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INTRODUCTION:

The Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan – Public Involvement Report provides an overview of the intent and efforts undertaken to engage the community in discussions and recommendations for the future of the study area.

Following the overview is a detailed section with specific information on outreach efforts, their costs, and performance measures. Some worked well, some not-so-much. The intent of providing this information is that future engagement processes learn from the experiences of this overall effort.

NEW! will be used throughout this report when a non-traditional approach or tool is discussed (and these also will be discussed in the Tool Box section.)

Community voices:

“I think Aloha is a diamond in the rough. We just need some inspiration.”

“An engaged citizenry is important for a vibrant and livable community.”

“To me it's important that we all respect each others differences and learn to live together without any assumptions.”

“We need more information”

“Interact with other ethnicities and races in community.”

“That the Hispanic community is involved in community matters.”

“Change the organizers because they do the same boring thing over and over. I would like them to be more creative so that young people would show up.”

“A waste of time.”

Public engagement, particularly for a community as diverse as Aloha-Reedville, is both challenging and rewarding. Under the best of circumstances public involvement efforts will never reach all the potentially impacted community members; be held at the right time or the right place for all community members; or address all the issues across a community.

Engagement should, however, attempt to provide a number of different ways community members can obtain information, be kept up to date, have information provided in understandable language or format (written and visual, translated if needed), and a variety of ways to provide input.
The first goal of the Aloha-Reedville project was to create a final result that is broadly supported by the community. Two approaches used to achieve that goal were: to establish an advisory committee with representation across a spectrum of the community, and to increase efforts to provide meaningful participation by historically under-represented groups (such as low income households, communities of color, youth, people with disabilities and seniors.)

BACKGROUND

The three-year Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan (AR Study) examined the extent to which existing conditions, community aspirations and emerging urban service and planning opportunities provide prospects for fulfilling regional planning objectives, while addressing local community issues. The study will serve as a foundation for future planning efforts through creation of sustainable development plans for the Aloha’s major commercial center and transportation corridors designed to help the study area become more prosperous in the future. Information about the Study can be found at the county’s website: http://www.co.washington.or.us/alohareedville

The AR Study is jointly managed by the Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation and Department of Housing Services with support from the Office of Community Development. The AR Study was funded through a Community Challenge Grant provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as well as a Metro Construction Excise Tax grant.

The study began with coordination of the Tualatin Valley Highway Corridor Plan (TVCP) managed by the City of Hillsboro and the Oregon Department of Transportation. The two efforts were managed through collaboration between the project managers for the County and City of Hillsboro. Information about the Tualatin Valley Highway Corridor Plan is available at: http://www.tvhighway.org

Additional planning efforts coordinated with the AR Study included the Washington County Transportation System Plan Update (www.tsp2035.com) and the Washington County Neighborhood Bikeway Plan: (http://www.co.washington.or.us/LUT/Divisions/TrafficEngineering/DesignInformation/neighborhood-bikeway-plan.cfm)

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT STRATEGIES

First things first: Several important first steps occurred at the onset; hire a professional public involvement consultant, gather input from those agencies and organizations that have demonstrated success, begin building project awareness in the community, establish a baseline understanding of the community, establish goals, and form citizen advisory and technical advisory committees.

Consultants with experience Project staff convened a selection committee to review proposals, conduct interviews, and make recommendation for a public involvement consultant. The selection committee included representatives from the county (three departments/divisions), the Oregon State University Extension Office – Committee for Citizen Involvement, Aloha High School, Centro Cultural de Washington County, and Clean Water Services. Each selection committee member had extensive...
public involvement experience. Proposals were evaluated on a points system of pre-determined criteria. Interviews were standardized and scored using a points system.

JLA Public Involvement of Portland, Oregon was hired as the projects public involvement consultant following proposal reviews and interviews. JLA brought significant experience and guidance to the process. In addition to helping develop a variety of outreach tools and assist in the planning and development of the public involvement plan, JLA staff facilitated 23 Citizen Advisory and 8 Technical Advisory committee meetings and organized community events.

JLA added to their capacity through a sub-contract with Marshall Mediation. This firm brought Spanish fluency capacity to the team in addition to expanding facilitation resources. Marshall Mediation provided initial outreach and engagement with Centro Cultural de Washington County, Adelantes Mujeres and conducted Spanish-language interviews with local business owners contributing to understanding community needs and aspirations.

Advisory committees with a broad reach
The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was charged to learn about and discuss existing conditions in the community (to build a shared foundation of understanding) and assist developing and refining recommended actions that respond to community identified issues and aspirations.

An open solicitation to the community returned 141 applications for five seats on the CAC. Recommendations for appointment by the Washington County Board of Commissioners (Board) were based in part on geographic location (to ensure each part of the community had representation) and what other constituent groups an applicant could represent.

Consideration also was given to having a diverse mix of voices and community perspectives represented on the advisory committee. Specific organizations were invited to participate in order to form a committee that could more fully represent the diverse Aloha-Reedville community.

In addition to the community members at-large, the CAC ultimately included:

- Cities of Beaverton and Hillsboro Chambers of Commerce
- Aloha High School
- CPO6, CPO7 (CPOs are the Citizen Participation Organizations that represent districts in Washington County primarily outside of the cities – although some overlap occurs)
- Faith-based organizations
- Centro Cultural de Washington County (Latino/Latina community non-profit)
- Adelantes Mujeres (Latino/Latina training and business development)
- Aloha Business Association
NEW! Leave space for the new people
The Board was initially asked to leave four additional At-Large positions vacant on the CAC. The intent was to fill those positions with representatives of organizations or social service providers from historically under-represented communities as they became engaged in the process.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) represented service providers, the adjacent cities, school districts, active transportation advocates, and partnering county divisions and departments. These participants reviewed existing conditions to ensure their accuracy and provided refinements to ensure that outcomes were realistic and achievable. Several of the agencies and organizations are responsible for some of the actions coming out of the process.

NEW! Engaging those that engage others
To achieve the goal of providing meaningful engagement with historically under-represented communities the project team first convened two best-practices roundtables (one with county-wide and one with regional representation.) Participants represented organizations and agencies with demonstrated success engaging communities which don’t typically participate in planning efforts. Key points from the discussion highlighted the need to build relationships and engage those members of the communities that could act as “trusted connectors” within their community (they may be considered leaders in the community or have extended connections throughout the community.) The best-practices roundtables summary is attached as Appendix 1.

A Portland-based non-profit, the Center for Intercultural Organizing (CIO), was contracted to help with the outreach and engagement efforts. CIO had demonstrated success engaging traditionally under-served communities in Portland and Beaverton planning efforts. They also had connections to many of the non-profits already serving the Aloha-Reedville Area. In addition Centro Cultural de Washington County, a well-recognized agency serving the needs of the Latino/Latina population in the county, was contracted to assist with outreach, materials development, and meeting facilitation.

Together the two agencies conducted over 600 one-on-one interviews in Spanish, Somali, Arabic, and Vietnamese. The first-of-its-kind effort brought forth new voices to the planning process providing more than 1800 comments.

Building upon this success, CIO developed a coalition of non-profits under the banner Aloha Unite. Each non-profit received up to $8,000 in grant funding to support participation efforts and pay for costs for focus groups and engagement workshops. The grants included the responsibility to engage constituents in planning discussions and provide feedback.
The Aloha Unite coalition included:

- Centro Cultural de Washington County (providing additional outreach capacity)
- Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)
- Organizing People, Activating Leaders (OPAL) – developing leadership and advocacy training
- Community Alliance of Tenants (CAT) – representing low-income and renters rights
- Oregon Somali Family Education Center (OSFEC) – developing leadership and assimilation
- Adelantes Mujeres – family education and small business development (focus on Latina businesses)

NEW! Involving faith-based organizations

In addition to the best-practices roundtables two other roundtable discussions were facilitated by the public involvement consultants involving 19 faith-based organizations which serve the area. The roundtables were opportunities for faith leaders to discuss the current state of activities in the area (beyond their faith services), explore partnerships, and provide perspectives to the planning process. These meetings also served as launching points for future collaboration among the faith communities.

The faith-based organizations participating were:

- Aloha Christian Church
- Beaverton Bahai Center
- Bethlehem Lutheran Church
- Cooper Mountain Presbyterian Fellowship
- Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon
- Faith Bible Christian School
- Journey with Jesus Christ
- Life Church
- Love Inc
- Oregon Area Jewish Committee
- Reedville Presbyterian Church
- Faith Center – Aloha
- Family Bridge Shelter/Inter-Faith Hospitality Network
- Inter-religious Action Network
- Islamic Society of Greater Portland / Human Rights Council / Bilal Mosque
- St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Parish
- Unitarian Universalist Community Church of Washington County
- Vision Action Network

Coordinating with these organizations also provided additional outreach opportunities to broaden community engagement efforts.
**NEW! Leadership and Capacity Development**

In addition to engaging community members CIO worked to develop leaders that can stay engaged in the Aloha-Reedville study and future processes by conducting a three-day leadership training course.

More than 25 participants learned about basic planning processes and how multiple government jurisdictions provide services. They were invited to a Board of Commissioners meeting and learned how to provide testimony or public comment (and had time to meet with a Commissioner to better understand the Board’s role.) The first-ever training resulted in 11 graduates one of which became a co-chair for CPO6 (the primary Citizen Participation Organization for the study area.)

The CIO Public Engagement Report and Community Feedback Reports are Appendix 2 and 3. The Centro Cultural de Washington County Engagement Report is Appendix 4.

**NEW! Aloha High School students – leaders and community members of tomorrow**

The Aloha High School (AHS) staff members were valuable contributors to the process. In addition to hosting many of the community outreach activities and public events AHS staff provided a number of opportunities to engage high school classes in discussion and exercises relating to the future of their community.

More than 220 students participated in discussions regarding issues in the community, desires for the future, and assisted in prioritizing many of the proposed actions that may address those issues and future desires.

Younger students (and their parents) were engaged in activities through other community events such as classroom visits at Reedville Elementary School, Annual Children’s Festival at Echo Shaw Elementary, Feria del Nino, Living La Vida Healthy at Reedville Elementary, Kinnaman Elementary Children’s Day, Aloha Centennial Celebration, Concerts in the Park, Aloha Farmers Market, Reedville Church BBQ, Aloha Library celebrations, and other community events.

Aloha High School Early Childhood Development Program students also provided assistance during community wide events through children’s activities and supervision at open houses.
Under supervision of their high school program director, these students gained experience as well as participating in the planning effort.

NEW! Go to the laundromat
The project team hosted more than a dozen community events inviting community members to attend at schools and faith institutions and more than 900 community members attended over the term of the study. Also effective was going to where the community gathered. Project team members many community events and meetings with active organizations. Team members attended more than 35 Citizen Participation Organization (CPO) meetings and 29 Aloha Business Association meetings.

The team also sought out opportunities to join the community at high school football games, back-to-school nights, concerts in the parks, farmers markets, faith facilities (attracting parishioners after services), community library events, annual community celebrations (Aloha Days, holiday bazaars and health fairs) and Home Owner Association meetings. Even more engagement was conducted through neighborhood coffees and intercept surveys at apartment complexes, markets, and a most unusual (but effective) location – laundromats.

NEW! Establish a baseline of understanding of the community
Aside from generating an existing conditions report, it was necessary to understand the communities’ values, the level of trust in working with government agencies, and to identify issues and aspirations.

Riley Research, a nationally-recognized leader in public surveys, was contracted to conduct a Statistically Valid Random Sample Survey at the beginning and end of the study. Complete reports including verbatim responses are included as Appendix 5.

Statistically Valid Random Sample Survey
This type of survey is conducted in a manner that provides a high level of confidence that the responses represent the community’s opinions within an approximate 5% error rate. Riley Research’s approach is based on nationally recognized methodologies.
Two questions in the surveys provide insight into community trust:

*To what extent do you think Washington County listens to the thoughts and ideas of area residents like you?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 Baseline Survey</th>
<th>2014 Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listens to an extent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does not listen much or at all</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / refused</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent do you believe your thoughts and ideas impact decisions in Washington County?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 Baseline Survey</th>
<th>2014 Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have an impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have not much or no impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / refused</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears from these responses that three-years of extensive community engagement efforts did not significantly change community opinions. Slight increases in the first question’s “Listens to an extent” and in the second question’s “Have not much or no impact” responses fall within the margin of error.
The second survey asked many of the same questions and was intended to gauge any change in awareness of the project, opinions regarding the process, and perspective on the ability to influence decisions. A list of attributes was provided to the respondents to assess issues from “Very Important” to “Not Important”. Following is a comparison graph of the two surveys.

**Question Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1g</th>
<th>Q1j</th>
<th>Q1k</th>
<th>Q1e</th>
<th>Q1b</th>
<th>Q1d</th>
<th>Q1l</th>
<th>Q1h</th>
<th>Q1i</th>
<th>Q1c</th>
<th>Q1f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>A vibrant economy and local jobs</td>
<td>Education opportunities</td>
<td>Housing you can afford</td>
<td>Reducing traffic congestion</td>
<td>Safe and convenient access to transit services</td>
<td>Access to shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public safety was a top priority for most community members. However the term “public safety” is broad and required reviewing verbatim responses to better understand how it was being interpreted.

Based on the responses the majority defined public safety as lack of sidewalks, street lights, and to some extent bike lanes – all transportation related connectivity issues. These issues also were reflected in Q1a and Q1d responses and often heard comments from most of the community engagement efforts.

A few of the responses referred to personal safety such as criminal behavior or gang activity. These also were referred to in Q1l. (These responses were provided to the project’s partners at the Washington County Sheriff’s office to alert them to community concerns.)

Another interpretation was identified through the engagement efforts with historically under-represented communities. Public safety was defined as health concerns in rental housing. This feedback directly influenced the decision to move forward with a Housing Maintenance Code recommendation as a project outcome.
Tools that engage
Throughout the public engagement process staff and consultants retained flexibility and openness to new ideas and approaches. (JLA Public Involvement’s contract directed that each year the public involvement plan would be reassessed and changes made to reflect what was learned in the previous year – this led to considerable changes in approach and tools used.)

NEW! One successful engagement tool was creating an 18 square foot aerial map of the study area. The map attracted attention and provided an interactive way to talk with community members about their neighborhood and then broaden the community discussions.

NEW! Other tools offered opportunity to learn about planning while also considering how transportation, housing types, and job locations all affect the community. One of those tools was developed by JLA Public Involvement – Meetings In A Box. This tool allowed community members to invite neighbors, friends, and co-workers to review a topic area; housing, transportation or economic development and have materials, topic questions, maps, a video, and a pre-paid response questionnaire to provide feedback to the project.
NEW! Another approach was the BUILT game. This planning exercise allowed attendees to consider how their street develops with homes (and possibly stores, offices, etc.), then combines several “streets” into a neighborhood and ultimately combines several “neighborhoods” into a community. The game forces tough conversations about community needs (for instance, where a waste water treatment facility might be placed) and how individual household needs relate geographically and impact other residents in the community overall (no one seems to want the treatment plant next door to their home so the group has to work together to find more reasonable solutions.)

The BUILT game was conducted in English, Spanish, and Somali with outcomes and explanations for placing different community elements captured by game facilitators.

Traditional solicitation approaches also were used in this process including:

- The project website maintained on-going comment opportunities throughout the process
  - Comment boxes in English and Spanish
  - Online mapping application that allowed comments to be provided at a specific location
  - Contact information for the project management team
  - Project email (used extensively by the community)
  - Online open houses (materials from community events posted along with response mechanisms)
- An interested parties list was kept for periodic updates and notices
- Keypad polling was used during the second phase of prioritizing actions and
- English and Spanish comment cards were available at every community event and advisory committee meeting.

More than 30 individual interviews were conducted with key stakeholders. In the latter part of the process, much focus was put on those stakeholders that may enhance business opportunities such as developers, commercial property owners, investors and realtors.

NEW! Respecting advisory committee members – they’re volunteers

This project was a three year process and it was recognized early on that the volunteers who make up the Citizen Advisory Committee were going to be asked to make an extended commitment to this effort. The project team attempted to accommodate the significant amount of information
they would receive and consider over the course of the project. In an effort to respect volunteer time and effort the project team worked to:

- Provide committee members with indexed binders to insert meeting materials and track information
- Provide meeting materials at lease a week in advance (although not always successful)
- Provide a complete set of printed materials at each meeting
- **NEW!** Maintain and provide updated table of meeting topics and significant milestones with each meeting materials distribution (for quick reference back to materials and discussions over 23 meetings)
- Identify and support an alternate for each appointed committee member (36 meetings is a lot of commitment that sometimes can’t be met)
- **NEW!** Continually updated “Reference Rack” – small literature rack with copies of planning and community related articles/reports/white papers for members to take away and consider
- **NEW!** Video “check-out” – community planning related DVD’s were offered on a rotating basis to help build a more informed understanding of planning issues and approaches
- Name tents
- Food served on linen tablecloths – white linen tablecloths were used for the food and refreshment tables.

**NEW! Contextual translation**

Many of the materials developed throughout the project were translated into Spanish. These materials also were posted to the Spanish language page on the project website.

Because planning in general is conceptual and in particular this project was so multi-faceted it was necessary to go beyond verbatim translation and use sources that translated the materials contextually. Two local firms were used for printed materials. Simultaneous Spanish-language translation was provided at several community events. In addition members of Aloha Unite provided small group translation in Spanish and Somali at some events.

**Print and online engagement**

Project information, including documents, maps, meeting announcements, and more was shared on the project website which was updated regularly throughout the three-year process.

The project website included multiple ways to allow public input including comment forms, interactive maps (visitors could post site-specific input), and contact information for the project team and project managers.

**Public engagement success is in the eye of the beholder**

The public involvement plan was initially drafted and offered to several groups for review. Reviewing organizations included the Committee for Citizen Involvement (a steering committee facilitated by Oregon State University Extension Office staff as the overarching committee for the CPO – Citizen Participation Organizations in Washington County.)

Review opportunity was also provided to: CPO6, the primary CPO in the Aloha-Reedville area; Metro staff (the regional planning agency that provided initial funding); the Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities (now known as the Office of Economic Resilience – the U.S.
Department of Housing and Urban Development that manages Sustainable Communities grants); and the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT-FHWA) grant staff.

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS

Measuring performance
A number of performance measures have been considered throughout the process. For instance, *was there an advisory committee and did it represent a broad number of potentially affected groups?* The answer is yes. Between the citizen and technical advisory groups a large number of community organizations, geographies, traditionally under-served communities, and partner service providers were represented.

Was there meaningful participation by historically under-represented communities? The answer is a qualified yes. Communities were identified and specific effort was made to engage and solicit feedback. Meetings were conducted at convenient locations within the study area (churches, locations along transit), translation was provided to ensure good communication, and materials were translated into Spanish (with additional translation provided by some of the CIO staff and Aloha Unite members.)

The second part of meaningful is related to the quality and influence of feedback. For the most part feedback received from historically under-represented communities was similar to that received from the broader community. Collectively that input provided guidance to the development of recommendations that will enhance the future livability of the community.

In some cases feedback from a specific community group resulted in immediate efforts by project team members or partners (other service providers) to address those issues directly. For instance concerns with law enforcement were noted by members of the Latino and Somali communities. The Washington County Sheriff and staff worked directly with the community to begin to address those concerns and this connection will allow discussions to continue in the future.

In other cases concerns from community groups elevated actions as recommendations in the final plan. For instance recommendations to consider a Housing Maintenance Code and work to develop a more robust education on landlord-tenant laws were were elevated after low-income households asserted that these were significant concerns for their communities.

*Does the advisory committee accurately reflect the demographics of the community?* Not directly. The Citizen Advisory Committee was predominantly white and older than the community at large. (Averages over the process: 56 years old, 67% male, 82% White, 15% Hispanic, 2% Asian, 20 years live or work in the community.) However with the addition of representatives at the table, especially those who serve the Latino community, the potential for outreach and engagement closed the gap somewhat (overall community is younger and 22% Hispanic.)

The Citizens Advisory Committee was offered quarterly evaluations of the process. A snapshot of evaluations follows from eight quarterly surveys. Survey questions were asked on a scale of 1 – 5 (5 being highest.) The following table provides percentages of total responses rated a 4 or 5.
Survey questions: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Did you have enough information to participate effectively? 75 86 91 92 100 100 82 90
Was information accessible? 83 79 82 77 100 100 55 80
Were meetings worthwhile and did good ideas come out? 83 93 82 97 83 88 82 80
Were your opinions listened to and used? 92 93 100 92 100 100 55 80

(Each survey included at least 1 response rating performance at 2 or below.)

Similar demographic and evaluation surveys were conducted at many of the community-wide events (open houses and workshops.)

Generally attendance at public meetings was similar to the CAC demographics, mostly Caucasian and older than the community in general. The series of events held in October and November of 2013 included more targeted community events as a result of CIO’s efforts. A snapshot of those events follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aloha High School</th>
<th>Westside Church</th>
<th>Reedville Elementary</th>
<th>Portland Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average ages</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average gender M/F</td>
<td>21/79%</td>
<td>28/72%</td>
<td>35/65%</td>
<td>28/72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self identified with Disability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>W-100%</td>
<td>W-21% H-64% German - 14%</td>
<td>W-77% API-11% H-11%</td>
<td>W-54% Somali-16% H-14% Middle Eastern- 4% Native American- 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glad I participated</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had enough information to participate</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of my time</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a better understanding of the process</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My input is being understood and used</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Did the public involvement effort reach a balanced audience?**  
The following table provides demographic information from a number of outreach efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Largest group</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>50-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Average</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender F/M</td>
<td>51/49</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>59/41</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>58/42</td>
<td>64/36</td>
<td>33/67</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity/Race % White/Hispanic</td>
<td>11/67</td>
<td>74/13</td>
<td>59/na</td>
<td>57/21</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>93/4</td>
<td>94/NA</td>
<td>0/100</td>
<td>90/7.5</td>
<td>70/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home: % Own or Rent</td>
<td>68/32</td>
<td>66/29</td>
<td>68/32</td>
<td>68/32</td>
<td>100/0</td>
<td>91/9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13/87</td>
<td>91/9</td>
<td>62/38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because reporting is voluntary, the data provided on the previous page is approximate and in many cases may not equal 100 percent. (Information that wasn’t obtained is indicated by NA.)

Data gathering is from the following activities, events, or groups:
1. Center for Intercultural Organizing and Centro Cultural de Washington County surveys
2. Riley Research Statistically Valid Random Sample Survey number two
3. October, 2012 community event
4. October – November, 2013 community events
5. June, 2011 open house
6. May, 2012 open house
7. January, 2012 Blanton Street neighborhood event
8. Meetings In A Box responses
9. Citizen Advisory Committee (averaged from eight surveys conducted over 23 meetings)

An overall assessment indicates those participants who provided demographic data trend a bit older then the largest census group (under 40 years old), represent fewer whites and more Hispanic community members than the census group and have slightly higher home ownership then the census. Additional extensive data is available on the project website.
It is important to note that the sample size is small relative to all those who participated in events, workshops, meetings, and/or provided comments through online opportunities, comment cards, or directly to project team members.

LESSONS LEARNED

Lesson: Making public engagement processes better
Every public involvement effort can be improved. The project team continually sought suggestions regarding who isn’t involved and why? Was there information that wasn’t understandable? How could outreach be improved?

Several hundred suggestions were captured. Many suggested more one-on-one interaction, better education on what government is responsible for (and what may be the community’s responsibility), holding more meetings in more places and at different times of the day, and an ever-increasing list of who else should be brought into the process.

