide strategies and goals that allow for communities to customize strategies that respond to specific demographic and economic conditions and that can be implemented by multiple involved partners.

Build Projects- convene funding partners to leverage investments that advance the outcomes of shared goals and strategies.

FY 2014-15 Management Response
Councilor Amendment Chase #1
Metro Equitable Housing Development Program

Program Scope and Deliverables

Two Year Pilot Program: July 2014-July 2016

I.   Implementation of Best Practices:

- Develop partnership, funding, and organizational model linking public, nonprofit, business, and philanthropic sectors in funders collaborative focused on promoting equitable TOD throughout the region.

II.   Resource Development

- Identify opportunities to ensure community led investment strategies include effective equitable TOD elements that allow the adjoining neighborhoods, residents and businesses broadly share in the benefits of public and private investment.

- Provide recommendations for further implementation and partnership when pilot program concludes.

III.   State and Local Policy

- The Equitable Housing Development Program will focus on funding and development and will coordinate closely with legislative affairs and the RISE team on related policy elements.

Program Stakeholder Engagement

Equitable TOD strategies are most effective when created through partnerships that incorporate community-led planning and include participation by government, business, advocates, foundations, educational and institutional partners.

To accomplish the deliverables of the pilot program, a stakeholder group will be convened, led by a Metro Council liaison.

Program Resources

1 FTE Senior Development Project Manager (Development Center)
This is a current and funded position in the Development Center that is currently vacant. Resources proposed in the budget amendment will be focused on two major program areas.

$100,000 Partnership and Collaboration: professional services contracts to establish partnerships
$100,000 Solutions and Investments: program funds awarded to successful competitive proposals

Funding for the two year pilot program: $200,000 from the FY 2014-15 Council Opportunity Account

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff · Red text are baseline group additions · Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale

Housing	Stable and Accessible High Quality Housing Choices	· Stable Housing
		 · Housing Choices
		   o Size/multifamily Price
		   o Location
		   o Culturally-responsive (i.e. supporting multigenerational families)
		   o Type
		 · Accessible Housing
		   o ADA Compliant
		   o Proximity to transit
		   o Proximity to services
		 · Quality Housing
			1. Healthy quality housing that is accessible for persons with disabilities and those without a car.
			 2. Diversity/variety of housing options that ensure mixed income communities so that all households can live near where they work, play, pray, and are not displaced by future investments in housing development.
				1. Healthy Housing:
				 ● Incidence of mold (change over time/concentration of incidence)
				 ● Incidence of lead poisoning (change over time/concentration of incidence)
				 ● **Contact Community Alliance of Tenants and Fair Housing Council for "Healthy" (not sub-standard) data measure recommendations**
				 2. Affordability
				 ● Location of Publicly-Subsidized Affordable Housing (EA-Metro) broken out by bedroom size.
				 ● Housing Cost Burden: Households paying 30% or more of income on housing and utilities
				 3. Access (ADA & Access to Finance)
				 ● HMDA Data (specifically, concentration of 1st time home buyers by race)
				 ● High Interest Loans by race
				 ● ADA compliant homes **(Contact**
					Points
					
					 PUMA
					
					 HMDA data can be aggregated to Census tracts

				Independent Living Resources for suggestions on data sources) using cost burden: households paying 30% or more of income on housing and utilities **4. Housing Tenure** – Decennial Census Data ● Density of homeowners (EA) ● Density of renters (EA) ● Minority Homeownership Gap (EA) 5. Proximity ● Proximity to Transit **¼ mile to bus stops and ½ mile to LRT is the standard for good proximity** ● Proximity to Services: **NEED TO DEFINE** (i.e. parks, food, social services). Possible creation of a composite using EA **Proximity can be looked at in combination with density – e.g. density of frequent transit stops within ¼ mile, and/or clustering of services, etc… Can run analysis once defined**	HMDA – Census tracts Unknown Decennial Census – Census block Metro – Tax lot level Metro – Tax lot level