All of the information gathered provides additional awareness for future projects and all with the intent of reaching more people in more ways and with more understandable information.

Lesson: Set clear expectations when asking complex questions
Governance is a complex and over-arching policy-level component of this project. Finding a way to ask meaningful questions about governance options and receive reliable and actionable responses from the community was one of the major challenges of this project. The project’s attempt to ask the community about governance options demonstrates some of the difficulties inherent in asking complex questions as part of a larger planning project.

This project focused on a large, urbanized, and unincorporated community. Input received about delivered service needs and desires ranged from “I’m happy with the services I get in my community” to “we need representation at decision-making tables to protect the future of our community” [paraphrased].

Questions about deciding on a future governance structure were introduced by some residents early in the process. Some residents suggested that the decision about which jurisdiction will govern these communities should be decided before determining community-identified needs and aspirations. The project team, with support of many CAC members, opted to work with the residents to articulate community goals before bringing in the question of which, if any, governance structure could best meet those goals.

The project team chose to ask about governance on a very general level and use responses to help determine the most appropriate next steps. The general intent was to identify possible trends that would inform specific outreach and community education regarding possible annexation, incorporation, and other potential governance options.

Following is the approach included in the January, 2014 Statistically Valid Random Sample Survey:

Four realistic options are available to the community:

1. Remain status-quo and accept that improvements will happen gradually over a long timeframe
2. Create one or more additional county service districts focused on specific types of improvements
3. Annex to the adjacent cities (an agreement exists between the cities and county)
4. Form a new city.

Participants were told that all three options besides the “do nothing” would incur some additional taxes or fees.

Each governance option involves a complex series of choices and possibilities. Survey respondents were informed that creating additional service districts could be coordinated between the community and the county. Annexations and/or forming a new city are essentially community-initiated possibilities and require much grass-roots effort, time, and resources.

The following graph shows the survey responses. Clearly there is no strongly preferred approach – so what did the survey results provide?

Survey responses indicate that 70%+ of respondents would like (and are willing to pay more for) some change. The outcome may not have provided a clear direction but it does provide some insight into the communities’ objectives.

Did this approach yield useable results? These survey results, considered in conjunction with public comments received throughout the process, provide a better understanding of some of the underlying issues, concerns, and community-identified benefits of annexation, incorporation, forming service districts, or remaining unincorporated.

Survey results provide more clarity and direction for the county and partnering jurisdictions to move forward. These results also indicate a significant need to educate the community about the details and differences between these potential governance options.
Making a definitive governance recommendation for this community was not one of the primary goals of the Aloha-Reedville project. When the community and partnering jurisdictions asked for more direction regarding potential governance, the project team worked to simplify an extremely complex issue enough to elicit a sufficiently meaningful response that stakeholders could strategize possible next steps (such as city outreach to discuss benefits of annexation, or county education regarding service districts). Survey results provide some direction for next steps, so this was a reasonably successful effort.

However, this does illustrate the need to establish clear expectations as early as possible in the project about any complex questions that the project is seeking to answer. The attempt to provide sufficient background information and education to allow meaningful, definitive, decision-making on complex issues such as governance requires significant time and resources. If an answer to a single complex question is one of the goals of a planning process, that must be articulated early—and that question should remain a primary focus of education and outreach efforts. Unless the project has a very large budget, it is probably unrealistic to attempt to address multiple complex issues. A great deal of education is necessary to understand complex questions such as governance—especially when the project aims at broad engagement including residents who are have not engaged in planning processes before.

Lesson: Engage early and often

While engagement efforts through Centro Cultural, CIO, and other community-based groups was successful in bringing a huge number of new voices into the project, these partners were brought into the process during the second year of the planning project. As a result, the majority of the data-gathering and development of the Existing Conditions Report was complete before a detailed engagement plan specifically targeting historically under-represented communities was developed.

The intent of the project team was to engage Centro and CIO to collect data related to community concerns and aspirations, as well as proving feedback about possible recommended actions for future improvements. However, project staff underestimated the amount of time and effort necessary to bring new partners up-to-date on the scope, scale, and limitations of a county planning project in an unincorporated urban area. If CIO, Centro, and the other community-based groups (CBOs) participating in Aloha Unite had been engaged earlier in the process, it would have provided more time for project staff to bring partners and outreach staff up to speed on the project. This would have resulted in better and more in-depth outreach strategies and community feedback.

In addition, bringing key CBO partners into project team meetings for a significant portion of the process would have been extremely useful. CBO staff was often not fully aware of details of project timeline, overarching project strategies, and practical limitations of county services. In addition, engaging CBO leaders in project team meetings would have increased CBO ownership in the planning process.

Lesson: Simplify administration

Engaging CBOs to perform outreach was also more time-consuming and challenging than project staff had anticipated. Many groups lacked staff and resources to allow organizations to efficiently enter into contracts with Washington County. Washington County’s procurement process requires that organizations have an established Tax ID number and W-9, as well as Commercial General Liability, Worker’s Compensation, Auto Liability, and Professional Liability insurance coverage. Waivers can be requested to reduce or eliminate some insurance requirements, but a Tax ID and
Commercial General Liability is required for all contracts. CIO was able to identify six organizations with sufficient structure to enter into capacity-building contracts (though all groups required insurance waivers and one group acquired Commercial General Liability specifically to allow participation in this process).

In addition to challenges in executing contracts, CBO invoicing was more time-consuming and difficult than expected for both the CBOs and Washington County. Many small organizations were not accustomed to providing detailed documentation for staff hours and expenses, and project staff spent a significant amount of time reviewing invoices and requesting documentation and corrections before CBO invoices could be paid. If CBOs could have been engaged and paid with a significantly-simpler invoicing structure—or, ideally, with simple lump-sum grants that did not require additional documentation for payment—this would likely have allowed for smoother working relationships and done more to strengthen new partnerships.

**Lesson: Work with partners to develop simple, understandable, and culturally-appropriate basic education materials**

The majority of planning processes seek to convey complex and technical information to the public in a way that allows for meaningful discussion, development of realistic and achievable aspirations, and meaningful decision-making by community members. This is challenging under the best of circumstances with informed and engaged participants with strong background knowledge making fairly straightforward decisions.

During the Aloha-Reedville planning process the project team engaged with many residents who had never participated in a planning process before. Many residents were unaware that they lived in an unincorporated urban area rather than a city and frequently had little or no understanding of how (and through what organization) their services were provided and paid for. Many community residents—as well as some of the local partner organizations—did not have a clear understanding of the differences between city services and county services or the legislative and policy challenges inherent in providing urban services in an unincorporated urban area.

In addition, many of the community members engaged by the CBOs participating in Aloha Unit were not native English-speakers and many had limited education. Of the 415 community members surveyed by CIO and the CBOs, 62.4% were not born in the U.S., over 50% had incomes below $30,000 a year (and over 70% had incomes under $45,000 a year), and 43.9% had a high school education or less. These community members need significantly more basic education and assistance to participate meaningfully in the Aloha-Reedville process than anticipated—virtually none of the outreach material developed early in the process was understandable to most of these new participants.

Although Washington County worked with CIO, Centro and the CBOs to revise existing material and utilize new outreach methods, these new materials could have been more effective if they had been developed earlier in the process thereby giving new participants more time to receive basic education on governance, service provision, financing, etc. As much of the basic information (e.g. simple governance overviews, basics of planning processes) will be substantially the same for any number of planning projects it would likely be very beneficial for Washington County to develop standard basic educational materials.

It would also have been valuable to work more closely with CIO in developing leadership curriculum and training materials much earlier in the process. This could have resulted in more effective training materials and allow leadership classes to be completed much earlier in the process.
THE TOOL BOX

Following is a brief description of unusual engagement tools used in the Aloha-Reedville project including the cost to develop them and a short explanation of their perceived effectiveness (or opinions suggesting how they could be improved.)

**Project Area Map**

18’ x 18’ photo

Cost $1,000
Scale is sufficient to identify homes and cars.

Supplier:
Color Technology Inc., Portland

Map is a floor-grade display material and was used in school gyms, classrooms, as well as parking lots, and meeting rooms.

Used more than two dozen times, it was a significant draw at every occasion.

Conclusion: excellent return on investment – used in each phase of the project to show study area and locations for recommended actions.

Supplier contact: [www.colortechnology.com](http://www.colortechnology.com)

**Meetings In A Box (MIAB)**

MIAB is a self-facilitated community discussion tool designed and produced by JLA public involvement consultant.

Included was a self-mailer for return of maps with notes and/or questionnaire completed by attendees. Feedback on project website also was an option.

Cost approximately $23,000
Consultant generated the MIAB design, templates for materials, video production and DVD development and managed feedback. Materials (and video) created in English and Spanish-language versions.
MIAB materials allowed groups to discuss housing, transportation, and business support (or two or all of the topics.) Each discussion was intended to take about 1.5 hours and was introduced through video narrations by subject matter experts.

Participants were provided maps of the study area to provide geographically located suggestions, questionnaires to capture the key points of groups discussions, and an option to go online and provide feedback. Materials could be sent to any group via mail or downloaded from the website.

Conclusion: an excellent tool that was under utilized. This was an interesting approach to allow self-guided discussions with neighbors, families, and co-workers. Announcements regarding the availability of the Meetings In A Box were made through newspaper articles, paid advertising in local business publications, e-mail blasts to interested parties list, presentations at CPO6, Aloha Business Association, Citizen and Technical Advisory Committees, and on project website.

This tool was vastly under-utilized but still considered a valuable engagement effort that also provided educational opportunities for increased community understanding of planning.

Supplier contact: www.jla.us.com

BUILT Game
The BUILT game is an inter-active place-making exercise for use by groups of 6 to 24 participants.

Created by Sojourn Theater, Evanston, IL.

Cost $16,000

Sojourn Theater representatives provided customized game pieces, game boards, iterative game development, and full-day training for staff and community-based organizations (who would eventually lead game play.)

Participants start with a “home” piece, and are given four additional “pieces” to place along their street (they must make decisions such as having a bar next door, or a park, or another element provided to them (they don’t get to make free choices – they work with what they’re given.) Once they have their street planned, they join with five other “streets” to create a neighborhood. Here they have opportunity to discuss the layout and can make a very limited number of changes.

From there, participants are asked to select a few elements from their neighborhood and join another six participants to create a community. Again they are provided specific community
elements like business centers, industrial centers, railroads, sewage treatment plants, multi-family housing, retail, entertainment, parks – all of which need to be integrated with their “homes” and select neighborhood elements. All this is accomplished through facilitated discussion among participants with the facilitator providing some guidance.

The game was played in English, Spanish, and Somali with the discussions and outcomes captured. The discussions are especially important to project planners to assess how decisions are negotiated. Negotiation styles ranged widely from mutually supportive to taking positions.

Conclusion: a valuable tool to educate community members about planning basics and engage them directly with each other to make the choices underlying community planning.

Supplier contact: www.sojourntheater.com

Superball Voting
An interactive “voting” exercise effective with high school students.

Designed and facilitated by JLA, the public involvement consultant.

Cost: Less than $100

JLA devised a tactile approach to allow students to vote on a series of recommendations using plastic containers and super balls to cast votes.

Each student was provided eight super balls and asked to select from a large number of recommendations to show their support.

Super balls were counted and tallied for each recommendation and discussion followed to illuminate decision making processes.

Conclusion: a fun and effective tool to engage participants with both a tactile approach and force prioritization among a number of potential choices. The follow-up discussion also proved valuable to understand why choices were made.

Supplier contact: www.jla.us.com
Sometimes it’s the small things – tools you may already know

**Word finds**
Project oriented puzzles.

Project staff created multiple word search puzzles at varying degrees of difficulty for community events. Puzzles were produced at display size (30” x 40”) and letter size for children’s activity tables.

Cost: cost of paper

These were very effective at drawing attention to a project table at a large community event. Adults would engage with staff or their friends and family and because the words were project oriented it provided opportunity to discuss the project.


Conclusion: fun tool and the price is right.

**Periodical rack**
Useful for advisory committee to provide relevant background materials.

Cost: $25 Store Fixtures Supply (used)

Conclusion: cost efficient educational benefit for citizen advisory committees and at community events.
Part of a project branding effort which also addresses public input for community identity.

Cost: Approximately $1,300 for 1,000 “I am Aloha, I am Reedville” and 500 “Yo soy Aloha, Yo soy Reedville”

Design and production provided by JLA, public involvement consultants.

Window clings were used at community events, as part of the Meetings In A Box, and at workshops.

Community response indicated they were well received. They began appearing on business windows around the area.

Conclusion: A useful tool to build project awareness and community identity.

**Project T-shirts**

A project branding effort.

Cost: $570 for 56 t-shirts.

T-shirts were given to Citizen Advisory Committee members and project team. They were intended for use at community gatherings and presentations to draw attention to the project. They also were used as incentives to provide feedback at events.

Design and production provided by JLA, public involvement consultants.

Most CAC members understood the goal and participated by wearing the t-shirts and engaging others in discussion. A few members refused to wear them and didn’t agree with the branding effort.

Conclusion: A useful branding tool. This could have been more effective if the CAC was provided opportunity to discuss project branding and especially if that discussion had occurred early in the process. The t-shirts were well received by the community (with requests to obtain one.)
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The Aloha-Reedville Project Team thanks the following participants for sharing their time and experiences to contribute to more meaningful engagement with those community members who do not normally participate in planning efforts.

**Roundtable Participants:**

- Carmen Caballero Rubio, The Latino Network
- Dawn Hanson, Masters Program for both Public Health and Urban Planning, Toulan School, Portland State University, IAP2 Scholarship Grantee
- Pei-Ru Wong, IRCO (Immigrant and Refugees Community Organization)
- Oleg Kubrakov, IRCO (Immigrant and Refugees Community Organization)
- Afifa Ahmed-Shafi, City of Portland, Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI)
- Jeri Williams, City of Portland, Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI)
- Tara Sulzen, 1000 Friends
- Jeanna Hall, Clean Water Services, IAP2
- Connie Ozawa, Director Toulan School, Portland State University
- Mike Dahlstrom, Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation, Long Range Planning
- Stephen Roberts, Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation, Office of the Director
- Kimberly Armstrong, Washington County Department of Housing Services

**Facilitators:**

- Jeanne Lawson, JLA Public Involvement
- Dena Marshall, Facilitator, Marshall Mediation

**Staff present:**

- Stephen Roberts, Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation, Office of the Director
- Kimberly Armstrong, Washington County Department of Housing Services

*In memoriam: Afifa Ahmed-Shafi, City of Portland, Office of Neighborhood Involvement*
ROUNDTABLES SUMMARY AND BEST PRACTICES

Outreach and engagement of historically under-represented communities is a significant challenge to government-led planning and policy efforts. One such effort is the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, a project to identify improvements that the Washington County (Oregon) planning and housing services departments could make to enhance the livability of an urban unincorporated area. A full project description is available at: www.co.washington.or.us/alohareedville.

Two expert panel roundtables were convened in fall of 2011 to help identify successful approaches used by agencies and organizations within the county and the Portland metropolitan region. Both roundtables were facilitated, two-hour discussions asking participants about key attributes for success and describing engagement failures and challenges.

Roundtables Purpose:
- Identify successful outreach and engagement approaches
- Identify unsuccessful techniques and describe why those efforts may not achieve desired outcomes
- Address challenges to engaging historically under-represented communities

Key Points

Questions for the county-centric group focused on specific opportunities that could be used in the Aloha-Reedville Study. The regional panel responses were more generalized, however the two panels arrived at many of the same directions.

1. **Understand the community.** Don’t assume you know what that particular community’s issues are, how they should be engaged, or how questions should be framed. Ask them. Bring them into the initial discussion about the project, what it means to their lives and how they would like to engage.

2. **Build long-term relationships.** As Jeri Williams noted; enter into discussions with the intent to build a life-long relationship. Project specific engagement can occur only after an initial level of trust and respect is established. Be open to change – relationships

3. **Be very clear and follow through.** Be very honest and articulate what is being asked of a community, why it is being asked, and how that particular community’s input will be incorporated into the process. Identify what benefit the community’s involvement will provide back to them. Jeanna Hall noted, it takes a very long time to build trust and it only takes a minute to lose it.

4. **Identify Leaders and Connectors.** These are two different approaches to building relationships. Leaders may be from organizations or agencies that are typically asked to represent a particular constituency. They are often in high demand and may serve the representative function very well. Connectors are those who know the intricacies of the
community and have multiple connections. They are valuable in another sense that they may have broader reach within a community. If both leaders and connectors are available, ensure there is coordination and consistency in their messages and actions.

5. **Build capacity.** Part of relationship building is providing education and tools to a community. These actions support the community’s evolving capacity to engage with their governments in meaningful ways. More input from a broader spectrum of the community results in better informed decision-making.

6. **Recognize the different lenses.** Be cognizant of the perspectives the project team is bringing to a project. That “lens” through which community engagement is viewed may be much different than the community’s to be engaged. Be able to “step into their shoes” to better understand their perspective. Be open to broadening your lens as well, this is a growth opportunity for all involved.

7. **Time.** Effective engagement of historically under-represented communities is time intensive. Planning for successful involvement requires time to build relationships, a commodity not typically available in many processes.

8. **Incentives.** Much of the work needed to engage historically under-represented communities is done by non-profits and citizen organizations (including school groups). These groups are often understaffed and need support (funding or other cost-saving incentives) to allow them to participate.

9. **Show appreciation.** When considering a community-wide event, demonstrate your appreciation for their time – provide interpreters, have food available (this is an opportunity to invite communities to bring culturally influenced foods to share and build broader diversity awareness), provide child care (consider opportunities to build leadership skills with age-appropriate activities) and present information in a variety of forms (text with contextual translation, pictures/illustrations, maps, games/activities, surveys/discussion groups, and/or performances among others).

10. **Contextualize translation.** Word-for-word translation is often ineffective in relaying the intent and content of planning projects (which are often difficult to understand in English). Work with reputable translation firms, and/or organizations that work directly with target communities to ensure the appropriate context and clarify questions to be meaningful to the community. When working with presentations – spend time with the translator before hand so that simultaneous translation isn’t word-for-word but can be reframed for better understanding.
Meeting summary of Regional Organizations/Agencies

The second roundtable was convened October 4, 2011 at Portland State University. Ms. Jeanne Lawson, principal of JLA Public Involvement, facilitated the discussions. Ms. Lawson posed a series of questions to the panelists. Following are the questions and summarized answers.

**Question 1: What is the single most important rule when trying to reach constituent populations?**

Oleg Kubrakov/IRCO: To work with the Slavic community (specifically Russian) the rule is - speak Russian. You can’t reach the Russian community without a good knowledge of the language; it is such a different culture with so much history of interaction with the government.

Pie-Ru Wong/IRCO: You must have passion to do the work – this work is about relationship building and changing the community. You need to recognize there is a strong potential to make changes in people’s lives.

Jeri Williams / ONI: Ms. Williams agrees with Ms. Wong. As a Native American and Oregonian, her observation is that people don’t always know where others are coming from and what their backgrounds are. This work is relationship building. You can’t look at this work as project-by-project – instead you need to consider building lifelong relationships in community.

Afifa Ahmed-Safi / ONI: Self-awareness and self-examination – acknowledge the lens through which you view the world (and consider all the factors that will affect those perspectives). Relationships are transformative ways to broaden the lens. For example the term “Hard to reach..” - If I were one of the “hard to reach” I wouldn’t see myself that way. Consider even the terms we use.

Christina Scarzello / City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: As the East Portland District Liaison (new way to engage communities), she has learned that the city has not been doing a good job of public involvement – especially with historically under-represented communities. As a planner for 17 years, Ms. Scarzello thought the bureau was doing a good job as required by law. Her rule: think about community engagement as an education process for community. Different communities have different relationships with the government – based on where they are from. Many may not trust governments compounding the challenges in reaching out to them. She is currently working on bureau’s revised public involvement manual.
Tara Sulzen /1000 Friends of Oregon: Ms. Sulzen asks what’s the value proposition you are asking of the community? What is purpose for them to come to a public meeting? What is the promise? What’s at the other end of the process? Without a clearly defined intent and return on the public’s efforts the outcomes will fall short of expectations.

Dawn Hanson / PSU student and 2011 IAP2 scholarship grantee: Ms. Hanson agrees with the relationship building and suggests reaching out to organizational leaders that work within the community’s day in and day out and understand how to interact on a personal level.

Carmen Caballero Rubio / Latino Network: Equip the community with the tools and skills to participate in decisions that affect their lives. Consider what capacity the community has and doesn’t have. Acknowledge if they don’t have expertise or capacity then determine how to assist them in acquiring it. ONI has done that well working with local community-based organizations. Partner/invest in those organizations.

Jeanna Hall / CWS / IAP2: Ms. Hall noted that it takes a long time to build trust and about a minute to lose it. Be genuine, be yourself, and it helps to gain trust. Listen and learn from the community. The real challenge is developing and retaining trust.

Connie Ozawa / Director, PSU’s Toulan School: The idea of public involvement and bringing in all groups that share space is a key to sustainability. Referring to Ms. Ahmed-Shafi’s discussion of lens, it’s not just “hard to reach” groups, but labeling any community member/group. What do we really know about the people living in this [any defined] space. Be sensitive to who is there. (Ms. Lawson noted that this issue has been discussed in many of PSU’s programs. Ideally we shouldn’t have to use labels.)
Question 2: What are the big screw-ups? Classic mistakes agencies make reaching historically underrepresented?

Ms. Caballero Rubio: Make sure when you engage a targeted community – don’t just pick one person as representative of that constituency. Recognize that there is a history and regionalism that exists within groups (diverse groups are diverse themselves). Staffs tend to go to one known “gatekeeper” and rely on one or two individuals (that may/may not be truly representative). On the community side – community members then also don’t feel they have equal access / opportunity.

Ms. Scarzello: That applies to all community engagement. One person assumes roles that may not be accurate.

Ms. Williams: That one person may be viewed as “sell out” to community/ co-opted.

Ms. Williams: About notices that go out: direct mail (beautiful documents) much of the information may not be understandable – translation is not direct word for word. Example of one form that said (in English): if you don’t speak English bring your child with you to translate. What languages do you need? Translate contextually for those groups.

Ms. Wong: Presentation/forums: Use simple language to explain what is going to happen at a “community forum” – will there be opportunities to speak, participate in small groups, or just listen? If you know organizations that work with those communities – use them to co-design and contextualize. It may be as simple as reviewing the presentation to assess understandability.

Ms. Sulzen: Different community forums are unclear about what is going to happen. Be clear about what type of information will help the planners/decision-makers? For example TV hwy capacity – recognize that it’s over capacity but what does it feel like? What does it sound like? How does it impact members?

Ms. Scarsello: Getting usual suspects: not getting people from the community that don’t normally show up – may be threatening. So how can you meet with a group that is more comfortable – community space, someone’s living room? Learning that traditional forums are not attractive – be creative with resources – figure out where it’s comfortable [safe]

Ms. Williams: Don’t assume if you have a meeting with a community and they shake their heads, don’t assume that it means they agree with you – quite likely it is respect and not personal intentions. Ask if approaches will work with target community – for instance, art may be very important to the community but that community doesn’t see it as a government function.

Ms. Lawson: This goes back to asking community to help design engagement.

Ms. Ozawa: Thinking about failures and successes is very tricky. One of the big failures had to do with communication tools used – the forms that planners communicate with (tables, flow
charts, maps, lots of text). Many people don’t think like that. For instance laying out a map and asking where are important places to you? – Consider having the people draw the map. However depending on the group – may not want a meeting – may need to solicit info in a different way.