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale

Transportation	Accessible, Affordable, and Safe Transportation Options	· Affordability
		· Accessible Transit
		  ○ Reliable
		  ○ Frequent
		  ○ ADA compliant
		  ○ Close to a variety of options for no or low car households
		· Safe Transportation
		  ○ Speed limits
		  ○ Crosswalks
		  ○ Sidewalks
		  ○ Appropriate bus stop amenities
		  ○ Signage
		· Transportation
		  ○ Pedestrian
		  ○ Bike
		  ○ Transit
		  ○ Car
			1. A variety of transportation options for low to no car households that are proximal, ADA compliant, reliable/frequent, and affordable.
			2. All transportation options are supported by basic infrastructure and can be safely accessed and used.
			3. Our transportation network effectively connects people to where they live, work, play, and pray.
				1. Public Transportation
				● % on time- Trimet "time points" data by line and by stop by census tract. **Tri-met time points**
				● times and days of service (early morning? Weekend?) **Trimet**
				● Transit Line by Frequency **Trimet**
				● % of households within ¼ mile of high frequency transit service
				● % of schools serviced by frequent bus lines **Available**
				2. Active Transportation **Metro**
				● Curbcuts – density **Available**
				● Sidewalks –density **Available**
				● Proximity to Bike Route **Available**
				3. Access
				● Averages trans costs as % of income **Available – ACS**
				● Crash Data: Pedestrian crash and fatality data **Available - ODOT**
					Trimet - Points
					
					Trimet - Points
					
					Trimet – Points
					
					Metro – tax lot level
					
					ACS – Census Tracts (PUMAs have lower margins of error)
					
					ODOT- Points

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale
Parks and Natural Space	Access to Parks and Natural Space	· Access · Community ownership. o Community stewardship for the development of park development.	1. Communities have equal access to well maintained and developed parks and recreation programs, community gardens, and natural spaces that safely serves the community in a culturally appropriate manner.	1. Proximity to parks, natural areas, greenspaces and school grounds ¼ mile proximity to developed parks on street network 2. Park Quality ● Developed for Public Use**? Metro- ORCA Public parks and other lands with some developed recreation areas** ● Park amenities ○ Lighting? ○ Amenities for gathering ■ Flat, flexible, open space **Possible analysis to determine this** ■ Picnic Table/BBQ space **Not complete for entire region at this time, but may be in near future** ■ **Maintenance investment per**	Metro – Tax lot level

4

				square mile 3. Park Access ● Parks accessible by sidewalks – **without complete access points, may be incomplete** ● Parks accessible by public transit - **without complete access points, may be incomplete** 4. Trails 5. Tree canopy assessment	

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale
Environment	Fair Distribution of Environmental Burdens	· Problems with Strict Fair Share · Environmental policies/decisions · Balancing environmental justice and environmental concern	1. Environmental mitigation efforts prioritize communities (historically and currently) disproportionately burdened. 2. Do environmental policies inform and engage those most impacted by them? 3. Are environmental policies ameliorating historical, current, and future environmental harms?	1. Brownfields –Clean-up rate of known brownfields 2. Superfund Sites – *Does not change much over time, not influenceable* 3. Water Quality/Protection Policies *– such as…? TMDL policies are statewide and don't vary locally* 4. Chronic disease *(as represented by risk/exposure factors??)* a. Asthma b. Lead poisoning *– Public investment in lead abatement* 5. *Population Density – ambiguous in terms of quality of life experienced* *b* # of air quality monitoring stations **See #3 below** *7* *9. Ecologically healthy waterways* 10. *Added to Parks* Our Indicators 1.Toxins Transported (Coal, precision	DEQ has a list Census tract level – CLF has data DEQ Air quality raster Decennial Census - blocks

| | | | | cast parts, Intel) – **Train manifests available through public records request**
2. Investment in environmental education for LiC and COC.
3. Building a tracking infrastruture. Do we have more than 1 air quality monitoring station? **DEQ has 7 air quality tracking stations in Portland 1. Downtown Portland, 2. St Helens Rd in Industrial NW, 3 & 4. Two on MLK, 5. Se Foster Rd, 6. SW Portland 7. SE Portland (locations are not exact)**
4. Baseline population locations and track movement/green spaces. **We can determine population within proximity to track location and green spaces.** | |
| | | | | | |