**Ms. Lawson: Successes – What are tangible examples of things that have worked?**

Mr. Kubrakov: One more negative part – allow part of a meeting to talk about negative parts. Slavic community members are white (so look like norms – but 150,000 Slavic members in Portland/Vancouver). Historically when Slavic members came here over the last 50 years – nobody cared about us – so why now? Historically rely on church so separation of government/church is not clear. Also historically in Russia government promises but never delivers – here it looks like the same. Example Portland Plan – Slavic representative worked with Portland PDX vision for 10 years and none of that input was brought forward.

A lot of people have to understand a new culture – parents can’t help as there is little knowledge about programs (unlike in Russia). Slavic community was not included in school reports – why? Example: a parent is called into school to address an issue – very concerned because of mistrust – don’t want trouble with government – scared.

Working with Slavic community is hard – must work with leaders.

Ms. Lawson: Previous work identified churches as a way to reach African-American communities but got push back from Russian community to not use churches. But you are saying that is different now – that churches may be a way to reach the community? Mr. Kubrakov – yes.

Ms. Lawson: Could be an evolution of trust-building.

Ms. Scarzello: Small focus project in SE Portland – (one-year timeline/budget) – learned you need time to reach community and build relationships. Got a late start on this project – traditional approach wasn’t working such as focus groups with Latino group – didn’t work.

Thru East Portland Action Plan – contacted members who offered to help with outreach to community. Got a small grant to fund assistance – got support to contextually translate previous survey – focused questions/ simplified/ added photos to supplement questions to determine what is important. Worked well, but took extra time/resources. Trying to build that into future efforts.

Ms. Lawson: Goes to IAP2 principles of engaging the community. In the process design and shaping questions.

Ms. Scarzello: Technically easier because this was a small project. It was called a pilot project.

Ms. Sulzen: Attended many conferences where public involvement best practices are discussed – usually leave frustrated because typically a session will focus on one new tool. But have heard opportunities to partner with businesses / respected institutions. There is not much trust with
government in unincorporated areas, as it is not seen as representative local government. Also identify leaders in communities – but also organizers, who make things happen and what can you offer them (Aloha has students for example that can go into their neighborhoods to ask questions). Identify not just who is representative – but who is can reach other people.

Ms. Williams: Challenge with identifying community leaders is that they become in high demand and don’t have time to work with constituents. Connectors are good resources. (Aloha – Pastor Jeff Strictland – Friday night community meetings following provided meals – have meeting afterwards talking about subjects such as importance of staying clean and sober.) Trusted navigators/connectors may be okay to use but won’t translate well.

Ms. Caballero Rubio: Need to balance leaders/navigators. Acknowledge that many of the organizations are non-profit and have capacity issues. Organizations have to pick and choose. Local government needs to invest to pay for resource time.

Ms. Lawson: Comes up a lot in public involvement plans about compensation for groups. Challenge is whether paid engagement for advocacy groups may dilute trust in outcomes. Thoughts?

Ms. Caballero Rubio: Goes to mission of organizations you are working with. It may not make sense to go to an advocacy group whose mission is not aligned. There may be only one or two organizations serving community in a small area like Aloha.

Ms. Williams: Cully neighborhood redevelopment – now that prosperity is coming to the community that it is for the benefit of the residents not to gentrify and force existing community members out. Plan for turning coal to diamonds. Beginning to recognize that gentrification will/could displace. Those are difficult conversations.

In civic education – begin by defining roles of different levels of government. Helping explain who does what is beneficial not just to immigrant but to all community members. Build capacity. Education is a two-way street – opportunities to build rich/rewarding relationship.

Ms. Lawson: Gentrification is no longer an unintended outcome. What does that look like in Cully?

Ms. Williams: Currently working with Verde to understand how to discuss these issues. How to discuss with planning departments and community – how to keep populations in place while making improvements.

Ms. Hanson: Tony with Verde has been involved for a long time – so this is bottom up, how would that translate to a top-down process like Aloha.
Ms. Lawson: Project or tool that is notable?

Ms. Ahmed-Shafi: Worksheet on website: what is your goal, what value is being brought to community? What value is community bringing to your process? Doing homework – what are express priority/needs of community? Specify community. Worksheet walks through steps. Time, capacity is needed. Classic mistake is treating public involvement as a sidebar. Portland neighborhood system is 30 years old – established relationship but still challenges with representatives. Aloha is new relationship – not going to get same results as a 30 yr old relationship.

Bringing organizations into process - build more institutional partnership.

Mr. Kubrakov: Involve community. Don’t forget to have a different approach for each community. It is impossible to address all communities in the same way. Make specific effort – learn culture – then consider outreach. For Slavic community you have to know the language.

Ms. Wong: Know more about communities. Coalition of Communities of Color report discusses Multnomah Co. communities. Important to do homework first before approach – understand basic needs/issues first. Take time to talk to people and understand their concerns. Approaching someone with a question to list something (like community contacts) is not useful. Logistic part is essential like providing bus tickets, childcare, food, interpretation, show appreciation and respect.

Ms. Hall: Complimented the City of Portland for events – adding fun, appreciation of regional distinctions.

Eryn Deeming Kehe: The following are chart packed notes from this discussion:

- Don’t assume you know anything
- Connectors –
  - Building relationships (takes time) Ms. Williams: who am I going to build a lifelong relationship with?
  - Following through on a promise – being clear about what you are asking people to do and how it will be used and following through.
- Capacity building – incorporating education and providing tools; compensating non-profits, build partnerships.
- More input makes better decisions – inclusiveness
- Engaging target populations in designing focus and building process as well as outreach
- What are you asking of the community that is important to them? (Ms. Williams– example is Vision PDX transition to Portland Plan – community provided thousands of comments that weren’t clearly brought forward.)
- Clearly understand your lens, separate from those you are trying to engage
- Embracing your un-comfortability
- Be transparent, be clear (including explaining how changes in political changes influence of plans)
- Continual evolution: community changes, issue change, leaders/decision-makers change. No process is final.

**Ms. Lawson: What would you like to try that you haven’t had opportunity?**

Ms. Scarzello: Work with youth – Photo Voice style – use photos instead of language. Use tools (technological and other tools)

Ms. Williams: Running for city council – try from a different level

**Audience questions:**

Jim Gladson, Berger Abam: Talking to the kids: Slavic population in east Portland – quite frequently had conversations with 10-yr olds about serious issues. It was uncomfortable. What role should kids play in helping educate parents? Mr. Kubrakov: Use interpreters, go face-to-face, problems with children – shouldn’t use them to translate context (could you trust them to explain grades?) Go to non-profit agency, not putting the burden on the kids.

Ms. Caballero Rubio: Burdens children to carry the message, they don’t have the maturity, context to translate. Government should have that responsibility to provide sufficient resources/opportunities.

Ms. Wong: For some communities have to respect power dynamics. For some it is the elders that need to buy-in first. Also, don’t embarrass parents by having children appear to be smarter. Consider engaging activity to lead discussions.

**Ms. Lawson: Samples to launch from?**

Ms. Williams: If using interpreter – find time ahead so that it is not simultaneous word-for-word which may not translate well or at-all.

Ms. Caballero Rubio: To capture youth voice – instead of childcare – use that time for leadership program for children (at the appropriate level). Don’t need to be complex but explains.

Mary Rose Navarro, Metro Sustainability Center: How do I pick that person to build lifelong relationship with? What if every government entity is out there? How to coordinate opportunities and share (don’t have to ask same questions over and over with same community members?)

Ms. Ahmed-Shafi: Discussed with public involvement advisory committee. Hold occasional public involvement brown bags to share, open to all city agencies. Trying to figure out how to share best practices among city staff.

Mike Dahlstrom: Acknowledge IAP2 opportunities.
Ms Sulzen: Similar to Metro public involvement audit and revised efforts. Lots of opportunities.

Ms. Caballero Rubio: As opportunities come open – think about the community being served, think about resources and hires that reflect those communities. This brings credibility to work.

Meeting summary of County Organizations/Agencies

The first roundtable was convened September 26, 2011 at the Peppermill restaurant in Aloha. Ms. Dena Marshall, Marshall Mediation (and a subcontractor to Jeanne Lawson/JLA Public Involvement), facilitated the discussions. Ms. Marshall posed a series of discussion topics to the panelists. Following is a summary of the discussions.

1. Roundtable Purpose:
   - Discuss panelists goals for the project's engagement and communication
   - Discuss the best ways to reach historically underrepresented communities in the area
   - Find out who the Aloha-Reedville Study should be talking to
   - Discuss efforts the panelists already have underway that could benefit Aloha-Reedville

2. Welcome and Introduction - Dena Marshall

Maria Loredo from Virginia Garcia Medical Clinics noted that there are many Hispanic and Somali families from the Aloha-Reedville area served by the Beaverton Clinic. She lived in the Aloha area for two years when she first moved to the area. She added that the area has changed a lot, specially the traffic, congestion, and an increase in accidents.

Anna Wendt from Willamette West Habitat for Humanity informed the panel that five of the 12 projects in the Aloha-Reedville area represent families from SE Asia, Somalia, or that are Hispanic. Leon Taylor added the first Habitat project was in Aloha twelve years ago.

Julie Webber, DAVS, specializes in aging services; citizens 60 and older. She informed the panel that accessibility, access to services and transportation, street lighting and signage are all issues that she sees in the Aloha-Reedville area. There will be an influx of seniors in the next five to twenty years and the needs of the aging population must be forecast and reviewed. For example the size of signage
should increase for easy visibility she is concerned with the aging population she has seen in a panic trying to use the limited crosswalks to get across TV Highway in manual wheelchairs while balancing groceries and packages.

Dagoberto Cerrud from Centro Cultural is a resident of Aloha. He sees problems for the Latin groups living in the area. He noted that streets needed more lighting and sidewalks.

Kathleen O'Leary, HHS, encourages looking for opportunities to engineer for a healthy community. Where people live, work, play and get around in their environment. Many issues affect a community; tobacco use, lack of good nutrition, opportunities for good exercise, safe access to sidewalks connections and transportation. Crossing major streets in Aloha-Reedville is an issue.

Ms. O'Leary states there is no sense of "there" in the community. She stated it was important to work with the schools and use them as an environment to start building. The Aloha-Reedville community comes together around its schools.

3. Best ways to reach historically underrepresented communities in the area

Ms. Loredo suggested to reach underserved groups in the community, you must know the normal avenue of communication for the group and how information is accepted. The community must be made aware of what is going on in order to have an opportunity to get their input. Once a group is gathered, it must be clear why they have been brought together. She suggested starting with community gathering spots. Post meeting and project information at churches, meeting centers, stores and laundry mats. She noted that there is a large Latino population on TV Hwy near Harvey's Marine and the Somali population frequents the Asian Health Center on Allen Blvd in Beaverton.

Ms. O'Leary volunteered that HHS works with small groups of Somali women and children to improve child nutrition. She suggested giving HHS postcards and signage that they could distribute when they connect with people. If they were provided a map, surveys, on-line information and a little training, they could assist making a connection with the community.

Recent families to the area have less access to electronic avenues than long-term residents. Residents have email accounts and use computers at libraries with the help of their children. They may do electronic surveys, some have already asked, but also keep written surveys.
Several panel members agreed ethnic newspapers and mailed materials and printed materials have not been effective. Focus groups have worked well.

The panel suggested finding out where people are concentrated, meet, shop and do business. Post meeting notices at places the community meets. On flyers note if they can win prizes, if daycare is available, and if live translation will be provided. Raffles are big with seniors and Hispanic citizens.

Ms. O'Leary suggested an intercept survey. HHS staff could be prepped to ask a short list of questions. If staff meets with a small group of residents, they could ask 3-5 questions and take advantage of unexpected opportunities.

4. Long Range Planning work is technical. How should be planning and growth be discussed?

Ms. Loredo suggested hitting them in them in the "heart strings". These groups want the best for their children; healthy and livable communities. Go to the schools, parent meetings, and migrant education programs. You must go to them. Childcare is an issue and having food is good.

Stephen Roberts added that we must ask them what the future community could look like and how they would like it to look for their future. The people are going to make the community what it is for the future. A grass-roots level of reaching the community is important.

The panel suggested using Virginia Garcia Health Clinics, Head Start, HHS, and other groups and organizations already in the community.

Information and questions must be simple and hit home with them. Re-phrase technical information into a context the community will understand. Where do you see yourself in twenty years? Where do you see your kids in twenty years? Do you feel safe with your child in the park? Is your child safe walking across the street? Do you want better roads? Do you want a more affordable place to live?

Mr. Taylor noted that since Ms. Wendt has started working at Habitat, they are doing much better with their outreach. Simplifying the message was a big factor in the improvement. Keep the message simple up front and add more information once the initial message is understood.

Ms. Webber stated that sending a personal invitation and reminder shows the community that the event is real, you really want people there, and you want input from the community. It was important to get the teachers involved. The teachers could reinforce the message and remind parents of events.

Ms. O'Leary suggested using "Trusted Navigators" with the community; WIC workers, home nurses, Centro Cultural, URCO, Loaves & Fishes. For example; the Loaves and Fishes center
manager could educate the drivers when there is information to be distributed. When the drivers drop off a meal they could let the client know there is a survey being dropped off with the meal and they would be picking it up the following day.

5. Who should the Aloha-Reedville study be talking to?
Schools are central to the community. The panel strongly suggested starting in the schools. Prioritize and start at either the high school or elementary school level. Teachers and the minority student associations can take the information to the parents. Schools have multi-generational connections with the community. Start with the principals; most principals in the area are very hands on. The panel volunteered there is a concentration of minorities in the elementary schools. Families with kids in the elementary schools will be in the community longer and often they have older children.

The Faith community, including the inter-faith alliance, was the second recommendation of the panel. People gather at churches and most churches have separate services for different languages. Meet with church pastors to discuss the Aloha-Reedville Study and any materials such as flyers and surveys that may be brought to a discussion with members of the congregation. Make arrangements with the church pastor to provide cookies and punch for a meeting with the congregation after services. The pastor and A-R Project Team can talk for a few minutes about the project, ask for comments and ideas, and encourage surveys to be completed.

Mr. Cerrud noted that most agricultural workers attend Spanish services and are mostly unavailable during periods of nice weather except for their attendance at worship services. Mr. Taylor noted that Habitat has had mixed results with outreach at the Mosque at 160th and TV Hwy. He added there are many families in the area and suggested it would be good to meet with the Imam.

Panel members suggested working with non-profits, going to homeowners association meetings, cultural celebrations, sports activities (soccer leagues), and other places the community may gather. Mr. Taylor cautioned to watch for cultural sensitivities in written materials and activities.

6. How should the Aloha-Reedville Study reach the historically underserved?
Members of the panel suggested using trusted navigators, groups and organizations that the community already sees and trusts. Trusted navigators would include: URKEL, Centro Cultural, the Asian Family Health Center, Bienestar, Washington County (Housing Services, DAVS, HHS), other housing organizations, HHS outreach workers, Food Banks and pantries, and Community Action Network (CAN).

To expand the reach of the project and build awareness, communication must be in the language that you are trying to reach. Materials must be in that language and there must be someone who
speaks the language to discuss the project and answer questions. If necessary, find an intermediary to make translations that are community friendly.

People don't have land line phone service any more, there is a high usage of smart phones in the area. Cell service can be intermittent with service better at the beginning of the month than the end of the month. Smart phone applications should be considered.

Use ethnic media where possible. KATU has a Spanish language service, Univision, the Asian Reporter, and any social media sites that can be partnered with the project.

7. **Are there opportunities for the Aloha-Reedville Study to partner with efforts the panelists starting or have already in place?**

Ms. Loredo stated the Beaverton Virginia Garcia Clinic has many patients that are Aloha residents. The clinic could give out flyers or questionnaires.

The panel was asked to consider helping build awareness through their own social media channels, web links, newsletters, Facebook pages, and tweets. The Aloha-Reedville Study could partner with any social media sites such as a Facebook page sponsored by the Aloha Business Association or the Aloha Library Association.

The message a partner would be asked to share would be simple. Tell what is going on and how it affects the community. Inform the community what will be happening for the next three years. Let the community know the project team can come to them for opportunities to discuss the study and answer their questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Know the normal form of communication used and how information is accepted for the groups you are trying to reach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reach the community in places they gather, shop, work, do business, and recreate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review committee guidelines and suggest changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Discuss how the Aloha-Reedville Study Area boundary was set.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

The Aloha-Reedville Study was a three-year planning effort to lay the groundwork for an enhanced quality of life in the community and addressing future growth.

The study's goal is to find ways Washington County can work together with the community to:

- Support job growth and enhance the community's prosperity
- Maintain and increase housing options affordable to everyone in the community
- Improve auto, public transit, freight, bike and pedestrian options.

According to the 2010 Census, 23% of Washington County’s population is non-white and 1 in 7 residents are "foreign-born. The Aloha-Reedville population is even more racially diverse than Washington County overall, with 30 percent residents of color. The percentage of Latino/as in Aloha-Reedville is double that of the Portland Metro region. Communities of color have historically been underrepresented in planning efforts—where decisions on housing, transportation, land-use, economic development, and public infrastructure quite literally shape their lives and impact their ability to thrive.

The Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan provided an opportunity for robust engagement on issues of the built environment. Recognizing a need for authentic, inclusive public involvement, the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan team made a concerted effort to try a new and innovative approach to outreach: directly contract community-based organizations representing immigrants, refugees, and communities of color to conduct culturally specific engagement.

A secondary but equally important goal of the project was for contracted community-based organizations to increase underrepresented groups’ ability to participate in current and future planning endeavors. Community involvement methods employed were designed to serve as catalysts for increased civic engagement, capacity, and organizing ability within communities of color for years to come.

The following report summarizes community-based organizations’ civic engagement work within these populations.
Project Goals

Center for Intercultural Organizing was contracted to conduct public engagement in immigrant and refugee communities and communities of color for the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community plan, and to manage the involvement of six other community-based organizations. Internally, CIO and community-based project partners developed a set of five goals to guide our work and foster long-term community involvement beyond the study’s timeline and scope.

**GOAL #1: Involve Community Members**
Project partners’ primary goal was to involve Aloha-Reedville area immigrants, refugees and people of color in the creation of the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, so that it would reflect their priorities. Community members’ participation in the areas of housing, transportation, economic development, and land-use would ensure that the resulting action plan expresses their values and is truly “owned” by the entire community.

**GOAL #2: Organize Cross-Culturally**
Rather than organizing in ethnic silos, CIO’s engagement process ensured organizations and individuals worked across cultures and built lasting relationships. Experience has taught us that cross-cultural organize is a necessary step in developing the community’s ability to advance proactive public policies that improve the lives of immigrants, refugees, and people of color in Washington County.

**GOAL #3: Train New Leaders**
In addition to providing ongoing opportunities for leadership development within the project itself, CIO and community-based organizational partners trained emerging leaders through a structured leadership development series of three full-day workshops. New leaders acquired the skills and shared analysis necessary for collaborative action, and they put their training into practice throughout the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan and, later on, within other Washington County leadership positions.

**GOAL #4: Build Organizational Capacity**
Funding from Washington County and technical assistance and support for CIO provided community-based organizations some of the needed capacity to meaningfully participate in the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan. Opportunities for organizational cross-training (e.g., Community Alliance of Tenants providing renters’ rights workshops and OPAL Environmental Justice providing transportation equity workshops) enabled organizational partners to learn about issues and topics outside their...
area of expertise, strengthening a collective knowledge base. As a result, the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan created a coalition of organizations representing immigrants, refugees, and people of color poised to implement prioritized strategies and actions within the identified areas of the plan.

**GOAL #5: Ensure Equity**

In the current economic climate, funding for government projects is challenge and getting harder. At the federal level, many programs, particularly for housing, have suffered significant budget cuts over the past few years, and some may be in danger of losing funding completely. Cognizant of this reality, project partners felt it was even more critical to ensure that equity is a clear and explicit criterion within the plan’s action items, and they continuously provided feedback on the plan utilizing an equity lens.

**Overview of Community Engagement**

Over the past 13 months, CIO and partners developed and obtained surveys, conducted community options focus groups, held informational community-building events, met with community leaders, canvassed neighborhoods, and provided leadership trainings to reach diverse communities utilizing culturally specific organizing techniques to surface issues, challenges, and solutions for residents living in the Aloha-Reedville study area and to build support for the project. These methods reached over 1,200 community members in hard-to-reach populations. During the engagement process, CIO and partners did not come across one resident who had previously heard about the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, demonstrating the need for and value of our involvement strategies.

**Coordination with Mainstream and Government Partners**

In addition to conducting culturally specific engagement, CIO worked with consultant JLA Public Involvement and the Washington County project staff to ensure underrepresented communities’ participation in mainstream community involvement activities. Through regular meetings with public involvement partners, we were able to anticipate translation needs and to adapt materials for culturally relevancy.

CIO and partners also attended and actively participated in the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan’s Citizen Advisory Committee meetings, reporting on
engagement activities and findings (refer to Appendix D for media coverage). This helped project partners align their public involvement efforts, stay apprised of project information, and coordinate upcoming activities.

**Tracking Participant Involvement**

Because CIO had recently purchased a new database with a sophisticated mapping tool, the project team was able to track where participants lived. Clusters of residents identified in our database helped CIO track apartment communities with high numbers of immigrants and refugees. This information was subsequently utilized during the course of our base building work, particularly when “cutting turf” during canvassing (see Appendix B for a screen shot of the CIO database).

Through the database, CIO could also create events and track attendance. This system permitted us to evaluate the continuum of involvement by participants—from first contact through leadership development—over the entire 13 months of the project.
PHASE I PROJECT ENGAGEMENT

Because the Center for Intercultural Organizing entered the engagement process at the end of Phase I of the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan—after the Existing Conditions Report had been produced by the Washington County project team and the first round of engagement had been completed—CIO first focused on creating a multi-lingual survey that could be widely distributed.

Survey results would then be analyzed and included in the background materials for the study and, in combination with previously received comments, used to develop community options.

Survey Development

CIO chose to utilize a survey methodology that employed two qualitative open-ended questions to solicit narrative responses from Aloha-Reedville community members about their values and issues of concern (see Appendix A).

1. When you think about the Aloha-Reedville area, what are three things you like about it?
2. What are three challenges that you experience in the Aloha-Reedville community?

These questions were combined with additional qualitative and quantitative questions on topics of housing, business ownership, cultural inclusion, transportation, and community safety. Finally, the survey included an optional section querying detailed demographic information from respondents.

Open-Ended Questions

Unlike closed-ended questionnaires, which require respondents to check pre-selected options, the open-ended survey format allowed respondents to express whatever topics were of most concern to them in as few or as many words as they desired. The aim of this design was to glean rich and nuanced insight into community members’ thinking, as well as a wide array of concerns, strategies and ideas for change.

While some of these questions elicited responses that were outside the scope of the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan or Washington County’s jurisdiction, they provided a fuller picture of the community and offered CIO insight into potential future work for community-based organizational partners.
**Topic Area Questions**

**Housing Questions**
1. Do you? (Select all that apply)
   - Live in Aloha-Reedville
   - Work in Aloha-Reedville
   - Own a business in Aloha-Reedville
   - Go to school in Aloha-Reedville
   - Attend religious services in Aloha-Reedville
2. If you live in Aloha-Reedville, do you: (Own/Rent/Other)
3. Have you experienced any challenges finding safe housing in Aloha-Reedville? (Yes/No) If yes, what were they?
4. Have you experienced any challenges finding housing you can afford?

**Business Ownership Questions**
1. If you do not own a business in the Aloha-Reedville have you ever considered starting one? (Yes/No)
2. If yes, what kind of support would you need to start a business?

**Cultural Inclusion Questions**
1. Do you feel welcome and/or comfortable participating in public events in Aloha-Reedville community? (Yes/No) Why or Why not?
2. If you do not feel welcome or comfortable participating in public events, what could be done to change this?
3. Would you or your community use a cultural center if one were located in the Aloha-Reedville area? (Yes/No)
4. If yes, which of the following things would you use it for:
   - Meeting Space
   - Adult Education Classes
   - Citizenship Classes
   - Youth Activities / Classes
   - Social Service Resources
   - ESL Instruction
   - Cultural Events
   - Office Space
   - Culturally Specific Education Other (please specify):
5. Where in Aloha-Reedville should a cultural center be located?
6. What could be done better to engage you and your community in the government decision making process?

**Transportation Questions**
1. How do you get around from place to place? (Car/Bus/Bicycle/Walk/Other)
2. Please rate the following transportation statements on a scale 1-5
   - Safe access to transit services including bus and MAX
   - Convenient access to transit services including bus and Max
   - Reducing traffic congestion
   - Safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations
Community Safety

1. Do you feel a sense of personal and community safety in the Aloha-Reedville area? (Yes/No)
2. If you do not feel safe, what can be done to improve personal and community safety?

Demographic Questions

CIO queried participants for demographic information, most of which was self-identified. By design, this allowed community members to feel more comfortable answering personal questions. Furthermore, because many immigrant and refugee community members view the concept of race/ethnicity in a different way than US-Centric categories of race/ethnicity, their responses included responses as diverse as nationality or tribal sub-clan. CIO asked the following demographic questions:

1. What is your race?
2. What is your ethnicity?
3. What is your age?
4. What is your gender?
5. Please indicate your household's annual income: ($0 to $15,000 / $15,000 to $30,000 / $30,000 to $45,000 / $45,000 to $60,000 / $60,000 to $75,000 / Above $75,000)
6. How many people live in your household?
7. What language do you speak at home?
8. What other language(s) do you speak?
9. What best describes you?
   • I am a U.S. born citizen
   • I am a naturalized citizen
   • I am an immigrant
   • I am a refugee/asylee
   • I am an international student
   • I am an international worker
10. In what country were you born?
11. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   • 8th grade
   • High School
   • Some College
   • Associate's Degree
   • Bachelor’s Degree
   • Master's/Post-grad
   • If other, please specify:

Multilingual Outreach

Partner organization Centro Cultural translated the survey into Spanish, and four community members translated the surveys into Somali, Vietnamese, Chinese and Arabic. For two additional languages—Khmer and Nepali—surveyors translated verbally and captured responses in English. A team of eight community organizers were employed to conduct culturally specific outreach.
CIO also asked participants a last open-ended question, “Is there additional information you would like to add?” Lastly, and perhaps just as importantly, CIO asked, “Do you want to know the results of the survey? Give us your email or contact info on a different sheet of paper.” This allowed CIO to collect the names and contact information on 160 individuals surveyed who wished to stay involved with the project.

**Data Collection Process**

Many elements combined to make the survey collection process truly unique. Hiring trusted community members familiar with diverse immigrant and refugee constituencies allowed CIO to utilize organizing techniques indigenous to the communities we surveyed and ensure that the work was genuinely multicultural. Multilingual surveyors often spent time one-on-one with residents, taking time to explain the Aloha-Reedville study. Participants were encouraged to express themselves either verbally or in writing in their own language and in places that were comfortable for them. Answers were filled out by participants or by surveyors acting as interviewers in coffee shops, mosques, churches, community spaces or other “safe” spaces.

After responses were collected, the surveyors submitted them in electronic format—many times translated from their original language—to an online survey tool. Some surveys were entered directly into the online tool rather than through a paper copy, either because the community member preferred to answer electronically or because it was easier for the surveyor to sit with a computer and type the answers directly into the survey form online.
Results and Demographics of Phase I Engagement

Note: For full analysis of survey responses, please refer to Center for Intercultural Organizing’s Community Feedback Report.

During Phase I of the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, project participants collected a total of 594 valid surveys. Of those who identified their gender, 51 percent identified as female, 49 percent male (32 did not respond). The median age of respondents was 37 years old.

Race, Ethnicity, Language and Immigration Status

Respondents were 89 percent people of color, and 11 percent Caucasian (including immigrants and refugees from European countries). The majority, 67 percent, identified as Latino, not surprising considering the strong partnership with Centro Cultural and the demographics of the study area.

Respondents hailed from 26 countries of origin: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Hong Kong, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Lebanon, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Thailand, United States, and Vietnam.
Languages spoken in the home included Alaskan (specific native language unidentified), Amharic, Arabic, Armenian, Cambodian/Khmer, Cantonese, Chinese, English, French, German, Hawaiian, Hungarian, Japanese, Korean, Mai Mai, Mandarin, Mien, Nepali, Portuguese, Somali, Swahili, Tagalog, Thai, Urdu, and Vietnamese. U.S.-born residents comprised 30 percent of respondents, a number that includes children of immigrants and refugees as well as residents from U.S. communities of color such as African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans. Respondents identified themselves as 20 percent naturalized citizens, 18 percent legal permanent residents (green card holders), 29 percent immigrants, and 2 percent refugees/asylees. Two individuals were international students and three were international workers.

**Household Data**

According to the 2010 Census, the average household size in the Aloha-Reedville study area was 2.91 persons per household. Our survey respondents had an average household size of 4.38. Larger, multi-generational families are more common in immigrant and refugee communities, and 72 percent of households we surveyed contained four or more persons, compared to 29 percent of households in the overall study area.

Although respondents’ household size skewed much larger than average for the region, median income was significantly lower. According to the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan’s Existing Conditions report, median income in the study area is $57,245. In contrast, 83 percent of respondents reported an annual household income of less than $45,000, and 61 percent reported an annual household income of less than $30,000 (83 individuals declined to report income). Survey participants were 68 percent renters and only 32 percent homeowners (92 individuals declined to report homeownership status).

**Educational Attainment**

Respondents had a lower level of educational attainment compared to the general population of the study area. Only 12 percent of those surveyed reporting having obtained a Bachelor's Degree or higher compared to 26 percent of study area residents. 12 percent reported having “some college.” 30 percent reporting having graduated 8th grade, 29 percent high school, and 4 percent reported having acquired a technical degree. 6 percent responded “other” when asked their level of educational attainment. However, 109 individuals surveyed were under 25 years old, and 85 respondents declined to answer the educational attainment question.
ENGAGING RESIDENTS THROUGH GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS

Grants to Community-Based Organizations

Center for Intercultural Organizing worked with Washington County staff to develop the process, required deliverables, and timeline to support and coordinate six community-based organizations’ (CBOs) engagement in the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan. Contracted community-based organizational partners played an integral role in developing effective engagement strategies and reaching diverse constituencies. All organizational partners shared a commitment to social justice, community organizing, and policy advocacy.

Grantee Organizations Included:

- **Adelante Mujeres**—Adelante Mujeres (Forward Women) is nonprofit organization located in Forest Grove, with members in the Aloha-Reedville Study Area. The organization’s mission is to educate and empower low-income Latina women and families, providing them the tools to achieve self-determination in the areas of education and enterprise. Adelante Mujeres was chosen as a project partner due to its economic development knowledge within immigrant communities and its established relationships in Washington County.

- **Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)**—APANO is a statewide, grassroots organization, uniting Asians and Pacific Islanders to achieve social justice. APANO uses its collective strengths to advance equity through empowering, organizing, and advocating with API communities. They were chosen as a project participant in order to create engagement strategies relevant to the diverse Asian/Pacific Islander communities living within the Aloha-Reedville study area. APANO also has significant experience in equitable public policy development.

- **Centro Cultural de Washington County**—Centro Cultural was a project participant from the beginning of the Phase I engagement phase. Centro’s mission is to promote education and economic development, increase cultural consciousness, respond to community needs and celebrate understanding among the diverse groups of its community. The County brought Centro Cultural into the project due to its longstanding relationships in the area’s Latino communities.

- **Community Alliance of Tenants (CAT)**—CAT is Oregon’s only statewide, grassroots, tenant-controlled, tenant-rights organization. CAT educates, organizes and develops the leadership of low-income tenants to directly challenge unjust housing policies and practices. Its mission is to educate and empower tenants to demand affordable, stable, and safe rental homes. CAT was chosen to participate based on its expertise in housing and ability to reach lower-income residents.

- **Oregon Somali Family Education Center (OSFEC)**—The mission of the Oregon Somali Family Education Center is to provide and promote culturally
relevant services to Somali families and contribute to unique experiences to all communities through partnerships with public and private organizations. The organization is located in Washington County, where a growing number of Somali families have settled over the past few years. OSFEC was invited to partner due to its relationships within the Somali and Muslim communities.

- **Organizing People, Activating Leaders (OPAL) Environmental Justice Oregon**—OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon builds power for environmental justice and civil rights through organizing low-income communities and people of color to achieve a safe and healthy environment in which to live, work, play and pray. OPAL strives to create opportunities for meaningful participation in the decision-making that sets policy in our region. Their transportation knowledge and relationships with public-transportation dependent low income populations in Washington County made OPAL an ideal project partner.

As project partners, community-based organizations (CBOs) received small grants from Washington County to ensure deep penetration of their respective membership in effective engagement approaches. Beyond the obvious support that direct funding provides, additional capacity was built within partner organizations through building relationships, developing leaders and organizing skills, providing education on planning and the built environment, and gaining knowledge on systems change strategy.

**Relationships**

Immigrants, refugees, and people of color are less likely to build the power they need to create positive change by working in isolation from each other or from mainstream institutions. Employing a grassroots, bottom-up approach designed and led by the individuals and communities impacted by the issues, the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan connected newcomers with their government, neighbors and each other. These relationships will continue well beyond the project’s duration.

**Leadership Development and Organizing Skills**

Throughout its involvement in the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, CIO provided ongoing leadership development workshops to organizational participants and to community members. Topics included Community Organizing 101, Land-Use Planning, Environmental Justice, Government Process and more (for leadership workshop agendas, please refer to Appendix E).

**Systems Change Strategy**

Project participants gained the knowledge and relationships necessary to develop strategies for systems change. The project was designed in a way to weave underrepresented communities into policy and planning decisions, and to groom them for board, committees, and other positions where they can influence public policy.
Aloha Unite

Community-based organizational partners instituted a project advisory committee comprised CIO staff, community organizers, trusted community leaders and representatives from community-based organizations to bring unique skills, talents and multicultural perspectives to guide our activities and ensure the project’s success. In an effort to clearly market the collaboration, they created a coalitional structure named “Aloha Unite.” This strategy publicly branded the group and gave residents a sense of belonging in something larger than a community study.

**Aloha Unite Purpose Statement:**

*Aloha Unite is an alliance comprised of regional advocacy organizations with a commitment to community organizing and engaging grassroots voices in civic matters. Through organizing, outreach, education and collective action, Aloha Unite is activating leaders and involving Washington County’s diverse communities in the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan to ensure equitable outcomes for all community residents.*

Aloha Unite was officially launched during a kick-off event held at PCC Willow Creek Campus on March 20, 2013. The event was highly publicized within partner organizations through social media and Internet and on Spanish language radio. The goal of the kickoff was to raise awareness of the Aloha-Reedville study and to inform the community that Aloha Unite leaders would be engaging residents and seeking community feedback for the study. Over 120 community members and partners attended the event along with Washington County staff.

Aloha Unite partner organizations met monthly to strategize their collective engagement activities, troubleshoot issues, create leadership development workshops, and prioritize actions. Member organizations utilized existing events to publicize the study and receive feedback, organized study-specific events, mobilized their members to participate, and leveraged relationships with cultural, religious, other community and leaders to reach residents. Despite joining the public involvement team late in the process, Aloha Unite together engaged 600+ unduplicated community members over the course of Phases II and III of the Aloha-Reedville study *(for a full list of Aloha Unite activities, please refer to Appendix G).*
Web and Social Media

Immigrants and refugees regularly use social media, particularly Facebook, to communicate with their family and friends back home. Language and culture-specific news channels likewise provide connection to local and international events. Therefore, Aloha Unite commenced a robust web and social media campaign to promote the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan.

Aloha Unite partners utilized their respective organizational web sites, Facebook pages, and twitter/social media accounts to cross-promote Aloha-Reedville events. Center for Intercultural Organizing created a dedicated Aloha-Unite page on its web site, and Aloha Unite created a Facebook page for joint messaging and networking (see screenshots of these strategies in Appendix D). As often as possible, postings were in both Spanish and English.
Educational Workshops

The creation of Aloha Unite provided the opportunity for constituent members from different partner organizations to meet and begin collaborative learning. For example, Centro Cultural leaders, who had been embedded in Washington County for years, were unaware of Community Alliance of Tenants (CAT), which only recently expanded beyond Multnomah County. Centro Cultural expressed a desire to inform their members about tenant rights. The comingling of partners raised interest in topic area workshops aimed at providing cross-training opportunities. Subsequently, 16 workshops were hosted by Aloha Unite member organizations.

Renters' Rights

Community Alliance of Tenants produced three renters’ rights presentations to tenants and housing advocates. CAT organized residents at several Aloha apartment buildings and held these events in the community rooms. Participants received basic tenant landlord law information. Several attendees stayed involved with the project, providing feedback on the housing related actions.

Affordable Housing

Community Alliance of Tenants conducted two public affordable housing forums to tenants and housing advocates. Attendees obtained a basic understanding of basic housing policies and planning.

Transportation Justice

OPAL Environmental Justice provided a comprehensive curriculum for three community workshops to engage residents in a discussion and broader understanding of the intersection between transit, housing and health outcomes. These workshops increased awareness of and demand for an integrated approach to transportation that ensures equal opportunity for positive health outcomes. Participants learned to identify root causes of injustice related to affordable housing, transit access and air toxics. Aloha-Reedville attendees provided feedback on the transportation draft action items.

Economic Development

Adelante Mujeres already had a series of ongoing small business development trainings, and they invited Aloha-Reedville residents to participate in the workshops. Eight workshops were held by Adelante Mujeres on economic and business development. Those who attended also received information on the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, and many stayed involved in helping to develop responses to the plan’s draft action items.
Built Game

The “Built” game was introduced by Washington County as a way to enable community members to come together and talk about the things that are most important to them when it comes to their neighborhoods and communities. Through a series of hands-on exercises, participants identified their personal priorities and preferences and worked with others to create the best community possible. Along the way, tradeoffs and tensions are surfaced in a way that enables participants to find areas of common ground and potential solutions rather than focusing on areas of conflict and controversy. The interactive game assisted community based organizations to introduce planning concepts, present the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, and collect community feedback on the group’s built environmental priorities.

Aloha Unite leaders were first introduced to “Built” through actually playing the game, giving them the opportunity to experience this tool as community participants would. Subsequently, four Built game nights were hosted by Aloha Unite partners with 51 community members participating.

- **June 27, 2013**: Blanton Street Fire Station, 16 participants
- **July 30, 2013**: Blanton Street Fire Station, 13 participants
- **August 4, 2013**: The Spot, hosted by Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO), 12 participants
- **September 29, 2013**: Centro Cultural, 10 participants

The Built Game presented an engaging popular education method of public involvement, introducing planning to community members in a participatory way (as opposed to the more instructional method in which in a way where government officials are in front of the room in a classroom style). Aloha Unite partner organizations made a concerted effort to make these events multi-generational, and to particularly involve youth.

A successful Built game produced for immigrant and refugee communities requires the following:

1) Language Interpretation
2) Culturally Competent Facilitators
3) Knowledge of BUILT Game Dynamics
4) Controlled Environment

Language Interpretation

Because the Built game relies heavily on English words written on cards and extensive dialogue among participants, interpreting (sometimes in multiple languages) was an essential component necessary for participation. Interpreters likewise needed to be knowledgeable about the Built game and how it fit within the context of the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan. In addition, the Built game had no history of use within immigrant and refugee communities, and Aloha Unite leaders needed to bring their strong linguistic and cultural facilitation skills to the tool. Terminology generally understood by native English speakers took on different dynamics in a multilingual context. For example, “SALON” in English refers to a barber or beautician’s place of business, but “SALON” in Spanish means a place where people celebrate and have parties. The term “BOX STORE” in the game was misunderstood to be a store with boxes as opposed to its intended meaning as a wholesale big box store like COSTCO. These slight differences in terminology can affect participants’ decision making while playing the game.

Aloha Unite organizers were in a unique position to offer not only interpreting, but also the context needed for authentic engagement. Kaltun Caynan with Oregon Somali Family Education Center was able to engage her community in the Built Game by offering translation based on her experience with the game, since she participated in the first training for Aloha Unite. Without this contextual interpretation there would not have been engaged members from the Somali community.

Culturally Competent Facilitators

The Built game invitations were open to the public, so the four workshops included some native English speaking, U.S.-born participants. Aloha Unite facilitators needed to strongly monitor the environment, as native English speaking participants could easily dominate the conversations because concepts and language are more familiar resulting in reducing the opportunities for feedback from other participants who were new to the public involvement process. The involvement of U.S.-born participants produced some positive outcomes as well, as participants found that they had more in common with their neighbors than they thought. Many community members discovered similarities in their views on public safety, education and transportation. This sort of bonding allows for future cohesion between neighbors and positions them to work together on common issues. Said one participant, “They want the same thing I do! A nice place to live with sidewalks around schools and a safe environment.”

Aloha Unite facilitators encountered some cross-cultural tensions between immigrant and refugee community members playing the Built game. Facilitators needed to be competent in navigating these dynamics to allow for a safe and open space for participants where everyone’s cultural values were respected. For example, a Muslim participant did not want to have a bar close to her neighborhood because of her religious beliefs; however, a
Latino community member explained how such spaces are important culturally, and often locations where their community gathers. A dialogue commenced on cultural compromises what that space would look like in order for the Muslim member to live with it in her neighborhood. Aloha Unite’s skilled cross-cultural facilitators were able to move the conversation forward in a meaningful way which, although uncomfortable, can also result in constructive solutions.

**Knowledge of Built Game Dynamics**

The Built game is complex logistically, and facilitators needed to be trained on the process and the dynamics of the game, including how to prepare it (boards, pieces, teams, etc.) and how to facilitate the resulting dialogue. Several key elements are necessary for a Built game to be successful in a cross-cultural environment.

During the Built game, one key instructor should be designated to guide the participants through the process, giving them step-by-step instructions to ensure that the game does not become confusing. This key instructor should set the context, discuss the goal and purpose of the game, and how the information collected will be used.

For each group that is formed during the game, one culturally competent facilitator should be assigned. The facilitator’s role should be to monitor each group that is separated out in the first phase of the Built game, when each is building their respective communities. The goal of these facilitators is to monitor the dynamics in the group to ensure full participation and engagement from all participants, and also to take notes and glean from them the subtext of the conversations and values being presented during the dialogue between participants. For example, during an Aloha Unite Built game event, one participant felt that a drug rehabilitation center was important to have close within her community, so that the greatest number of people affected (those who live within residential boundaries) have access to treatment. Another participant implied that drug rehabilitation centers are full of people that commit crimes, and therefore a police station—rather than a drug rehab—should be close by. Skilled facilitators can adeptly express how common issues of concern (e.g. drug use) can be addressed differently depending on a community’s values, rather than personalizing the situation or casting judgment on the values expressed.

A minimum of two volunteers who have been trained in the Built game should be available to help navigate all of the pieces of the game. There are many tokens, cards and moving parts to this game that need to be evenly distributed in order for the game to be successful. This became difficult when Aloha Unite leaders were facilitating, providing instruction and distributing cards at the same time.

**Controlled Environment**

Aloha United hosted a Built game event in one location, which was not very conducive for such a structured activity. Held in a public restaurant during a time of the day it was not busy, the venue did not allow for a meaningful presentation. The Built game needs to
be played in a room that has no other distractions, where the directions can be clearly heard and once the game is over there is a group space to have meaningful dialogue. An open public space is also not a safe space, given that some of the sharing of values and opinions can make participants feel vulnerable. Lack of privacy can restrict people from engaging.

**Comments from Built Game Evaluations**

“Me parece bien que tengan ideas para mejorar la ciudad es bueno que alla personas que se interesen por nuestra ciudad. Gracias por informacion y que nos tomen encuenta a los Latinos.”

**Translation:** “I think that it is good to receive ideas to improve the city [sic] and there are people that are interested in our city. Thank you for the information and taking the advice from Latinos.”

“Great opportunity to work in team and see how sometimes it’s difficult to agree. My community was very worried about school and hospitals because they are important to the success of our community.”

Mi comunidad/ciudad es un buen lugar par vivir porque cuenta con servicios y esta’ equililorada cuenta con areas verdes y se ‘siente’ como una comunidad. La actividad me parecio una esopenda oportunidad de compartir ideas con otros miembros de la comunidad.

**Translation:** My community/city is a good place to live because we have services and green spaces everywhere that feels like a community. The activity is a great idea and opportunity to share ideas with other community members.
Canvassing

Canvassing—a systematic initiation of direct contact door-to-door with residents—can be a strategic way to reach specific demographics. Aloha Unite employed limited canvasses to target apartment buildings and neighborhoods with high concentrations of immigrants, refugees, and people of color in Aloha-Reedville. The multi-lingual team knocked on doors of private residences, engaging in face-to-face interactions with community members. The main purpose of canvassing was to inform people about the Aloha-Reedville study, gauge their interest in participating, invite them to upcoming events, and collect basic contact information. Secondary goals included providing volunteer opportunities to residents, offering concrete skills development training and on-the-ground practice. Lastly, canvassing increased Aloha Unite’s breadth and reach, multiplying its involvement efforts.

The Center for Intercultural Organizing worked with the Alliance for a Just Society to train canvassers then tailored the outreach to Aloha Unite. The canvassing training included components on setting goals, “cutting turf,” scouting territory, messaging, role playing, and creating and implementing a rating system for contacts.

A calculated canvassing formula exists that explicates the amount of time, number of volunteers, and resources needed to reach a targeted number of doors and contacts. Participants learned how to use this formula to create a realistic canvassing plan for Aloha-Reedville. Canvassers then learned about “cutting turf” and scouting, which considers the geographic area the team will target and its attributes. U.S. Census figures were reviewed along with CIO’s database to learn where immigrants, refugees, and people of color resided. Once key apartment complexes and neighborhoods were identified, volunteers scouted these areas to ensure the locations were accessible and appeared safe. Through this method, we learned that there are some areas that have gated communities or security patrol cars that will not allow canvassing in their neighborhoods.

When volunteers are knocking on doors, the message needs to be clear and concise. Aloha Unite created a canvassing script with crucial information about the project. Because the most important part of messaging is always how the message is delivered, canvassers spent time practicing message delivery. This practice allowed volunteers to feel comfortable and to become familiar with the diverse array of potential responses they could expect to hear from residents at the door.

Aloha Unite canvassers created a rating system for every person with which they had contact. This allowed for organizers to gauge community members’ interest on a scale
from 1-5, estimating their expected level of involvement. The rating system devised for the Aloha-Reedville canvassing was:

- 1: They verbalize that they oppose this work and do not want to be involved.
- 2: They have no interest
- 3: Neutral
- 4: Maybe attend an event and also provide their contact information.
- 5: They are allies and constituents wanting to volunteer and will participate in the study. They eagerly sign up.

Aloha Unite canvasses were held on June 13 (Aloha-Reedville neighborhoods, businesses, and apartment complexes) and on June 29 (Somali community canvass at apartment building) yielding 138 contacts. In addition, OPAL Environmental justice canvassed transit commuters at bus stops and talked with residents about their transit needs.