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale
Civic Engagement	Meaningful Engagement and Empowered People	· Meaningfully Involved People ○ Opportunity to influence the outcome § Check in with community early and often in process § Provision of technical assistance § Provision of services such as childcare and translation · Empowered to Shape Environment · Transparency – information sharing and assistance · Enforcement of obligations · Distribution of where money is spent	1. Though important, meaningful civic engagement goes beyond voter registration and turnout, but instead allows historically under represented communities to weigh in on policy outcomes that will influence them. 2. Governmental institutions must provide meaningful access to the decision making process that is early enough to determine outcomes, transparent, and accessible in language, technical knowledge, time of day, and with childcare provided.	1. Voting: Percentage of eligible and registered citizens who voted in presidential elections, by race and ethnicity (need input on options for this indicator –GPP and EA use different data for this) Our Indicators: 1.Voting % eligible and registered who voted in pres elections, and non-presidential by race and ethnicity Combine categories 3 - 6 - IMS project 7. Number of elected officials, city employees, subcommittees, advisory disaggregated by race (Any position subject to Public Records Law) - Office of Equity and Human Rights dashboard Available through records request	County level – possibly smaller geographies?

| | | | | **9. Metro Investment in capacity building and technologial support of under-prepresented communities**

10. Metro Investment in community outreach by bureau and community location

11. Title VI requests (i.e. for language translation) and/or complaints filed and determinations – Requests for language translation would come from individual organizations. Can find total numbers of suits filed <u>per state</u>, and number resolved, but finding few other details. | |
| | | | | | |

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale
Health Outcomes	Healthy People, Families, and Communities	· Community Health · Family Health · Individual Health o Physical, mental, spiritual, and emotional health · Health Equity · Emphasis on prevention and harm reduction	1. The economy, environment, and social impacts are major determinants of health. We cannot focus on individual choice. 2. Everyone can achieve good health that is reasonable for them at a cost that they can afford.	1. Asthma rate – *some studies say 3/5 of asthma cases are genetic – do we want to track health outcomes with a major genetic component? genetics would be a confounding factor in any rate change over time, not influenced with policy* [No genetic tracking, but we do want to track Asthma rates as certain environmental factors influence this---maybe can track instances of asthma attacks?] 2. Diabetes rate - *maybe better to focus on Body Mass Index (BMI) as health outcome instead? BMI + diet + genetics are risk factors for diabetes* [Do not use BMI] *3. Cardiovascular disease rate – major genetic component here too but also diet, exercise, access to primary care and prescription drugs, etc.* 4. Cancer – *undetermined data availability; not in Equity Atlas or GPP* [What leve of geographyl?] 7. Infant mortality/morbidity/*low*	

				birthweight rates Available *8. Traffic Fatalities and Injuries: Number of pedestrian, bicyclist, and vehicle occupant fatalities and serious injuries within the greater Portland region.*Available - ODOT 9. Health services provided in a culturally appropriate way *– cultural appropriateness is difficult to get* [Community Health Workers? Easier data to track, OHA, CHW, CCC, ORCHWA]] Key Health Data points: 1. Asthma, Diabetes, Cardiovascular, Cancer rates 2. One mental health or addiction data point 3 Infant mortality, low birthweights - Available	ODOT - Points

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale

Individuals with Disabilities	Access for Individuals with Disabilities	· Veterans
		· Physical, mental, and emotional health
		· Minimum ADA compliance but we want to do better
		  o Transportation
		  o Infrastructure
		  o Buildings
		· Services
			1. Our region meets and exceeds all disability requirements while protecting veterans and those with medical health challenges, allowing them to be active members in their communities.
			  a. This is an unconfirmed draft.
				1. Services
				● Proximity to service centers
				  o Youth and Adults with Disabilities
				● % Veterans served (ODVA Data?)
				● **Connect with Independent Living Resources and the county service departments to find out more about services provided and locations**
				2. Access
				● Curbcut Density **Available**
				● ADA compliance of housing
				● Auditory cues for sidewalks in relation to service centers	