Quotes from Canvassers

“It was good to meet face to face and get to know the community.”

“Canvassing was something I could do with my children. It was their favorite thing to do!”

“This was my first time volunteering and doing this type of service for the community. I enjoyed it and people wanted to get involved.”
PHASE II AND III PROJECT ENGAGEMENT

Note: For full analysis of focus group responses, please refer to Center for Intercultural Organizing’s Community Feedback Report.

Shortly after Center for Intercultural Organizing and our community-based partners joined the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, the focus of the project shifted from where the community currently is to where it wants to be. Phase II included a variety of opportunities for both residents we had previously engaged and those new to the project to provide aspirations and identify alternatives to achieve them. Community alternatives were presented during events where individuals conducted electronic voting, in an online survey, and during community options focus group events hosted by Aloha Unite.

As the last and final phase concludes (Phase III), Aloha Unite partner organizations have provided direct feedback on draft actions, and they are currently considering their respective roles in action plan implementation. Collaborations between jurisdictional partners, nonprofit organizations, private sector/businesses, and community volunteers will be necessary for aspirations to become realized. Project partners are committed to continuing their engagement in coming years as the Aloha-Reedville, taking active part in the plan’s actualization.

Community Options Surveys

Electronic Polling and Online Surveys

In March 2013, JLA Public Involvement conducted a series of public forums in order to receive feedback about a number of issues facing the Aloha-Reedville area. Forum data was collected using an Audience Response System, and was provided to Riley Research Associates (RRA) for data analysis. JLA moderated four forums and managed the online survey.

Regrettably, as this effort was not well-coordinated with Aloha Unite due to community-based organizations’ late involvement in the project. CBOs has just finalized their contracts and they were focusing on the launch of Aloha Unite as well as conducting basic outreach to and training for community members. Three separate events had turnout from the constituencies we targeted. Demographic data for these forums are inaccurate. For example, OSFEC’s co-sponsored event garnered 12 surveys; however, only one participant identified as “black.” This is partly due to the U.S.-centric categories of race, and how Africans prefer to identify.

In addition to the forums, the same questions were asked through online surveys in English and Spanish. Aloha Unite member organizations directed their constituents to this survey, and more than 175 additional responses were received online (it is not known how many surveys were received from our constituencies). For the results of the March
Focus Groups

Mainstream public involvement efforts, such as the ones led by JLA Public Involvement, are less effective in reaching historically underrepresented communities without partnering with strong organizations and leaders that have trusted relationships in targeted communities. Aloha Unite partner organizations felt that their constituencies were not accurately reflected in the electronic polling and online surveys, and requested time to conduct further culturally-specific focus groups on community options. Washington County agreed to extend the timeline, if the community options focus group questions were merged with action items under development.

Focus groups were designed to inform residents of the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, explain the process to date, and involve them in the final phases of plan creation. Based on the expertise of CBO partners and on the feedback gleaned from residents in Phase I, Aloha Unite partners decided to hone in on three topic areas: housing, transportation, and economic development. The focus groups questions aimed to use the community options survey instrument as a vehicle for continued engagement and dialogue.

During the course of the workshops, trainers stressed that their feedback would not guarantee change but rather that the study embodies a collective process of identifying needs of the community that may or may not result in actions from Washington County once findings have been presented (refer to Appendix H for focus group questions).

A total of 5 events and 93* total participants provided both quantitative and qualitative feedback to the community options survey questions.

- August 13, 2013, PCC Willow Creek—32 participants
- August 23, 2013, Blanton Street Fire Station—16 participants
- August 24, 2013, Westside Community Church (Spanish)—28 participants
- September 4, 2013, Brentwood Oaks—7 participants
- September 19, 2013, Kinnaman Elementary—10 participants

* Please note that this number is approximate. For confidentiality reasons, not all participants registered their attendance or signed in; additionally, other family members (including children) were present at various events but did not participate. For the purposes of this report, “participant” refers to those individuals who provided quantitative or qualitative data, and excludes those who merely attended events without actively engaging. Due to the design of the events and the focus group format, partners were unable to collect demographic data on participants.
**Data Collection Method**

The focus group events were facilitated in three ways depending on the number of participants.

- **Large group (Willow Creek event):** Background information on the project was discussed and then groups broke up depending on the individual’s interest area in housing, transportation, or economic development. The group was brought back together and they collectively discussed topic areas, with the larger group providing additional feedback.

- **Small group (Blanton Street event):** In smaller group discussions, facilitators were able to obtain feedback from the entire group in all three topic areas (with some topics, such as housing, receiving more discussion based on participants’ relative interest levels).

- **Neighborhood focused topic group (Brentwood Oaks Event):** In large-group discussions, facilitators found that some participants wanted to have “house party” style events in order to focus in on a topic area which might impact them the most, so that they could bring these discussions back to their respective communities. For example, Constance Kosuda, an active participant of the study, helped to organize residents in her apartment complex at Brentwood Oaks addressing housing concerns and then allowed attendees the opportunity to answer the survey.

Information from the focus groups was gathered, synthesized, and provided to the Washington County project team. For full analysis of community options survey responses, please refer to Center for Intercultural Organizing’s **Community Feedback Report**.
Aloha-Reedville Community Report Back Sessions

To close the loop on public involvement and report to the community on the action items under development, Aloha Unite, JLA Public Involvement, and Washington County co-hosted two community report back sessions—one in English and one in Spanish. The events were also used to continue to gather any additional feedback which may have been missed.

- October 25, 2013, Westside Community Church, 25 attendees (Spanish forum)
- November 14, 2013, PCC Willow Creek Campus, 56 attendees

Westside Community Church Event

The first event at the Westside Community Church—focused on the Latino community—was hosted entirely in Spanish. Headsets were provided to non-native Spanish speakers. Some English-speaking community members expressed hesitancy in using the headsets, and one attendee left. There were 25 community members in attendance, with strong Latino representation. Culturally appropriate refreshments were offered, and a childcare corner enabled families to be together during the event. Some of the youth participated, providing their feedback.

A high level presentation of the study was shared, and community members were directed to move through all the ‘stations’ where action items were presented in order to get a raffle ticket. This incentive proved a good way to motivate participants to visit each ‘station’ and provide feedback. Information was gathered and then there were three door prizes given out once everyone finished moving around the action item booths.

Many of the participants were really engaged in the process, as evidenced by comments on the evaluations. For some community members, this final event was their first time participating in the Aloha-Reedville study, and for a few, it was their first time ever attending a public engagement event with the government. As one individual expressed, “I am learning things that I didn’t know about happening in my own community.”

PCC Willow Creek Event

The final community feedback event was designed to attract a diversity of community members involved throughout the entire project. Attended by 56 individuals, the event drew both U.S.-born people who had been involved in the project since the very beginning and individuals from historically underrepresented communities, including immigrants and refugees. There was strong Latino and Somali representation, and translation support was provided for these participants. A hot Mexican food dinner was served from a local immigrant-owned small business and action item boards were set up along with a large-scale floor map of Aloha-Reedville to engage people in discussion.
Washington County staff introduced the framework of the project and where it was headed for any new members in the audience, and the informed community members on how their feedback had been incorporated into the draft final action items. After this presentation, Center for Intercultural Organizing presented the basic findings from Phase I surveys, clearly demonstrating through the demographic data that communities who previously had not been engaged in government now had a voice in the process. Participants then received instructions to collect stamps at each action item booth for a door prize raffle drawing at the end of the event.

Attendees included Aloha Unite participants from the leadership workshops, canvassing, and other community events. The community report back sessions served to demonstrate to community members the larger picture and the overall results of their engagement as well as provide another chance to reflect their thoughts back to the County.
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Aloha Unite partner organizations share a common commitment to grassroots organizing, and leadership development is a fundamental pillar of this work. Training new leaders with the skills and analysis they need makes future collaborative action possible, and is an essential step to Aloha-Reedville action plan implementation. Throughout the study, Aloha Unite mentored new leaders, and found opportunities for these leaders to put their training into practice.

Leadership Training Events

In addition to providing opportunities throughout the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan for community members to gain and practice their leadership skills, Aloha Unite partners developed a structured leadership development track for community members. The series was held over three Saturdays and included 15 training hours of workshops. A total of 20 individuals attended various workshops, and 12 went to all of them (for the agendas refer to Appendix F).

1. September 9, 2013—18 participants
2. October 5, 2013—20 participants
3. October 19, 2013—20 participants

Leadership development workshops included:
- Washington County Government 101
- Utilizing an Environmental Justice Framework
- Affordable Housing
- Connecting the Pieces: The Action Plan
- Land Use Planning 101
- Influencing Outcomes: Citizen Participation Organizations (CPOs)
- Review Current Draft Action Items: Analysis and Prioritization
- Principles of Community-Based Leadership
- Organizing Terminology: Building a Shared Language
- Public and Written Testimony
- Public Speaking as a Community Organizer: A Role Play Activity
Citizen Participation Organization 6 (CPO6)

On October 3, 2013, the Chair of Washington County’s Citizen Participation Organization 6 (COP6) term ended. None of the attendees stepped into that role and with all the other open officer positions vacant, the CPO6 Steering Committee needed to address the issue.

Through Aloha Unite’s community involvement and leadership development efforts, two of our members stepped up to accept the leadership role and were voted in by acclamation. Co-Chair Constance Kosuda, a retired trial attorney and two-year Aloha resident had served briefly on the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan’s Citizen Advisory Committee and was active in Aloha Unite. Co-Chair: Damarise Davis, a paralegal and five-year Aloha resident, had been involved in the project since the Aloha-Unite kick off in March 2013.

Their first CPO6 meeting as co-chairs garnered high turnout including residents who had been attending the CPO meetings for many years and new interested residents wanting to be more involved.
LESSONS LEARNED

Center for Intercultural Organizing and the Aloha Unite partner organizations (all except Centro Cultural) were brought into the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan project a full year after the project had begun, when Phase I was essentially complete. As such, the most glaring lesson learned is to involve community-based organizations with access to historically underrepresented populations from the planning phase of the project, before engagement begins.

This highlights the challenge of working on project-specific efforts. Establishing relationships, creating scopes-of-work, and executing contracts can take up to several weeks or months to establish. Without an existing programmatic and contracted approach with a government jurisdiction, any engagement with non-profits, community-based organizations, or conveners (such as the Center for Intercultural Organizing) is unfunded. This includes the government entity’s efforts to apply for and secure grant funds to conduct the project. This leads to question of how to engage early enough to have substantial influence on the project’s public involvement design?

Many of the involvement strategies employed by the Aloha Unite team were hamstrung by the timeline, and out of sequence (for example, leadership development trainings being provided near the end of the project, the Built Game offered in the middle, canvassing for events but not for initial engagement, etc.). JLA Public Involvement, the consultant employed by the project, originally interviewed many of the member organizations eventually contracted, but those interviewed were staff, and they did not live in the Aloha-Reedville area and were unable to provide many of the responses that interviewers desired. Once JLA Public Involvement, community-based organizations, and Washington County staff began coordinating activities (near the end of Phase II), public involvement activities were more streamlined.

Conversely, while community-based organizations are experts in engaging their respective populations—and some are even subject matter experts—a project as complex and technical as the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan required two-way educational components that neither Washington County nor contracted organizations had worked into the scope of the project. Both sides, community and government, were learning along the way. The following “best practices” should be considered before launching future public engagement projects intending to reach immigrants, refugees, and people of color.

Best Practices

Contracting with Community-Based Organizations
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Engage all partners early. Because many of the partner community-based organizations were not involved in the engagement process from the beginning, a significant amount of time was spent bringing those organizations and their constituents up to speed on the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, including providing information on the study, the process to date, education around issues, the project’s framework, constraints of the outcomes, and other materials essential to their participation.

Create clear administrative processes. Government partners should work with community-based organizations to create systems for administration, including progress report templates, invoice templates, deadlines for reporting, and roles and responsibilities for contracted organizations. It also is important for the government project staff and community-based organizations’ representatives to understand the needs of both. Government funded projects have specific reporting needs and timelines, and project staff need to be sensitive to the constraints of non-profits resources to meet those requirements.

Ensure adequate CBO funding for administration. Administration of the grant contracts and organizational work plans took CIO a great deal of time. Some Federal certifications, such as Section 3 verification, took significantly more effort than anticipated. In many cases, CIO had to request HUD forms from all six organizational partners. This administration took a significant amount of time, which was not budgeted.

Delineate lines of accountability. From the point of view of partner organizations, the entity to which they were accountable was unclear. Most CBOs are used to receiving grants or contracts directly, and being responsible for reporting to the funder. In this case, the funder was Washington County, but the grant manager was Center for Intercultural Organizing. Organizations did not understand why CIO was requiring the level of reporting Washington County expected when the funds were from the government, not CIO. It would have been easier administratively to have the funds distributed directly to CIO, or for the County to have been both the funder and the entity to which organizations were required to report.

Establish communications protocol. Communication lines need to be established so misunderstandings don’t create poor morale or unmet expectations. Regular meetings between government partners and community-based organizations, not facilitated by outside parties, can greatly improve outcomes. Community-based organizations supported by CIO were expecting more direct communication with County partners and Washington County staff felt overwhelmed by the number of (very similar) requests for information coming from CBOs. Outlining procedures for communication from the beginning could have lessened this unnecessary stress.

Ensure a realistic timeline. Project timelines are often based on “best case scenarios” and do not have room for adjustment. Building in ample cushion for adjustment can be challenging to do, given deadlines and commitments to funders, but it is extremely important. When working with multiple community-based organizations (particularly
those engaging historically underrepresented communities) being flexible while simultaneously moving toward set goals facilitates authentic involvement.

**Multicultural, Cross-constituency Organizing**

**Engage grassroots organizations.** The way in which organizations connect to the community is as important as the constituencies to which they have access. While filling an incredibly valuable community need, social service agencies do not generally engage in community organizing. There are certain skills common to community organizers that are easily transferrable to public involvement endeavors (e.g., canvassing, messaging, event planning and turnout, meeting facilitation, leadership development, etc.). Likewise, partnering with organizations with aligned social justice values made forming Aloha Unite effortless. All the CBOS had strong ties within the community and when community members were approached, residents knew that their best interest was in mind, and that the information they conveyed would be truthfully represented in the study.

**Provide cross-training opportunities.** Aloha Unite organizational partners shared their skills and expertise not only with community members, but also with one another. Cross-training workshops on renters’ rights, environmental justice, land-use planning, and business development collectively increased the knowledge base of the whole group. These experiences make future joint work and potential collaborative funding proposals more likely.

**Inclusive Public Involvement**

**Develop new leaders:** Aloha Unite has helped create new civic leaders through actively engaging individuals and groups in the public involvement planning process. Additionally, the team provided structured leadership development opportunities for the most involved participants. Leadership development should be part of any public involvement project’s goals from the outset.

**Provide skilled, culturally competent facilitators.** In order to produce safe and inviting public events, ensure that facilitators are culturally and linguistically competent, skilled at listening well and moving people respectfully through discussion. Rely on the expertise and existing relationships community partners have with their constituents. They are often the best messengers to their own communities.

**Co-create engagement tools.** Involve community partners in developing public involvement tools, methods, and messages. Surveys, questionnaires, interview questions tested in the community for relevancy can provide more ownership over engagement content and methods. When professionals or government staff without cultural competency create tools that are not community-tested, unfortunate and unintended consequences can occur (for example, the window decals for the Aloha-Reedville study told Spanish-speaking residents to throw them out the window, rather than adhere them to the window).
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Meet community members’ needs. For many, civic engagement is a luxury. Providing for basic needs brings all populations more fully into public life. Throughout our engagement process, CIO often provided food, child care, translation and other amenities that facilitated involvement.

Show how community members influence project outcomes. Washington County staff did an excellent job demonstrating how specific feedback from the community was included in the action items development, when it was not, and why. This can reduce public distrust and skepticism. Involving community-based organizations and residents in implementing actions likewise fosters more trusting relationships between the public and the jurisdictions serving them.

Suggestions for Engagement Tools Used

Recommendations for the Built game. The Built game is highly reliant on English words written on cards. A pictorial version, or one with multiple languages on the cards, would better facilitate the involvement of immigrants and refugees. Language interpreting significantly slows the process and adds a dynamic of isolation to the process. Attendance should be strictly monitored, as the game cannot be played easily with more than 16 participants.

Best Practices for Canvassing. As a public involvement method, canvassing should be employed early. Existing neighborhood demographics can be used to identify targeted hard-to-reach demographics. Canvassers need to be multi-lingual, or work in teams that speak multiple languages. Canvassing with county officials and project team members would have helped elevate the importance of face-to-face conversations on the doorstep and better connect County employees to the community they are intending to reach, providing experiential knowledge to staff members, who may not live in the area.

Hosting House Party Events. Community leaders held smaller events in their homes, or in the meeting rooms of apartment complexes. At each of these events, attendees should be asked to also host an event. Those who volunteer already have knowledge of how events occur, the information presented, and the format, making it easier to train them. This was the case with Iglesias Multicultural at Westside Community Church. Max Calderon, a faith leader in the community who attended the event, then hosted an event to invite and inform members of his congregation to participate in the study. The location of house party style events not only provides a comfort level for the participants, it also enables maximum participation as it eliminates the need for travel.

Using Volunteer Leaders. Phone banking, one on one relationship building, and ongoing communications were essential for engagement to happen. Residents reacted positively to being invited to an event by their neighbors and friends, rather than by government employees, public engagement professionals, or through email. Knowing someone who would be attending created a welcoming space for newcomers.
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APPENDIX A

Community Engagement Survey

Aloha-Reedville Study & Livable Community Plan Survey

1. Do you? (Select all that apply)
   - Live in Aloha-Reedville
   - Work in Aloha-Reedville
   - Own a business in Aloha-Reedville
   - Go to school in Aloha-Reedville
   - Attend religious services in Aloha-Reedville

2. If you live in Aloha-Reedville, do you:
   - Own
   - Rent
   - Other

3. If you do not own a business in the Aloha-Reedville have you ever considered starting one?
   - Yes
   - No

3a. If yes, what kind of support would you need to start a business?

4. When you think about the Aloha-Reedville area, what are three things that you like about it?
   1. __________________________
   2. __________________________
   3. __________________________

5. What are three challenges that you experience in the Aloha-Reedville community?
   Challenge 1______________________________
   Challenge 2______________________________
   Challenge 3______________________________

6. Do you feel welcome and/or comfortable participating in public events in Aloha-Reedville community?
   a. ___Yes ___No
   b. Why or Why not?

Community Survey – Page One
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7. If you do not feel welcome or comfortable participating in public events, what could be done to change this?

8. Have you experienced any challenges finding safe housing in Aloha-Reedville?
   - Yes
   - No

   If yes, what were they?

9. Have you experienced any challenges finding housing you can afford?

10. How do you get around from place to place?
    - Car
    - Bus
    - Bicycle
    - Walk
    - Other:

11. Please rate the following transportation statements on a scale 1-5
    1=Very Important 2=Somewhat Important 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Unimportant 5=Not Important
    ___ Safe access to transit services including bus and MAX
    ___ Convenient access to transit services including bus and Max
    ___ Reducing traffic congestion
    ___ Safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations

12. Would you or your community use a cultural center if one were located in the Aloha-Reedville area?
    - Yes
    - No

12a. If yes, which of the following things would you use it for:
12b. Where in Aloha-Reedville should a cultural center be located?

13. Do you feel a sense of personal and community safety in the Aloha-Reedville area?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

13a. If you do not feel safe, what can be done to improve personal and community safety?

14. What could be done better to engage you and your community in the government decision making process?

DEMOGRAPHICS

15. What is your race?

16. What is your ethnicity?

17. What is your age?

18. What is your gender?

19. Please indicate your household’s annual income:
20. How many people live in your household?

21. What language do you speak at home?

22. What other language(s) do you speak?

23. What best describes you?

☐ I am a U.S. born citizen
☐ I am an immigrant
☐ I am an international student
☐ I am a naturalized citizen
☐ I am an refugee/asylee
☐ I am an international worker

24. In what country were you born?

25. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

☐ 8th grade
☐ High School
☐ Some College
☐ Associate's Degree
☐ Bachelor's Degree
☐ Master's/Post-grad

If other, please specify:

26. Is there additional information you would like to add?

END: Do you want to know the results of the survey? Give us your email or contact on a different sheet of paper.
APPENDIX B

Tracking Involvement – Database of Aloha-Reedville Residents

Sample: Individual Record with Meetings and Events History

Sample: Mapping Function for Contact Records
APPENDIX C

Aloha Unite Marketing Materials

Aloha Unite!
“Organizing for Prosperity”

We are Aloha Unite a Leadership Steering Committee composed of regional advocacy organizations with a commitment to community organizing and engaging grassroots voices in civic engagement. Through community organizing, outreach, education and collective action, we will be activating leaders and informing Washington County’s Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan to ensure equitable outcomes for all community residents.

Our strategies focus on Leadership Development, Environmental Justice, Research into Action and Meaningful Community Involvement. We are working with low-income families, people of color, immigrants and refugees who live, work, play and pray in Aloha-Reedville and are determined to make our community a better place to live.

Activities

- Strategy Meetings – Working together to develop inclusive feedback recommendations to Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan
- Leadership Trainings – Gaining skills to organize your friends and neighbors to work towards changes you would like to see in Aloha.
- Community Forums – Community wide forums to provide input and feedback to study goals.
- Policy Research into Action – Organize community members to hold accountability that community input is reflected.

As a community member, your voice is critical to the future development of your environment. Join us as we have upcoming community events and engage in participation.

If you are interested in actively volunteering your time please contact us.

For Information: InfoAlohaUnite@interculturalorganizing.org
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APPENDIX D

Internet and Social Media

Center for Intercultural Organizing Web Site

![Aloha Unite! Dedicated Presence on CIO’s Re-launched Web Site](image_url)
Facebook and Twitter Outreach

Aloha Unite! Kick Off Celebration!

Going (30)
- Carmen Madrid
- Carla Hernandez
- Rosa Martinez
- Gabriela Coronado
- Joseph Santus-Lyns
- Art Change

Maybe (21)
- Stephanie D. Stephens
- Jules Sarra
- Deepak Sharma
- Nelson Acienza K

Invited (620)
- Renee Jaramillo
- Andrew Riley
- Claudia Oregon
- Gabriel Price

Aloha Unite is a leadership steering committee composed of regional advocacy organizations with a commitment to community organizing and engaging grassroots voices in civic engagement. Join us to celebrate the kickoff to our work together in engaging low income families, people of color, and immigrant and refugee communities in organizing for prosperity in Aloha.

Aloha Unite Leadership Steering Committee: Center for Intercultural Organizing, Oregon Somali Family Education Center, Community Alliance of Tenants, OPAL Environmental Justice, Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon, Adelante Mujeres, and Centro Cultural.

RSVP to the event here: https://www.thedatabank.com/dpg/50/stlistproc.asp?formid=meet&calendareventid=35304

PCC Willow Creek
2775 SE Division St.
Beaverton, Oregon 97006

View Map • Get Directions

Write something...

Recent Posts

Adriana Luna Ocasio
I was a great event!!! Thanks everyone for being so nice.

Like • Comment • Follow • Post • Share • March 20 at 10:01 pm via mobile

3 people like this.

Write a comment...

Sonorees Linda was at this event — with Carmen Madrid.

CIO @CIOportland
Aloha Unite ... TONIGHT! Washington County friends, see you there!

fb.me/tW4ojGcZtU

1:46 PM - 20 Mar 13 (GMT-07:00)

Reply to @CIOportland
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Media/Press on Engagement of Underrepresented Groups

Aloha-Reedville study: area needs more sidewalks, parks and police, immigrants say

By Andrea Castillo, The Oregonian
on September 12, 2012 at 8:45 PM, updated September 19, 2012 at 3:49 PM

“A Lee este articulo en Español

Aloha’s immigrant populations say the area needs more sidewalks, parks and a stronger police presence, but enjoy its churches, affordable housing and quiet environment.

Representatives from two Washington County community groups presented the feedback they have gotten so far in their efforts to involve Aloha’s immigrant residents. Karla Hernandez of the Center for Intercultural Organizing, a Portland-based immigrant and refugee rights organization, and Dagoberto Cerrud of Centro Cultural, a Latino cultural center in Cornelius, each gave updates about their survey findings for the Aloha-Reedville study.

They spoke during this month’s Aloha-Reedville study citizen advisory committee meeting Wednesday night at the Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue North Operating Center.

Cerrud said Centro Cultural has collected 126 surveys in Spanish so far. He said many people were wary of participating at first, until they heard what their input could do for the community.

Hernandez said the Center for Intercultural Organizing has five surveyors actively out in the community. She said the survey has been translated into Somali, Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese.

Because Aloha has no real community center, she said, surveyors have been getting creative, going to places such as Laundromats, churches and apartment complexes to find immigrants willing to participate. The organization has collected about 130 surveys to date.

Wednesday’s meeting also served as a way for committee members to participate in a dress rehearsal for a workshop next month. The workshop, set for Oct. 13, will serve to identify solutions to previously defined community issues and needs. It is part of phase two of the Aloha-Reedville study plan: establishing the community’s needs and considering options. Phase three is creating a plan and phase four is implementing it.

The workshop will take place from 10 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at Aloha High School. Afterward, a party celebrating Aloha and Reedville will take place, featuring food, music and dance from different community ethnic groups.
7/9/13

On Oct. 11, leaders of the study will host a community improvement fair for those wishing to participate in the workshop to educate themselves about the needs and possible solutions. The fair will take place from 4:30 to 7:30 p.m. also at Aloha High School.

-- Andrea Castillo

© 2013 OregonLive.com. All rights reserved.

Note: This article also appeared in Spanish.
Hello Aloha: Land Use Leadership Initiative Considers Transportation and Equity in Washington County
By Mark Gamba, 1000 Friends of Oregon
Friday, May 17, 2013

It was both an inspiring and depressing tour of the Aloha-Reedville area.

This 9-square mile unincorporated area of Washington County 11 miles from downtown Portland centers on the Tualatin Valley (TV) Highway and has about 50,000 residents. According to our hosts, Mike Dahlstrom from Washington County’s Planning Department, Sunshine Dixon from OPAL, and Karla Hernandez from the Center for Intercultural Organizing, there are lots of low-income people and people of color living and working in the Aloha community.

On our drive in to the area, we saw some pitiful bus stops along TV Highway. Mere feet from the busy road, these stops had no shelters and no seats. They were very exposed, making for a really uncomfortable, unsafe place to wait for a bus. We also learned that Aloha-Reedville residents are more likely to need to have to transfer, making their transit experience that much more difficult.

We stopped at Aloha High School and met with Mike Dahlstrom, who shared a bit about the county’s Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Communities Plan.

Metro Councilor Bob Stacey discusses transportation funding as LULI participants Candace Jamison and Salim Mayberry, and Washington County Planner Mike Dahlstrom listen.

(http://www.co.washington.or.us/LUT/PlanningProjects/alohareedville/index.cfm) , a federally funded effort to create solutions for the poor transportation set up in this area.

Mike described streets without sidewalks, streets that don’t connect or are poorly connected, pedestrians being hit by cars – all this in the context of expected and planned population growth in the area. He related a horrifying tale of a woman pedestrian being hit and killed by a car and then dying un-discovered for three days in a ditch that she had fallen in to after being hit. It was really hard to imagine that happening right in the midst of heavy car traffic, regular foot traffic, and a busy Intel campus. Dahlstrom, a self-described “strong and fearless” cyclist, told us that he was terrified to ride on Kinaman Road, the road that Aloha High School is located on.

Who will be served by coming investments? One thing is for sure: there ain’t a lot of scratch to go around.

Earlier in our tour Metro Councilor Bob Stacey shared a bit about the declining revenues being generated for transportation infrastructure improvements and the highly competitive nature for getting access to those funds. (See a
Gas tax revenues are down thanks to decreased driving and increased fuel efficiency. There are $10 billion in regional projects awaiting funding from pool that ranges in the hundreds of millions annually.

So, what is to be done? The inspiring part of the trip was hearing about the combined efforts of OPAL, CIO, Centro Cultural, and the Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO). These groups are increasing the ability of local low-income people and people of color to engage in effective advocacy for their community’s transportation needs.

Yet the county’s existing conditions report and project website do not appear to provide significant detail on demographics of the area. Fortunately, a group of community-serving organizations are putting resources into listening to the community and devising solutions to meet their needs.

OPAL, Centro Cultural, and the Center for Intercultural Organizing are working together with a minuscule budget from the federal funds to engage the class- and race-diverse residents of the area. As opposed to the county’s approach, these groups are going to where the people are through door-to-door canvassing, surveying people at bus stops and using other culturally-appropriate and culturally-specific approaches to identify the community’s needs. And it’s paying off. A recent open house they held had 180 participants, far greater than the 50 that came to Washington County’s forum.

Some class and race tensions emerge here. A white resident told officials that they didn’t want another BBQ restaurant in the area. Middle income residents who own cars say the road network is fine, while low-income residents say they need better infrastructure for riding public transit, walking, and riding bikes.

This kind of capacity building serves not only the residents of the area but the county as well, as it creates an organized constituency that can demand its fair share of resources for improving infrastructure. The organizers wouldn’t say it, but I will: this kind of effort should receive the same level of funding that goes to, say, an existing conditions report that doesn’t even tell planners who lives in the area and says the same things that community members can tell you.

Between the county and these groups, there’s a great opportunity to bring together the diverse residents of this area to build the 9 miles of sidewalks missing in immediate proximity to schools and make streets safer for pedestrians. Sunshine Dixon put it best: “we’re learning to dance together and that takes a little bit of work.”

It also takes resources, and I hope to see the county put more funding into the kind of organizing and capacity-building that CIO, OPAL, Centro Cultural, and APANO are doing. I hope these coordinated and equity-focused efforts are finding favor in competitive proposals for limited transportation dollars.

Finally, we talked a little bit about how this kind of public-sector and community-based effort to address transportation infrastructure can be further bolstered by resources from organizations like 1000 Friends of Oregon. For example, 1000 Friends could provide legal or technical expertise to community groups to hold decision-makers accountable.

For LULI participants, the trip served as a neat package of “how-to’s” in land use planning: working in partnership with communities, engaging the technical expertise of community-serving organizations (and paying them), and understanding the political and funding landscape, among other instructive lessons.
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Leadership Development Training Agendas

Aloha Unite Leadership Training
12:00 pm – 5:00 pm Saturday September 21st, 2013
Washington County Street Conference Center
225 S First Ave, Hillsboro OR 97124

AGENDA

12:00 PM: Welcome

- Introduction
- Review Agenda
- Quick Overview of Leadership Training
- Ice Breaker

12:30 PM: Washington County Government 101

1:30 PM: Environmental Justice Framework 101

2:30 PM: Break

2:45 PM: Affordable Housing Workshop

4:15 PM: Connecting the Pieces and Closing

- Overview of Housing, Transportation, and Business Economic Development
- Next Training: October 5th 12:00 PM – 5:00 PM
- Day Reflection
- Evaluation
Aloha Unite Leadership Training
12:00 pm – 5:00 pm Saturday October 5th, 2013
Washington County Street Conference Center
225 S First Ave, Hillsboro OR 97124

AGENDA

12:00 PM: Reflection on Last Training
- Review Agenda
- Reflect on Last Training

12:30 PM: Land Use and Planning 101

1:30 PM: Community Feedback/Survey Summary

2:00 PM: Break

2:15 PM: Influencing Outcomes
- Citizen Participation Organizations (CPO) – Structure and Involvement

3:00 PM: Existing Opportunities
- Review Current Draft Action Items
- Analysis and Prioritization
  - Group Activity

4:55 PM: Closing and Evaluation
- Next Training: October 19th 12:00 PM – 5:00 PM
- Next CAC Meeting: October 9, 6 - 8 p.m., Edwards Center Auditorium, 4375 Edwards Place, Aloha OR
- Evaluation
Aloha Unite Leadership Training
12:00 pm – 5:00 pm Saturday October 19th, 2013
Washington County Street Conference Center
225 S First Ave, Hillsboro OR 97124

AGENDA

12:00 PM: Reflection on Section Training (Karla and Patrick)
  •  Review Agenda
  •  Reflect on Second Training

12:15 PM: Review Final List of Top 3 Priorities (Karla)

1:00 PM: Community Based Leadership (Karla)
  •  Basic Principles of Community Based Leadership

2:00 PM: Break

2:15 PM: Organizing Terminology (Karla)
  •  Building A Shared Language

3:00 PM: Public and Written Testimony (Carmen)
  •  Special Guest from Washington County Leadership: Commissioner Malinowski
  •  Public Speaking as a Community Organizer
  •  Role Play Activity

4:30 PM: Graduation (All Aloha Unite)
  •  Certificates
  •  Evaluation
  •  County Commissioner Meeting October 22nd 6:30pm Washington County Public Services Building Auditorium
  •  Spanish Open House October 25th 7pm-8:30pm at 18390 SW Farmington Rd, Aloha OR
  •  Aloha Unite Open House November 14th 6:00pm-8:30pm 241 SW Edgeway Dr, Beaverton, OR
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## APPENDIX G

### Table of Aloha Unite Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Number Engaged*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2013</td>
<td>Prospera Networking Event</td>
<td>Blanton Street Station</td>
<td>Adelante Mujeres</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/2013</td>
<td>Aloha-Unite Kick-Off</td>
<td>PCC Willow Creek Campus</td>
<td>Aloha Unite</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/2013</td>
<td>Latino Business Leadership Event</td>
<td>Blanton Street Station</td>
<td>Adelante Mujeres</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/27/2013</td>
<td>Beaverton Family Celebration</td>
<td>Dept. of Human Services</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Community Gathering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/30/2013</td>
<td>Aloha Reedville Meeting</td>
<td>Apartment Complex</td>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/2013</td>
<td>Economic Issues Workshop</td>
<td>Merlo Station Center</td>
<td>OSFEC</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/2013</td>
<td>Latino Business Leadership Event</td>
<td>Blanton Street Station</td>
<td>Adelante Mujeres</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/2013</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Workshop</td>
<td>Merlo Station Center</td>
<td>OSFEC</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/2013</td>
<td>ESPERE Program Event</td>
<td>Blanton Street Station</td>
<td>Adelante Mujeres</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/22/2013</td>
<td>Outreach Event</td>
<td>Merlo Station Center</td>
<td>OSFEC</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2013</td>
<td>ESPERE Program Event</td>
<td>Blanton Street Station</td>
<td>Adelante Mujeres</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2013</td>
<td>ESPERE Program Event</td>
<td>Blanton Street Station</td>
<td>Adelante Mujeres</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/2013</td>
<td>Latino Parent Meeting</td>
<td>Aloha High School</td>
<td>Latino Community</td>
<td>Community Gathering</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/2013</td>
<td>APANO Community Gathering</td>
<td>Mio Sushi</td>
<td>APANO</td>
<td>Community Gathering</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2013</td>
<td>Canvassing</td>
<td>Aloha-Reedville</td>
<td>Aloha Unite</td>
<td>Canvassing</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2013</td>
<td>Renters’ Rights and Transportation Justice Workshops</td>
<td>Merlo Station Center</td>
<td>CAT, OPAL, OSFEC</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2013</td>
<td>Latino Business Leadership Event</td>
<td>Blanton Street Station</td>
<td>Adelante Mujeres</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/2013</td>
<td>Renters’ Rights Workshop</td>
<td>Centro Cultural</td>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/2013</td>
<td>Somali Community Event</td>
<td>Merlo Station Center</td>
<td>OSFEC</td>
<td>Informational Gathering</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2013</td>
<td>BUILT Game</td>
<td>Blanton Street Fire Station</td>
<td>Aloha Unite</td>
<td>Community Gathering</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>OSFE/C</td>
<td>Community Gathering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/29/2013</td>
<td>Canvassing</td>
<td>Aloha-Reedville OSFEC</td>
<td>Community Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2013</td>
<td>Latino Community Gathering</td>
<td>Blanton Street Fire Station</td>
<td>Centro Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2013</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Meeting</td>
<td>CIO Beaverton</td>
<td>CBO Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12/2013</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Meeting</td>
<td>CIO Beaverton</td>
<td>CBO Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2013</td>
<td>BUILT Game</td>
<td>Blanton Street Fire Station</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Community Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2013</td>
<td>BUILT Game</td>
<td>The Spot</td>
<td>APANO Community Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/2013</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Meeting</td>
<td>CIO Beaverton</td>
<td>CBO Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2013</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Workshop</td>
<td>PCC Willow Creek</td>
<td>CAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2013</td>
<td>Community Options Workshop</td>
<td>PCC Willow Creek</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Community Options Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/23/2013</td>
<td>Community Options Workshop</td>
<td>Blanton Street Fire Station</td>
<td>CIO Community Options Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2013</td>
<td>Community Options Workshop</td>
<td>Westside Community Church</td>
<td>CIO Community Options Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2013</td>
<td>Community Options Workshop</td>
<td>Brentwood Oaks</td>
<td>CIO Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2013</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Meeting</td>
<td>CIO Beaverton</td>
<td>CBO Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2013</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Meeting</td>
<td>CIO Beaverton</td>
<td>CBO Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2013</td>
<td>Community Options Workshop</td>
<td>Kinnaman Elementary</td>
<td>CIO Community Options Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2013</td>
<td>Leadership Training</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2013</td>
<td>BUILT Game</td>
<td>Centro Ctural</td>
<td>Centro Cultural Community Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/2013</td>
<td>Leadership Training</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2013</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Meeting</td>
<td>CIO Beaverton</td>
<td>CBO Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2013</td>
<td>Leadership Training</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/2013</td>
<td>Community Report Back</td>
<td>Westside Community Church</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Spanish Language Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Meeting</td>
<td>CIO Beaverton</td>
<td>CBO Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2013</td>
<td>Community Report Back</td>
<td>PCC Willow Creek</td>
<td>Aloha Unite Community Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: “Number Engaged” refers to the total number of attendees at the event or meeting. Therefore, there are some duplicated individuals.*
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APPENDIX H

Community Options Focus Group Surveys

Transportation

1. Transportation Alternatives

Our community uses many forms of transportation to get around: TriMet (buses and MAX), driving, bicycling and walking. The Aloha-Reedville community has an opportunity to help prioritize investments in transportation.

(a) Please rank the following types of transportation according to what you use the most (first to last): Public transit, Bicycling, Walking, Driving (personal automobile), Other

(b) How often do you use the following types of transportation?
   (i) **Public Transit** (TriMet): Frequently (approx. every day), Regularly (at least a few times each week), Occasionally (at least a few times each month), Intermittently (at least a few times each year), Never
   (ii) **Bicycling**: Frequently (approx. every day), Regularly (at least a few times each week), Occasionally (at least a few times each month), Intermittently (at least a few times each year), Never
   (iii) **Walking**: Frequently (approx. every day), Regularly (at least a few times each week), Occasionally (at least a few times each month), Intermittently (at least a few times each year), Never

(c) For each type of transportation that you use, please indicate what you use it for (to get to work, school, grocery store, medical care, visit friends/family, recreation)
   (i) **Public Transit**: _____________________________________________________________
   (ii) **Bicycling**: ________________________________________________________________
   (iii) **Walking**: ________________________________________________________________

(d) For each type of transportation, please indicate whether you would use it more frequently if there were increased investments in that mode
   (i) **Public Transit**: Would you use TriMet more if transfer times were longer, service was more frequent and/or transit stops were more accessible? Y // N
   (ii) **Bicycling**: Would you bike more if there were more bike lanes and improved signs and crossings? Y // N
   (iii) **Walking**: Would you walk more if there were more sidewalks and safe pedestrian crossings? Y // N

(e) Please list any other barriers to mobility or safety that you experience.

2. Transit Service Enhancements (Action Item #33)
The primary transit routes in Aloha-Reedville are bus lines #57 (TV Hwy), #52 (Farmington/185), #88 (Hart/198), #62 (Murray Blvd), #67 (Bethany/158) & the Blue Line MAX (Willow Creek & Beaverton TC).

(a) Which transit routes do you ride the most?
(b) Do you have any of the following concerns about these transit lines?
   • Not safe to access transit stop (no sidewalk, lighting, safe street crossing) Y // N
   • Too far of a walk to get to transit stop (more than 6 blocks) Y // N
   • Service is too infrequent (bus does not run frequently enough) Y // N
   • Not Enough (or No) Service in Evenings or on Weekends Y // N
   • Transfer time for single ticket is not long enough Y // N

Washington County partners with TriMet and can advocate for transit service enhancements, increased access to transit stops and improved amenities on these routes.
(c) What issues should Washington County focus on?

3. Sidewalks, Connectivity and Safety (Action Items #24-25)

There is a need for sidewalk infill, crossings and improved pedestrian safety in Aloha-Reedville so that residents can walk safely in the community. Sidewalks around schools are a high priority for residents.

(a) Please identify any gaps in sidewalks around schools in Aloha-Reedville that you think should be prioritized for investment.
(b) Many people in the community identified sidewalks around schools as the top priority. Please rank the following additional places based on where you think sidewalk infill should be made (first to last):
   • Businesses and stores
   • Transit Stops (bus and MAX)
   • Parks and recreation areas
   • Health and social services
   • Other:
(c) Please identify any intersections or areas along major roads and crossings that you think should be prioritized for improvements, and identify the first improvement you would like to see made?

4. Neighborhood Bikeways (Action Item #28)

Washington County has an opportunity to invest in better bicycle infrastructure. There are several options to consider: along TV Highway, along neighborhood streets, or off-street. Neighborhood routes include options such as Johnson or Alexander to the north and Blanton or Shaw to the south.
(a) Please identify your top three potential bike routes in Aloha-Reedville that can provide safe bicycle access to transit, services, goods and community destinations.
(b) Please identify any other access, safety or design concerns with bicycling in the community.

5. Air Quality, Asthma, and Community Health

Air pollution and hazardous air toxics are a serious problem in Washington County and across the Portland region. Exposure to air toxics can result in serious health impacts, such as respiratory and heart illness, kidney disease and cancer.

(a) Does anyone in your household have asthma or respiratory illness? Y // N
   If yes, who?
(b) Please rank the following sources of air toxic emissions based on your level of concerns (first to last):
   - Residential Wood Combustion (wood burning)
   - On-Road Mobile (cars, trucks, automobiles)
   - Area Sources (gas stations, auto body shops, Laundromats)
   - Non-Road Mobile (construction and landscape maintenance)
   - None of the above (air toxics is not a concern)
(c) Please rank the following strategies you think Washington County could use to reduce air toxic emissions (first to last):
   - Work with DEQ to retrofit wood stoves (to reduce air toxics from residential wood burn)
   - Work with TriMet to increase transit ridership (to reduce air toxics from cars)
   - Work with County health department and DEQ to require stricter air pollution permit
   - standards for small businesses (to reduce area source emissions)
   - Encourage clean diesel and mitigation measures for all construction and maintenance projects (to reduce non-road mobile emissions)
   - Other (any other air toxic risk-reduction strategies):
(d) Please describe any other concerns related to air quality and/or health?
Housing

What can we do to make our homes healthier, safer, more affordable, and better for our community? The Aloha-Reedville study and Livable Community Plan has identified some potential ways to improve the housing options for current and future residents of Aloha-Reedville. Which ideas would you like to see implemented? Are there any others we haven’t considered?

1. Housing Maintenance Code

For renters, a housing maintenance code may help to ensure that your apartment or house is safe and habitable. If a landlord doesn’t make repairs, this can make your house unsafe or unhealthy because of mold, unsafe electrical systems, or other reasons. If a Housing Maintenance Code was established, landlords might be more likely to keep buildings in good repair. For homeowners, it’s important to keep your home safe and healthy as well. If your or your neighbor’s home has a fire hazard, or is infested with rats or mice, this can affect the whole neighborhood.

In order for a Housing Maintenance Code to be effective, there would need to be inspectors. People who live in the community would probably help pay for inspectors through a tax or fee. That might mean that your rent or property taxes go up.

(a) Do you think a housing maintenance code might help improve your house, apartment, or neighborhood?  Y//N
(b) Do you think it would be worth paying for? Y//N

2. Fair Housing

Fair housing means that everyone should have the same access to housing, and rights to live in their housing without discrimination, regardless of their race, religion, nation of birth, gender, family size, or other “protected classes.” This project can help reduce housing discrimination and segregation by making changes to code language and government policies that are discriminatory or unfairly create problems for people based on race, gender, family status, etc.

(a) Can you think of some examples of how someone might face discrimination when looking for a home to rent or buy?

3. ADU – Accessory Dwelling Unit or “Granny Flat”

An ADU is a second, smaller home that a property owner can build on his/her lot. This can make room for an additional family member, or the property owner can rent it to someone else. This can help property owners increase their income, as well as increase the number of rental units available throughout the Aloha-Reedville area, without the need to find additional land to build on.
Right now, it is expensive and hard for property owners to build an ADU because of the development code and permitting process. The County is taking steps to make this process cheaper and easier.

(a) How could an ADU help your family or neighborhood?

4. Community Land Trust – To make buying a home more affordable

A Community Land Trust or CLT buys old homes, or builds new homes, and sells them at a reduced price to a new homeowner who wouldn’t normally be able to afford one. The price of the home can be as low as 50%-70% of what the price would be on the private market.

In return, if the homeowner ever wants to resell the home, after one year, ten years, or 100 years, the owner agrees to sell the house back to the CLT or at a reduced price, so that the home remains affordable for future Aloha-Reedville residents.

(a) Do you think a Community Land Trust would work for your family or in your neighborhood? Y // N

5. Corner Duplex Options – Allowing duplexes on corner lots

A duplex can look like a regular house or a small apartment building, and includes two smaller homes. Some Aloha-Reedville residents are looking for more additional housing options – bigger than an apartment, but smaller than a single-family house. If duplexes were allowed on corner lots, the smaller homes could be more affordable, without changing the nature of the neighborhood.

(a) Would you like to live in a corner duplex, or see more of them in your neighborhood? Y // N

6. Incentives for homeowners to improve or repair their homes

Some Aloha-Reedville homeowners would like to make improvements or repairs to their homes, but don’t have enough money or access to loans to do it. This program could establish a new incentive program for homeowners, or simply promote homeowner awareness of programs that already exist through the city and county.

In order for a new incentive program to work, it would need money for incentives and operations. People who live in the community would need to provide money for a new program through a tax or fee. That might mean that your rent or property taxes go up.

(a) Would you take advantage of an “Incentives for Homeowners” program, or like to see a program in your neighborhood? Y // N
(b) Would it be worth paying for a new program? Y // N
7. Aging in Place – Finding ways to make sure residents can stay in their home, as they get older

As we move through life, our housing needs and preferences change. How can we find ways to make changes to our homes and neighborhoods so that we don’t have to move when we get older? We could explore future strategies, changes to the city code, or work to develop programs that could help seniors to age in place.

(a) How would an “aging in place” program or strategy help your family or community?

8. Employer-Supported Housing – How can we live closer to where we work?

We can reduce traffic and congestion if people lived closer to their jobs. Some jobs have programs to help employees buy homes closer to their job. This program could help promote those programs, and perhaps encourage more employers to offer them.