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale
Economy	Fair Access to Employment and Economic Prosperity	· Income (Group - which measure is most appropriate?) · Access (Job Training, Family-Wage Jobs) (considerable overlap with housing, education, and transportation) · Pay inequity (per-capita income) · Equitable recruitment, retention, promotion, and hiring · Building intergenerational wealth · Small business opportunities ○ Access to credit ○ Access to loans · Culturally responsive lending terms and conditions · Governmental contracting and procurement prioritization	1. An economy that provides support for small business, job training for individuals, and provides **living** wages (incomes?) that promote human dignity, prosperity, and wealth accumulation.	1. **Income** (ask group to narrow these down) a. Median household income by tract (EA) b. **Median household income, % change by tract (EA) – Be aware of margins of error** c. **PUMS per-capita income by race/ethnicity vs. US (PP) - b. and c. should be interpreted in tandem** d. **Self-sufficiency wage (PP) - group prefers this metric for income, as it includes food and household costs Is this updated and available on a regular cycle?** e. Overlap with other indicators i. Transportation to jobs (EA) ii. Locations of Workforce Training Sites and Employment-Related Services (EA) 2. **Access (Overlaps with housing/transportation/education)** a. **Transit Access to Family Wage Jobs (up to 60 minutes travel time) (EA), including quality and kind of job Can use LEHD data to determine travel time to general job industry (travel time and access are different).** b. **Transit access to middle and high schools and post-secondary educational institutions** c. Transportation to jobs (EA)	ACS - Census tracts, PUMA Unknown LEHD are modeled data available at various geographies Puma

13

				d. Locations of Workforce Training and Employment-Related Services (EA)
				e. Housing cost burden (PP)
				f. Housing Plus Transportation Costs (PP)
				3. Poverty
				a. Percent Households below Poverty Level (EA)
				b. % K-12 students eligible for free and reduced lunch by school (EA) (compare with a school's capture rate) **Available**
				4. Wealth creation
				a. High Interest Rate Loans (PP) **Available**
				b. Access to home loans (EA) **Available**
				      i. Conventional
				      ii. FHA
				      iii. Denials – white/non-white
				c. access to pensions or other retirement income - get at intergenerational inheritance and wealth
				5. Jobs
				a. Unemployment rate (PP) disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age
				
				6. Cost of living / purchasing power parity
					ACS Census Tracts
					
					ACS – Census Tracts
					School Attendance Areas (not reliably available at this time, but with work could be
					
					Unknown
					
					MSA

14

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale
Food **Betsy**	Access to Affordable and Nutritious Food	· Access to Food o Food deserts · Access to Healthy Food o Community farmers markets · Access to Culturally Appropriate Food · Access to Affordable Food · Food education o GMO labeling o Nutrition and healthy eating classes	1. Communities have access to healthy, affordable, and culturally-appropriate foods with institutional support to properly educate nutrition and cultural food traditions. 2. The healthy choice is the easy choice.	1. Proximity to Food Stores and Farmers' Markets Accepting SNAP 2. Rate of Diabetes 3. Affordability ● Market basket survey **(Check with Multnomah County for data - Healthy Food Retail Initiative)** ● Supermarket Membership Card Data (Identification of where people are shopping compared to where they live) **Proprietary data – not available.** 4. Culturally appropriate food ● Culturally specific food stores (NAICS?) **Not split out by culturally specific in NAICS – Small business data?** 5. Food Education ● Investment in food education programs ● Schools that provide food education	Unknown Unknown Unknown Unknown