(a) What kind of support do you think an employer could reasonably provide you?

9. Residential Development

People want to live in Aloha-Reedville, because it’s such a great place! This means that, as the community grows, we may need to build new residential developments so that new people moving here will have a place to live. We can explore different tools to encourage new residential development to include housing options for people at all income levels. For private development, the County could provide incentives to ensure that some of the new homes are available to people and families of all incomes. Some of these incentives may have costs or require additional revenue, and some may require changes to the code. There are also state-level restrictions that limit how the County may require what is built in exchange for these incentives. All of these issues would need to be considered if the County were to design an incentive program. The County can also explore ways to assist non-profit developers, often called CDCs, to secure public funding to build all types of housing for different types of people, including seniors or larger families, and include social services and support, such as childcare, after-school programs and health services.

(a) Do you want new residential developments to provide housing opportunities for people at all income levels? Y // N
(b) Do you want the County to explore an incentive-based program for new private development? Y // N
(c) Do you want the County to explore ways to assist non-profit developers to secure public funding? Y // N
(d) Would you consider a new tax or fee to help pay for these programs? Y // N
Economic Development

Overall, the Aloha community represents a target market in many ways. It is very important to know the social, demographics and psychographic analysis of this market, its composition and segmentation, in order to promote or generate economic activities that meet the specific needs of this market. This question will help to understand the commonalities and differences of the members of the study sample.

1. Why do you live in Aloha?
   - Housing (cost, location, etc.)
   - Jobs
   - Schools (schools, community colleges, etc.)
   - Location (close to public transportation, roads, etc.)
   - Other reason, please specify: _________________________________

In the questionnaire of the study, we found a constant concern to improve the appearance and promotion of the city in order to increase business. We found that the members of the sample recommended by 90% the improvement in the overall appearance of the community and its promotion. These questions will help us to find out what kinds of attractions are here already, and what new things might help make the community more attractive. This can help provide useful information for future marketing promotion campaign for Aloha-Reedville. The questions will help us to understand the shopping habits of the members of this study sample and will be a good starting point to promote increased economic activity in the area.

2. Shopping and Attractions

   (a) What kind of attractions you would like to have / see in Aloha?
      - Cultural attractions (galleries, concert halls, museums)
      - New workplaces
      - Parks and recreational sites
      - Shopping
      - Other, please specify: _________________________________

   (b) Where do you do your shopping?
   (c) What do you buy?
   (d) How often?
   (e) What kinds of things would you like to buy, that you can’t get in Aloha-Reedville right now?

3. Physical Attributes

   (a) Do you think Aloha is an attractive place? Y // N
      If you answered yes, why?
      If you answered no, why?
   (b) If you could add or remove something from Aloha, What would be?
4. Interactive activity

The participant will place a post it on the location of their home or business in the community, this activity would help us to identify the geographical distribution of the members of the sample.

(a) Where do you live?
(b) Where do you do your shopping?
(c) Attractions? / Needs?

Participants will choose a business, attraction, shopping place, etc., actual, or wished-for by them, in their answers and will be located on the map, in that way we could know the geographical zones of commercial and marketing interest to the members of the sample.
Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan
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PHASE I COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Center for Intercultural Organizing (CIO) was contracted to conduct public engagement in immigrant and refugee communities and communities of color for the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community plan. We entered the engagement process at the end of Phase I—after the Existing Conditions Report had been produced by the Washington County project team and the community engagement was already underway. Therefore, CIO first focused on creating a multi-lingual survey that could be widely distributed to obtain more detailed information about the cultural and ethnic diversity of immigrants, refugees, and people of color in the study area, and to begin collecting their comments regarding existing community conditions. One of our partners, Centro Cultural de Washington County, worked with CIO to develop a Spanish language version of the survey.

Upon completion, survey results were analyzed and included in the background materials for the study and, in combination with previously received comments, used to develop community options (refer to Appendix A for survey instrument). The review below provides additional information about Aloha-Reedville’s diverse population and respondents’ perceptions about current conditions of cultural inclusion, opportunities for entrepreneurism, transportation, and housing.

For more information on the engagement process and methods employed, please refer to the Community Engagement Report.

Results of Phase I Engagement

During the first phase of CIO’s work on the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, CIO (and project partner Centro Cultural de Washington County) collected a total of 594 valid surveys. Of those who identified their gender, 51 percent identified as female, 49 percent male (32 did not respond). The median age of respondents was 37 years old.

---

1 It is important to note that the findings in this report should not be generalized beyond the survey participants to represent the views of the larger population of immigrants, refugees, or people of color. This is because Aloha-Reedville survey participants were not selected through random sampling but were rather invited to participate through an intentionally open culturally-specific engagement process. While the sample size is statistically relevant, it cannot be considered statistically validated. Some perspectives are sure to be over-represented as others are to be under-represented.
Race, Ethnicity, Language and Immigration Status

Respondents were 89 percent people of color, and 11 percent Caucasian (including immigrants and refugees from European countries). The majority, 67 percent, identified as Latino, not surprising considering the strong partnership with Centro Cultural and the demographics of the study area.

Respondents hailed from 28 countries of origin: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Hong Kong, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Lebanon, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Somalia, Thailand, United States, and Vietnam.

Languages spoken in the home included Alaskan (specific native language unidentified), Amharic, Arabic, Armenian, Cambodian/Khmer, Cantonese, Chinese, English, French, German, Hawaiian, Hungarian, Japanese, Korean, Mai Mai, Mandarin, Mien, Nepali, Portuguese, Russian, Somali, Swahili, Tagalog, Thai, Urdu, and Vietnamese. U.S.-born residents comprised 30
percent of respondents, a number that includes children of immigrants and refugees as well as residents from U.S. communities of color such as African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans. Respondents identified themselves as 20 percent naturalized citizens, 18 percent legal permanent residents (green card holders), 29 percent immigrants, and 2 percent refugees/asylees. Two individuals were international students and three were international workers.

**Household Data**

According to the 2010 Census, the average household size in the Aloha-Reedville study area was 2.91 persons per household. Our survey respondents had an average household size of 4.38. Larger, multi-generational families are more common in immigrant and refugee communities, and 72 percent of households we surveyed contained four or more persons, compared to 29 percent of households in the overall study area.

Although respondents’ household size skewed much larger than average for the region, median income was significantly lower. According to the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan’s Existing Conditions report, median income in the study area is $57,245. In contrast, 83 percent of respondents reported an annual household income of less than $45,000, and 61 percent reported an annual household income of less than $30,000 (83 individuals declined to report income).

Survey participants were 68 percent renters and only 32 percent homeowners (92 individuals declined to report homeownership status). Renters who expressed difficulty finding housing mentioned location of affordable housing most often as a barrier. For
example, one respondent said, “Houses according to the number of people in our family and that are closer to public centers are more expensive. The houses that are economical are either in poor condition or in less safe [areas].” This sentiment was echoed in many surveys.

Respondents also cited the distance of these more affordable residences from public infrastructure such as well-maintained roads, public transportation, parks, and schools, as well as the lack of grocery stores and shopping areas near affordable places to live. Respondents additionally mentioned the lack of immigration documentation, vandalism and crime, apartment/house size, community safety, poor building maintenance, and even discrimination by landlords as issues of concern.

**Educational Attainment**

Respondents had a lower level of educational attainment compared to the general population of the study area. Only 12 percent of those surveyed reporting having obtained a Bachelor's Degree or higher compared to 26 percent of study area residents. 12 percent reported having “some college.” 30 percent reporting having graduated 8th grade, 29 percent high school, and 4 percent reported having acquired a technical degree. 6 percent responded “other” when asked their level of educational attainment. However, 109 individuals surveyed were under 25 years old, and 85 respondents declined to answer the educational attainment question, so these numbers are somewhat unreliable.

**Business Ownership**

In Oregon, immigrant and refugee entrepreneurs and innovators play an important role in the economy. According to a 2010 report published by the New York-based Fiscal Policy Institute, 10.7 percent of all business owners in Oregon are foreign-born. In all, about 6,800 small business owners in Oregon in 2010 were immigrants, according to the study, and new immigrant business owners were reported to have a net business income of $1.1 billion, which is 9.8 percent of all net business income in the state. Residents of Aloha-Reedville showed a similar entrepreneurial spirit. Of the individuals surveyed, 167 responded “yes” to the question, “If you do not own a business in the Aloha-Reedville have you ever considered starting one?”

While respondents showed interest in business ownership, they also reported needing support. Access to capital was the most frequently mentioned barrier at 46 percent. Some Muslim community members mentioned the religious prohibition against interest and the need for no-interest loans to begin a new business (this is likewise a barrier for Islamic families to home ownership through mortgages). Other community members lacked the immigration status necessary to obtain loans. Affordability of appropriate business space kept some from beginning a new enterprise in the Aloha-Reedville area.

Secondarily, many respondents (43 percent) believed they lacked the knowledge needed to launch a business. Language barriers prevent some individuals from accessing business development programs, and others simply do not know where to look for support on
issues pertaining to legal formation, taxes and payroll information, licensing, marketing resources, or other information.

Survey respondents also cited needing “encouragement” or individualized business counseling, community support, child care, and industry-specific information.

**Cultural Inclusion**

Respondents value Aloha-Reedville’s “small community feel” and appreciate their friendly neighbors and the area’s multicultural environment. “It is a small community,” explained one resident, “So you meet people you know shopping and at events.” Many Spanish speakers discussed how prevalent their language is in the area, and that they often find others who speak it.

Only 33 individuals answered “No” to the question, “Do you feel welcome and/or comfortable participating in public events in Aloha-Reedville community?” It is clear from the responses that the vast majority of people considered the term “public events” to refer to non-governmental activities. When answering, “Why or Why Not?,” those who felt uncomfortable mentioned such factors as the lack of a town center (like Hillsboro or Beaverton), the fear of crime, discrimination perpetrated by other residents, and cultural and linguistic isolation.

Those who did feel comfortable participating in public events commented on the welcoming nature of the people, the safety of areas where people gather (e.g., Tualatin Valley Recreation Center), and the calm, semi-rural environment. While this displayed some disagreement or tension in the data, the overwhelming number of residents surveyed felt a level of community inclusion acceptable to them.

A small group of respondents defined “public events” to be governmental, and suggested increased language access, better communication with residents, and more convenient meeting times as ways to support their involvement in civic affairs.

When asked if residents or their communities would use a cultural center if one were located in the Aloha-Reedville area, 88 percent of respondents answered “yes.” In addition to the potential uses for such a center—which were provided as selections on the survey—residents identified many other purposes. For example, a cultural center could be used for “festivals and reunions,” explained one respondent, “Aloha should have an annual festival.” Other ideas for cultural center uses included computer access, a large outdoor open space (for concerts, cookouts, events), a weekend market, a day care center, sports facilities such as a swimming pool, gym, or basketball court, a place for community co-integration, or a banquet room. A few respondents mentioned that a cultural center could be co-located with future housing developments.
Residents provided very large number of open-ended responses to the question asking where a cultural center should be sited. Ideas ranged from along Tualatin Valley Highway (various cross-sections were mentioned, with “near 185th” being the most common), to close to the new library, to next to a school or place of worship. “By the Thriftway” and “next to (a particular) park were other common responses.

**Transportation**

When asked the question, “How do you get around from place to place?” respondents most often checked the response “car” (81 percent), but half of the surveyed residents responded “bus.” 37 percent walk, 24 percent bike, and 12 percent take the train. Even though residents surveyed most frequently drive to travel from place to place, their highest priorities were around bicycle and pedestrian safety.

Residents cited breaks and gaps in sidewalks, particularly in places where children are present, as being problematic. Safety around schools and parks are areas of concern for residents.
Transportation Priorities for Residents

**How important to you is safe access to transit services, including bus and MAX?**
- Very important: 70%
- Somewhat important: 14%
- Neutral: 4%
- Somewhat unimportant: 10%
- Not important: 2%

**How important to you is convenient access to transit services, including bus and MAX?**
- Very important: 63%
- Somewhat important: 13%
- Neutral: 5%
- Somewhat unimportant: 18%
- Not important: 2%

**How important to you is reducing traffic congestion?**
- Very important: 60%
- Somewhat important: 18%
- Neutral: 7%
- Somewhat unimportant: 13%
- Not important: 2%

**How important to you is safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations?**
- Very important: 74%
- Somewhat important: 16%
- Neutral: 6%
- Somewhat unimportant: 2%
- Not important: 2%
Community Safety

A significant number of individuals, 74 people, reported feeling unsafe in the Aloha-Reedville area. The reasons given included both physical infrastructure deficiencies (e.g., inadequate lighting, poor roads, and lack of sidewalks) and social issues such as crime, gangs, drugs, and vandalism. The majority of respondents identified the need for more police or better patrols, but this was not an area of complete agreement. A representative example of this tension is the comment, “Being a minority I find myself getting harassed and singled out by the police.”
PHASE II AND III COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Shortly after Center for Intercultural Organizing and our community-based partners joined the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, the focus of the project shifted from where the community currently is to where it wants to be. Phase II included a variety of opportunities for both residents we had previously engaged and for those new to the project to provide aspirations and identify alternatives to achieve them. Community alternatives were presented during events where individuals conducted electronic voting, in an online survey, and during community options focus group events hosted by Aloha Unite.

As the last and final phase concludes (Phase III), Aloha Unite partner organizations have provided direct feedback on draft actions, and they are currently considering their respective roles in action plan implementation. Collaborations between jurisdictional partners, nonprofit organizations, private sector/businesses, and community volunteers will be necessary for aspirations to become realized. Project partners are committed to continuing their engagement in coming years as the Aloha-Reedville effort is implemented, taking active part in the plan’s actualization.

Community Options Surveys

Electronic Polling and Online Surveys

In March 2013, JLA Public Involvement conducted a series of public forums in order to receive feedback about a number of issues facing the Aloha-Reedville area. Forum data was collected using an Audience Response System, and was provided to Riley Research Associates (RRA) for data analysis. JLA moderated four forums and managed the online survey. Regrettably, this effort was not well-coordinated with Aloha Unite due to its late involvement in the project, although three of the forums were aimed at reaching diverse constituencies (for more in-depth information at this and other Community Options Survey engagement methods, please refer to CIO’s Community Engagement Report).

Demographic data for these forums are inaccurate. For example, Oregon Somali Family Education Center’s co-sponsored event garnered 12 surveys; however, only one participant identified as “Black.” This is partly due to the U.S.-centric categories of race, and how Africans prefer to identify. In the future, demographic data should offer a range of free-form, disaggregated options which can be ‘rolled up’ into the often-problematic racial categories assigned to individuals in the United States².

² Oregon's Health Care Quality Corporation's guidance on collecting race-based data is a comprehensive model for how data can be collected more accurately (refer to Table 2 at http://www.oregon.gov/oha/oei/CommitteeMeetingMaterials/ORHealthQualityCorporation.pdf).

www.co.washington.or.us/alohareedville    CIO Community Feedback Report
In addition to the forums, the same questions were asked through online surveys in English and Spanish. Aloha Unite member organizations directed their constituents to this survey, and more than 175 additional responses were received online (it is not known how many surveys were received from our constituencies).

**Focus Groups**

Mainstream public involvement efforts, such as the ones led by JLA Public Involvement, can be more effective in reaching underrepresented communities by partnering with organizations and leaders that have trusted relationships with community members. Aloha Unite partner organizations were concerned that their constituencies were not accurately reflected in the electronic polling and online surveys, and requested time to conduct further culturally-specific focus groups on community options. Washington County agreed to extend the timeline, if the community options focus group questions were merged with action items under development.

Focus groups were designed to inform residents of the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan, the process to date, and involve them in the final phases of plan creation. Based on the expertise of CBO partners and on the feedback gleaned from residents in Phase I, Aloha Unite partners decided to hone in on three topic areas: housing, transportation, and economic development. The focus groups’ questions aimed to use the community options survey instrument as a vehicle for continued engagement and dialogue.

During the course of the workshops, trainers stressed that their feedback would not guarantee change but rather that the study embodies a collective process of identifying needs of the community that may or may not result in actions from Washington County once findings have been presented *(please refer to Appendix B to view focus group questions)*.

A total of 5 events and 93\(^3\) total participants provided both quantitative and qualitative feedback to the community options survey questions.

- August 13, 2013, PCC Willow Creek—32 participants
- August 23, 2013, Blanton Street Fire Station—16 participants
- August 24, 2013, Westside Community Church (Spanish)—28 participants
- September 4, 2013, Brentwood Oaks—7 participants
- September 19, 2013, Kinnaman Elementary—10 participants

---

3 Please note that this number is approximate. For confidentiality reasons, not all participants registered their attendance or signed in; additionally, other family members (including children) were present at various events but did not participate. Information and feedback was gathered from all participants present at each event. For the purposes of this report, “participant” refers to those individuals who provided quantitative or qualitative data, and excludes those who merely attended events without actively engaging.
**Data Collection Method**

The focus group events were facilitated in three ways depending on the number of participants.

- **Large group (Willow Creek event):** Background information on the project was discussed and then groups broke up depending on the individual’s interest area in housing, transportation, or economic development. The group was brought back together and they collectively discussed topic areas, with the larger group providing additional feedback.

- **Small group (Blanton Street event):** In smaller group discussions, facilitators were able to obtain feedback from the entire group in all three topic areas (with some topics, such as housing, receiving more discussion based on participants’ relative interest levels).

- **Neighborhood focused topic group (Brentwood Oaks Event):** In large-group discussions, facilitators found that some participants wanted to have “house party” style events in order to focus in on a topic area which might impact them the most, so that they could bring these discussions back to their respective communities. For example, Constance Kosuda, an active participant of the study, helped to organize residents in her apartment complex at Brentwood Oaks addressing housing concerns and then allowed attendees the opportunity to answer the survey.

Qualitative data were collected from focus groups through note takers during each of the five events. Due to the varying formats of each focus group and the way in which information on participants was collected (e.g., sign-in sheets without demographic data), limited quantitative data on participants are available. However, qualitative data were codified, categorized, and tallied based on the most common responses.

**Data Analysis**

- **Qualitative data:** We received more qualitative data than quantitative, which in turn provided a richer, more profound understanding of issues and community desires. This information was then aligned with the survey questions. Although our discussions were focused on specific issue areas and action items, other topics of interest arose, which will be noted throughout this report.

- **Quantitative data:** Qualitative data were compiled in a spreadsheet to quantify responses in each issue area. This enabled CIO to analyze qualitative data for patterns. For example, when we found that the majority of the residents surveyed lived in apartment complexes, and comments from these individuals were focused on landlord complaints and housing conditions, that information enabled us to identify key issues.

**Community Options Survey Findings**
The emerging Aloha-Reedville plan categorized recommendations into theme areas: Healthy and Active Living, Neighborhood Quality, Business and Shopping, Getting Around Safely, and Major Roads. Upon analysis of the data, CIO aligned comments with these categorizations and provided feedback on developing action items (Refer to Appendix C for details).

Aloha Unite’s data collection—both in Phase I and in subsequent phases—highlighted other emerging themes that did not necessarily align with the topic areas identified in the existing plan categories. The following themes represent additional community issues as conveyed through the surveys and community sessions:

- Poor Living Conditions and Housing Inequity
- Economic Viability and Opportunity
- Transit Accessibility and Safety
- Gentrification Mitigation
- Community Plan Implementation
- Social Determinants of Health

**HOUSING**

**Poor Living Conditions and Housing Inequity**

Concerns about housing conditions dominated most of the community feedback sessions. During Phase I, 68% of our surveys came from Aloha-Reedville renters. Because we did not specifically ask about housing conditions, we did not receive many comments on the state of rental units or issues with landlords. However, as Aloha Unite began to facilitate discussions around housing, and the Community Alliance of Tenants (CAT) provided education on renters’ rights, discussions around inequity and poor living conditions repeatedly emerged. These sentiments were likewise reflected in the community options focus groups on housing.

The highest number of comments received during the community options focus groups on housing pertained to three areas: the need for a housing maintenance code, safety, and health. Unsurprisingly, all of these key areas are deeply interconnected; many renters reported that their units were not being properly maintained, in turn compromising their safety and their health. Support for a housing maintenance code was the top priority among the 8 items on the housing community options survey.

In total, there were 53 comments specific to poor living conditions in rental units. Renters commented on how this has begun to impact the health of tenants and their families:

“Black mold has been here for three years.”
“Mold in the vent, told apartment employees but the problem hasn’t been fixed.”

“Stove top exploded and kept getting hotter, they finally changed it but I could have died.”

“My mom has asthma – [maintenance] people can come more quickly – they don’t really fix it.”

Community members felt that they were often ignored when they informed landlords or property managers about the need for repairs in their units. When repairs were not immediately addressed, problems become worse; in the case of environmental hazards such as mold, those problems can lead to significant health concerns for individuals and families.

Others reported that they perceived property managers to be discriminatory, handling issues for white tenants while ignoring those of people of color, immigrants, and refugees. One tenant reported to their landlord that an upstairs neighbor was pouring beer down their rain spouts and over their deck. The individual reported the behavior, yet it continued to happen. The individual’s family could no longer enjoy the space on their deck to get fresh air, eroding their sense of well-being.

Inequities in housing also stem from challenges in the rental process. Many community members conveyed that application processes were tedious, overly difficult, and that there was no assistance (such as help navigating the rental application process, understanding forms which are not available in a renter's native language, and so on). Many newly-arrived immigrants and refugees have no local rental history, which was in some cases a barrier to securing housing they could afford.

**Recommendations**

1. **Develop a Housing Maintenance Code.** Aloha-Reedville renters would benefit from an enforceable housing maintenance code, allowing tenants to hold landlords accountable for not taking care of their units. Aloha Unite recommended that the Housing Maintenance Code Action Item be considered a priority recommendation in the Aloha-Reedville Plan, and we were heartened to see this issue elevated.

CIO and Aloha Unite recommend Washington County convene a working group to assess concerns about housing conditions and create recommendations moving forward on incorporating a housing maintenance code which truly reflects community needs, while receiving support from landlords and property managers. The committee should comprise stakeholders with technical expertise on housing, community members who experience housing-related challenges, as well as
landlords and property managers.

There are other models of implementation on creating housing maintenance codes that we can use in order for a successful process and implementation plan that have already been used in other counties and regions. One compelling example is the “International Property Maintenance Code,”\(^4\) published by the International Code Council, which provides adaptable guidelines for local governments with respect to internal and external housing maintenance. The City of Gresham, for instance, has opted to adopt this code as their local maintenance code, as has Multnomah County. Other jurisdictions, such as Salem and Portland, have adopted their own, specifically-tailored codes.

2. **Develop a Structure for Ongoing Engagement on Housing Issues.** Ongoing dialogue and public involvement must continue between Washington County and local community-based organizations in regard to housing. As demonstrated from these sessions, the relationships and trust that CBOs have earned in their communities allows for open and honest dialogue to occur, which in turns facilitates the county's commitment to public engagement and outreach in underserved communities.

One model for this kind of engagement is the City of Portland, which operates the Portland Housing Advisory Committee as well as the Fair Housing Advocacy Committee. Both of these appointed bodies provide opportunities for city staff, landlord and tenant advocates, community-based organizations, and members of the public to collaboratively and proactively identify challenges and opportunities for improving housing citywide. These bodies can become a vital lifeline between organizations like those comprising Aloha Unite and policymakers, and give communities a clear venue for raising concerns.

3. **Designate a Clear Staff Contact.** Washington County should also consider designating a single staff contact so that individuals, families, and community-based organizations have someone to whom they can turn in the event that housing issues arise.