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale

Education
Betsy
	Access to and Attainment of Quality Education	· Outcomes/Attainment
		· Quality of Education
		· Access to
		  o Schools
		  o Language immersion
		  o After school programs
		  o School clinics
		  o Head Start
		  o SUN schools
			1. Improving the region's outcomes, quality, and access by closing **achievement gaps, dropout rates, chronic absenteeism, and access to special programs**.
			2. Kids safely and efficiently get to school and back home.
			3. Students are set up for academic success
			4. Students' economic opportunities are not limited by economic debt.
				1. Adult educational attainment
				  a. Adult Education Levels (PP)
				2. Dropout Rates
				  a. Annual graduation rates by race/ethnicity by district (PP)
				3. Chronic Absenteeism
				  a. Percentage of students in each school district that meet attendance requirements (PP)
				4. Access to Special Programs
				a) Childcare/Head Start Access (EA)
				b) Availability of Advanced Placement/ International Baccalaureate Courses (EA)
				5. Achievement Gaps
				  a. Percentage of third and sixth grade students who meet or exceed math and reading assessment standards, by race and ethnicity and by school district. **Can get this by school with public records request and fee – also available by Gender, LEP, Disability, Migrant status, Economically disadvantaged status, TAG**
				6. Financial Literacy (leaving school with financial literacy knowledge)
				7. Non-traditional student support (childcare)
				8. Student debt	

				Our indicators: **- Adult educational attainment –** Available w/ high MOE at census tract level, PUMA level may be better **- Graduation Rates and targets** Available - ODE **- Disparate Disciplinary Rates** Available - ODE **- SUN School representation in PPS** – Would need regional equivalent for this. **- Student Debt** **- Quality of eduation?** **- Teacher demographics,** Available - ODE **representative of communities served** **- Recruitment and retention of diverse teachers, staff and administration** **- Investment in district: ESL funds, language ermersion, childcare, translation** **- TIF dollars diverted in from High school and primary education in URA** DOR **- School closure by geography -**Available **- Stability of population - reason for leaving, where they're going? - access administrative data to track kids** **Add "Access to childcare" as a new indicator.**	ACS – Census tract or PUMA ODE – school points ODE – school points ODE – school points State dept of revenue – scale unknown ODE – school points

Indicator Category	Indicator Title	Indicator Descriptors	Indicator Descriptions	Possible Data · Black text is in original document · Dark red and blue text are notes from DRC staff . Red text are baseline group additions . Green are RC notes after 6/20	Available Scale

Criminal Justice
Betsy
	Community Justice	· Do Not Focus on Criminal Aspect
		  o Emphasis on rehabilitation and restorative justice
		  o Most available indicators are focused on crime, not rehabilitation
		· Community Support Systems
		  o Re-entry services
		  o Know your rights (access to justice)
		· Juvenile justice
		· Immigrant rights
			Community justice broadly refers to all variants of crime prevention and justice activities that explicitly include the community in their processes and set the enhancement of community quality of life as a goal. Recent initiatives include community crime prevention, community policing, community defense, community prosecution, community courts, and restorative justice sanctioning systems. These approaches share a common core in that they address community-level outcomes by focusing on shortand long-term problem solving, restoring victims and communities, strengthening normative standards, and effectively reintegrating	1. Over representation of populations of color and low-income communities in:
				  a. Arrests **and stops, particularly under Portland's "mere conversation" searches, which are akin to stop-profile-and-frisk**
				  b. Sentencing
				  c. # in correctional facilities
				  d. Parity data on % under supervision vs. community rate by year (limited cross-tabs by race/ethnicity)
				  e. Juvenile Crime Rates by county and by race/ethnicity
				2. Recidivism by location
				  a. Total and juvenile, annual data by county 2003-12 (PP)
				3. Supportive policies
				  a. Ban the Box
				4. Supportive re-entry services
				  a. Housing
				  b. Economic development
				  c. Oregon DOC annual county-level reports on youth receipt of services by gender and race
				5. White Collar crimes
				6. Locations of
				  a. Targeted enforcement areas
				  b. Transit, drug-free zones
				
				Our indicator (meant to refocus this from	

			offenders.	negative definition of criminal justice to positive one):	
				1. **Investment in crime prevention programs vs. carceral system (i.e. prisons, jails, etc.)**	Unknown
				2. **Access to alternatives to incarceration: probation services, community courts, post-incarceration support, re-entry services (i.e. Better People, SCAFE, Constructing Hope, STRYVE)**	Unknown
				3. **Race and ethnicity disaggregation of arrest, conviction, and sentencing trends**	Unknown