4. **Help Facilitate Ongoing Renters’ Rights Training.** There has been increased awareness of renters’ rights among our constituencies through the educational sessions CAT has held, while gathering community feedback. This format was very effective as many in the community were not familiar with housing terminology. This education has begun to create the dialogue needed to really understand communities’ concerns and housing issues. We found these sessions to be extremely valuable in terms of raising and empowering tenant voices, by helping them understand their rights and responsibilities. Support for further renters’ rights trainings should continue in the County.

Similarly, stakeholders should work together to create a straightforward pathway for renters to have their issues addressed. For example, the County might work with Community Alliance of Tenants to host and publicize a training (in turn defraying the costs incurred by the organization); in addition to offering some official legitimacy to such an event, sponsorship would make it clear that Washington County is committed to ensuring that all residents have access to safe and healthy housing.

5. **Continue to Engage Residents and Build Leadership.** As our sessions progressed, there were community members living in rental units who quickly emerged as leaders. These community members can advise Washington County on housing and tenant issues (as part of standing advisory boards and committees, for example). They can also act as change agents to facilitate discussions between landlords, property managers and tenants, and homeowners.

**ECONOMIC VIABILITY AND OPPORTUNITY**

The community options focus group results support the Phase I survey findings regarding economic development in the Aloha-Reedville community. Residents surveyed indicated that the three areas most needing support were financing, education, community support.

In surveys, over 30% (167/507 surveys) of community members indicated that they wanted to start a business, but did not pursue them based on some of the following factors:

- **Financing:** Aloha-Reedville residents who want to start a business did not understand the existing business financing opportunities available in their community. 46% (56/507 surveys) respondents identified this as a key barrier to starting a successful business. The county should partner with community-based organizations to ensure that such information is widely available in multiple languages.

- **Education** Coupled with financing, 43% (52/507) of those surveyed felt that they did not have the requisite knowledge to open a small business in the community. They were overwhelmed by the process of determining, for example, the type of licenses or certifications needed. These residents need basic information on business development to thrive.

Marketing and economic development activity, included in the Support Local Business recommendations in Appendix C, could include education and training for new business start-ups. However, supporting local businesses also means that education and training sessions should be designed to be understood by a wide range of communities, including immigrants and refugees, and in languages other than English.
Some culturally-competent programs already exist in Washington County. For example, organizations like Adelante Mujeres and Portland Community College offer small business education. The county could partner with such organizations to host or co-sponsor trainings in county-operated spaces. As this report's earlier comments about housing education indicate, the legitimacy of a County-sponsored event is advantageous.

- **Community support.** Immigrants and refugees are often strongly supported by their respective communities; families will gather and help each other to start a small business. This ranges from actual start-up financing, to apprenticeships, and even providing physical spaces to start their business. Unfortunately, that kind of community support is not institutionalized in Washington County. Micro-enterprise businesses have begun to address issues of financial support and start-up operations, but do not represent a large-scale network of business community alliances which can help small businesses thrive. Expanding opportunities for underserved communities to participate in existing organizations and networks, such as the Aloha Business Association (ABA), is critical; these organizations should include representatives from immigrant- and refugee-owned businesses in the area.

**Farmers’ Markets**

Many community members expressed that farmers’ markets can be a useful place to start small businesses, but they come with their own limitations (particularly given that farmers markets are often seasonal, rather than year-round). A farmers’ market is a supported action item (refer to Appendix C for details)—however, if a future farmers’ market operator charges high stall fees, this could well be a barrier for new businesses. Community members and the county should work with any farmers’ market provider(s) to develop mechanisms of entry without high fees. Although the county would not directly play a role in setting such fees, the county can help facilitate such a future dialogue.

**Accessible Business Spaces**

There are commercial spaces existing or under development that could support small businesses new to the area. However, residents felt that the rents were cost prohibitive, and that these spaces were not generally inviting to immigrant-owned businesses. A few residents mentioned that the available commercial building stock was not suited to their particular business, or that the commercial space had either lease or other restrictions regarding prohibited uses that erected barriers. For example, one resident who wished to offer cooking classes found that the spaces she visited did not have small kitchens. When she finally found a suitable space, there were too many restrictions preventing her from conducting her classes. Updating the Home Occupations action item would assist in providing more opportunities for homeowners to start their small businesses, with the
caveat that this does not necessarily support those living in rental units. The action item should encourage landlords and property managers to permit such home-based businesses for their tenants.

**Cultural Community Center(s) and Social Spaces**

The need for cultural community center(s) was an ongoing theme that was supported by 88% (495/562 surveys) in Phase I and additionally supported during the Phase II focus groups. Clearly, cultural community spaces are valued as places to grow and thrive, and for diverse communities to continue to support each other.

Many immigrants and refugees expressed significant concern with respect to social isolation. While members of immigrant and refugee communities gather in their homes, there is not a real space to meet with community members to celebrate large-scale cultural events. Social space also allows community meetings for dialogues or trainings, and an area to help new immigrants and refugees to navigate through the American system in culturally-competent ways. Cultural and social spaces should be considered in future planning and development projects.

Immigrants and refugees often find that, in addition to the lack of social space, there are no venues to support their cultural preservation. Community members identified cultural preservation as, for example, having a gathering space that shows cultural art, performance, cooking classes, storytelling, or other forms of gatherings.

**Recommendations**

1. **Support Small Business Development in Immigrant and Refugee Communities.** Jurisdictions across the country are vying to attract immigrants in an effort to boost their economies. Aloha-Reedville has already attracted immigrants and refugees, many of which are interested in starting small business. However, they need support to develop, launch, and maintain thriving businesses. While most of this work is outside Washington County’s jurisdiction, the County can play a role in partnering with existing programs and thereby lend legitimacy to business development efforts. We recommend that the County continue to work with groups like Adelante Mujeres, as well as local business associations which are supportive of multicultural growth in the community.

2. **Designate Staff Contact as a Resource.** The County should designate a single staff contact so that individuals, families, and community-based organizations have someone to whom they can turn in the event that issues relating to economic development arise.

3. **Consider High Use Commercial Center that Supports Small Businesses and Cultural Inclusion.** The action item on a high use commercial center should include consideration of a cultural community center as well as mechanisms and
incentives for developers to support small businesses. Ensure that urban renewal projects do not only benefit large, out-of-state businesses, but offer opportunities (during development through contracts and subcontracts) for smaller, local businesses. Design elements of the center could include spaces that encourage the type of business development community members want, such as open air spaces for summer markets, or smaller shops designed for emerging small business owners. In addition, including immigrant and refugee community members in the visioning process for a high use commercial center would increase the likelihood that cultural elements are included, and a developer may be interested in supporting the community-validated vision.

TRANSIT ACCESSIBILITY AND SAFETY

Sessions on the community options survey indicated fairly broad support for transit-related action items. We found from the original surveys that many community members we surveyed are transit dependent. While many of them also drive, we found that other family members (including spouses and children) were especially dependent on public transit.

Data analysis on transportation issues in the community options focus groups revealed a strong emphasis on improving the accessibility and safety of local transit.

Accessibility

Transit services

Many community members in Aloha-Reedville rely on transit services for purposes other than work or school. For example, many families report relying on public transit for grocery shopping and for staying connected to family and friends. Many also used transit services to arrive at their places of worship.

Community members expressed concern that there are not enough bus stops to make transit accessible, and some reported having to walk miles to get to the nearest bus stop; bus stops are few and far between in many parts of Aloha-Reedville. Others expressed concern that transit information was inaccessible to those with limited English proficiency, which hampers an individual’s ability to understand bus schedules and transit system policies.

Timing of Buses

Participants reported that there were not enough bus trips in the area, and that if a bus was missed it could take as many as 20 to 30 minutes before another bus would come. Comments noted concerns with schedule reliability.
“Sometimes my 19 year old daughter has to skip her work shift due to late buses.”

Another commonly-reported concern was that transfer times are too short and should be extended to allow people to use their tickets for a two-way trip without having to purchase a new one. Although TriMet is likely to extend transfer times to two-and-a-half hours in the coming months, this would be insufficient to meet identified community needs in such remote locations, particularly as these residents must travel through multiple cities to reach their eventual destination.

Although transit service is under the purview of the Tri-County Metropolitan Transit District (TriMet), as one of its key intergovernmental partners, the county has greater leverage to advocate for such service enhancements when compared to community-based organizations.

Safety

Transportation safety is another frequently-identified priority. Individuals want to feel safe as they travel to and from their bus stops, and while waiting for a bus or carpool to arrive.

Safe Routes to Schools and Transit

Respondents reported that walking to transit from their homes (or vice versa) often felt unsafe. Part of this is because the Aloha-Reedville area’s sidewalk network is woefully inadequate, and because many roads are adjacent to deep ditches or ravines. The lack of reliable street lighting also made people feel unsafe as they are walking home in the dark and drivers cannot see them.

Respondents likewise viewed pedestrian walkways to schools a high community need. Parents were worried about gaps in sidewalks where children were forced into the street on their way to and from school each day.

Also, although only a few bicycle commuters were identified in the survey, our respondents indicated that there are not significant separated bikeways in the Aloha-Reedville area, which makes cycling unsafe.

Safety at Transit Locations

Public transit is highly desirable, but many respondents indicated that they felt physically unsafe at bus stops. There are many transit stops in the area without shelters or benches, and many are poorly lit. In the numerous areas where there are no sidewalks, it is
particularly unsafe for commuters to stand in unlit areas, and there have been multiple instances of people being struck and sometimes killed while waiting for the bus.

Recommendations

1. **Advocate for Expanded Transit Access.** Work with community partners and TriMet to advocate for expanded transit access, aimed at ameliorating long wait times, inconvenient or unsafe bus stop placement, and unlit bus shelters.

2. **Involve the Community in Decisions about Lighting Improvements.** While residents surveyed support improved street lighting, there were also comments from home owners and renters who expressed a strong opposition to street lighting in their particular neighborhoods (these individuals consider neighborhood lighting a sort of visual pollution, and others worried that lighting would increase traffic and negatively impact safety). The County should facilitate discussion about how the entire community feels about lighting in certain areas, weighing residents’ concerns against the overall safety of the community.

3. **Improve Bikeways.** Identify major area bikeways and challenges to safe, accessible bike access as a part of any transportation improvements.

**GENTRIFICATION**

Gentrification is the process of renewal and rebuilding accompanying the influx of middle-class or affluent people into deteriorating areas that often displaces poorer residents. This displacement is often felt most severely in historic communities of color and among renters. Gentrification can accompany public improvement projects that are part of government revitalization efforts. If the Aloha-Reedville Livable Community Plan successfully reduces barriers to private investment, gentrification and displacement could become a concern in the Aloha-Reedville community. This phenomenon has often trailed new development nationwide.

This plan includes recommendations for improvements in transportation, services, environment, business, etc. and can be expected to raise living standards in the area. The proposed action items may lead to improved housing and amenities, which will likely result in increased property values, new residents being attracted to the area, rents being raised, and current renters being pushed out due to increased costs of living. In addition, small, local businesses are also vulnerable to the influx of more affluent and bigger business.

The overwhelming majority of immigrants and refugees Aloha Unite partners surveyed were renters. For renters, the affordability of housing units and access to other amenities such as public transportation are among the most sought after when choosing a place to
live. Unfortunately, state law profoundly limits local governments' ability to mandate the development of new affordable housing, which puts communities at a greater risk for displacement.

Recommendations

1. Washington County can and should advance a state legislative agenda to ease statutory restrictions, such as ORS 197.309 (which prohibits mandatory inclusionary zoning ordinances) to ensure that new development doesn't increase the volatility of rental costs. In addition, the County can partner with advocacy organizations to help educate community members about current restrictions in state law.

2. **Monitor Demographic Shifts.** One key to understanding the impact of gentrification and the displacement which accompanies it is analyzing demographic trends. Using the 2010 Census and the information in the Aloha-Reedville Existing Conditions study as a baseline, Washington County should monitor the demographic profile of the Aloha-Reedville area (including an analysis of race, immigrant status, and income) for annual trends (by, for example, studying the US Census Bureau's American Community Survey, released in non-Census years). These data can subsequently be used by government, private sector and community partners to consider the need to mitigate potential impacts of gentrification should this trend arise.

COMMUNITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

The Aloha-Reedville Livable Community Plan contains many action items that Aloha Unite would like to see move forward. Community empowerment and support will be an important part of plan implementation; if nothing else, this project is an opportunity for Washington County to systematize its engagement with organizations like the partners involved Aloha Unite. Aloha Unite discussed ways in which plan implementation could move forward with the support of the community and Washington County.

Aloha Unite stays committed as a team to continue to see the work move forward with ongoing support from the County and the community. In addition, there have been many Aloha-Reedville residents identified that continue to express their interest in staying involved. Center for Intercultural Organizing will be working with Aloha Unite partners to align our respective organizational plans with Aloha-Reedville action items prioritized for implementation, and continue to work with partners in Washington County. In particular, this report should not be seen as a one-off opportunity to solicit community feedback, but as the beginning of an ongoing process of engagement; by this, we mean that the county can and should continue to engage the organizations of Aloha Unite individually and as a whole to monitor the implementation of the Aloha-Reedville Livable Community Plan.
Ongoing Development of Citizen Participatory Organization 6 (CPO6)

At this time, Aloha Unite has successfully placed new community members in leadership opportunities within CPO6. We view this structure as a way to engage more community members that have not been traditionally involved in area decision-making. The CPO structure—with support of OSU Extension Services—will help participants remain engaged and active within their community, and create a space for education and training. This will also allow a strong voice for community members to be more civically engaged and involved with Washington County commissioners and other county leaders.

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH

Aloha Unite and its member organizations noted that adopting a “social determinants of health” framework in reviewing Aloha-Reedville action items was helpful in prioritizing areas of implementation. The social determinants of health are the physical, social, and economic conditions that contribute to individual, family, and community health and or either facilitate or limit their ability to thrive. They are risk factors found in one's living and working conditions (such as the distribution of income, wealth, influence, and power), rather than individual factors (such as behavioral risk factors or genetics) that influence health.

According to the World Health Organization, “This unequal distribution of health-damaging experiences is not in any sense a ‘natural’ phenomenon but is the result of a toxic combination of poor social policies, unfair economic arrangements [where the already well-off and healthy become even richer and the poor who are already more likely to be ill become even poorer], and bad politics.”

Viewing the Aloha-Reedville action plan through the lens of social determinants of health helps highlight the connections between action items and their overall impact on the community. Immigrant and refugee communities and other underserved populations are most likely to be disproportionately impacted by health disparities, and—while it is not the primary focus of the plan—the resulting actions will either improve the community’s health or, as an unintended consequence, make them less healthy.

Survey data emphasized that transportation options, public safety and limited social support and social interactions affect communities of color in the Aloha-Reedville area. These concerns should be recognized when developing the physical community. Continued access to government, inclusive physical spaces, economic opportunity, healthy housing, and transportation access are the keys to a thriving community inclusive of all.

---

APPENDIX A

Community Engagement Survey

1. Do you? (Select all that apply)
   - [ ] Live in Aloha-Reedville
   - [ ] Work in Aloha-Reedville
   - [ ] Own a business in Aloha-Reedville
   - [ ] Go to school in Aloha-Reedville
   - [ ] Attend religious services in Aloha-Reedville

2. If you live in Aloha-Reedville, do you:
   - [ ] Own
   - [ ] Rent
   - [ ] Other

3. If you do not own a business in the Aloha-Reedville have you ever considered starting one?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

3a. If yes, what kind of support would you need to start a business?

4. When you think about the Aloha-Reedville area, what are three things that you like about it?
   1. _______________________________
   2. _______________________________
   3. _______________________________

5. What are three challenges that you experience in the Aloha-Reedville community?
   Challenge 1________________________________________
   Challenge 2________________________________________
   Challenge 3________________________________________

6. Do you feel welcome and/or comfortable participating in public events in Aloha-Reedville community?
   a. ___Yes ___No
   b. Why or Why not?
7. If you do not feel welcome or comfortable participating in public events, what could be done to change this?

8. Have you experienced any challenges finding safe housing in Aloha-Reedville?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

   If yes, what were they?

9. Have you experienced any challenges finding housing you can afford?

10. How do you get around from place to place?
    - [ ] Car
    - [ ] Bus
    - [ ] Bicycle
    - [ ] Walk
    - [ ] Other: ________________

11. Please rate the following transportation statements on a scale 1-5
    1=Very Important 2=Somewhat Important 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Unimportant 5=Not Important
    ___Safe access to transit services including bus and MAX
    ___Convenient access to transit services including bus and Max
    ___Reducing traffic congestion
    ___Safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations

12. Would you or your community use a cultural center if one were located in the Aloha-Reedville area?
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] No

12a. If yes, which of the following things would you use it for:
12b. Where in Aloha-Reedville should a cultural center be located?

13. Do you feel a sense of personal and community safety in the Aloha-Reedville area?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

13a. If you do not feel safe, what can be done to improve personal and community safety?

14. What could be done better to engage you and your community in the government decision making process?

DEMOGRAPHICS

15. What is your race?

16. What is your ethnicity?

17. What is your age?

18. What is your gender?

19. Please indicate your household's annual income:
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20. How many people live in your household?

21. What language do you speak at home?

22. What other language(s) do you speak?

23. What best describes you?

☐ I am a U.S. born citizen    ☐ I am an immigrant    ☐ I am an international student
☐ I am a naturalized citizen  ☐ I am an refugee/asylee   ☐ I am an international worker

24. In what country were you born?

25. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

☐ 8th grade    ☐ Associate's Degree
☐ High School    ☐ Bachelor's Degree
☐ Some College   ☐ Master's/Post-grad

If other, please specify:

26. Is there additional information you would like to add?

END: Do you want to know the results of the survey? Give us your email or contact on a different sheet of paper.
APPENDIX B

Community Options Focus Group Surveys

Transportation

1. Transportation Alternatives

Our community uses many forms of transportation to get around: TriMet (buses and MAX), driving, bicycling and walking. The Aloha- Reedville community has an opportunity to help prioritize investments in transportation.

(a) Please rank the following types of transportation according to what you use the most (first to last): Public transit, Bicycling, Walking, Driving (personal automobile), Other

(b) How often do you use the following types of transportation?

(i) **Public Transit (TriMet):** Frequently (approx. every day), Regularly (at least a few times each week), Occasionally (at least a few times each month), Intermittently (at least a few times each year), Never

(ii) **Bicycling:** Frequently (approx. every day), Regularly (at least a few times each week), Occasionally (at least a few times each month), Intermittently (at least a few times each year), Never

(iii) **Walking:** Frequently (approx. every day), Regularly (at least a few times each week), Occasionally (at least a few times each month), Intermittently (at least a few times each year), Never

(c) For each type of transportation that you use, please indicate what you use it for (to get to work, school, grocery store, medical care, visit friends/family, recreation)

(i) **Public Transit:**

(ii) **Bicycling:**

(iii) **Walking:**

(d) For each type of transportation, please indicate whether you would use it more frequently if there were increased investments in that mode

(i) **Public Transit:** Would you use TriMet more if transfer times were longer, service was more frequent and/or transit stops were more accessible? Y // N

(ii) **Bicycling:** Would you bike more if there were more bike lanes and improved signs and crossings? Y // N

(iii) **Walking:** Would you walk more if there were more sidewalks and safe pedestrian crossings? Y // N

(e) Please list any other barriers to mobility or safety that you experience.

2. Transit Service Enhancements (Action Item #33)
The primary transit routes in Aloha-Reedville are bus lines #57 (TV Hwy), #52 (Farmington/185), #88 (Hart/198), #62 (Murray Blvd), #67 (Bethany/158) & the Blue Line MAX (Willow Creek & Beaverton TC).

(a) Which transit routes do you ride the most?
(b) Do you have any of the following concerns about these transit lines?
   • Not safe to access transit stop (no sidewalk, lighting, safe street crossing) Y // N
   • Too far of a walk to get to transit stop (more than 6 blocks) Y // N
   • Service is too infrequent (bus does not run frequently enough) Y // N
   • Not Enough (or No) Service in Evenings or on Weekends Y // N
   • Transfer time for single ticket is not long enough Y // N

Washington County partners with TriMet and can advocate for transit service enhancements, increased access to transit stops and improved amenities on these routes.

(c) What issues should Washington County focus on?

3. Sidewalks, Connectivity and Safety (Action Items #24-25)

There is a need for sidewalk infill, crossings and improved pedestrian safety in Aloha-Reedville so that residents can walk safely in the community. Sidewalks around schools are a high priority for residents.

(a) Please identify any gaps in sidewalks around schools in Aloha-Reedville that you think should be prioritized for investment.
(b) Many people in the community identified sidewalks around schools as the top priority. Please rank the following additional places based on where you think sidewalk infill should be made (first to last):
   • Businesses and stores
   • Transit Stops (bus and MAX)
   • Parks and recreation areas
   • Health and social services
   • Other:

(c) Please identify any intersections or areas along major roads and crossings that you think should be prioritized for improvements, and identify the first improvement you would like to see made?

4. Neighborhood Bikeways (Action Item #28)

Washington County has an opportunity to invest in better bicycle infrastructure. There are several options to consider: along TV Highway, along neighborhood streets, or off-street. Neighborhood routes include options such as Johnson or Alexander to the north and Blanton or Shaw to the south.
(a) Please identify your top three potential bike routes in Aloha-Reedville that can provide safe bicycle access to transit, services, goods and community destinations.
(b) Please identify any other access, safety or design concerns with bicycling in the community.

5. Air Quality, Asthma, and Community Health

*Air pollution and hazardous air toxics are a serious problem in Washington County and across the Portland region. Exposure to air toxics can result in serious health impacts, such as respiratory and heart illness, kidney disease and cancer.*

(a) Does anyone in your household have asthma or respiratory illness? Y // N
   If yes, who?
(b) Please rank the following sources of air toxic emissions based on your level of concerns (first to last):
   - Residential Wood Combustion (wood burning)
   - On-Road Mobile (cars, trucks, automobiles)
   - Area Sources (gas stations, auto body shops, Laundromats)
   - Non-Road Mobile (construction and landscape maintenance)
   - None of the above (air toxics is not a concern)
(c) Please rank the following strategies you think Washington County could use to reduce air toxic emissions (first to last):
   - Work with DEQ to retrofit wood stoves (to reduce air toxics from residential wood burn)
   - Work with TriMet to increase transit ridership (to reduce air toxics from cars)
   - Work with County health department and DEQ to require stricter air pollution permit standards for small businesses (to reduce area source emissions)
   - Encourage clean diesel and mitigation measures for all construction and maintenance projects (to reduce non-road mobile emissions)
   - Other (any other air toxic risk-reduction strategies):
(d) Please describe any other concerns related to air quality and/or health?
Housing

What can we do to make our homes healthier, safer, more affordable, and better for our community? The Aloha-Reedville study and Livable Community Plan has identified some potential ways to improve the housing options for current and future residents of Aloha-Reedville. Which ideas would you like to see implemented? Are there any others we haven’t considered?

1. Housing Maintenance Code

For renters, a housing maintenance code may help to ensure that your apartment or house is safe and habitable. If a landlord doesn’t make repairs, this can make your house unsafe or unhealthy because of mold, unsafe electrical systems, or other reasons. If a Housing Maintenance Code was established, landlords might be more likely to keep buildings in good repair. For homeowners, it’s important to keep your home safe and healthy as well. If your or your neighbor’s home has a fire hazard, or is infested with rats or mice, this can affect the whole neighborhood.

In order for a Housing Maintenance Code to be effective, there would need to be inspectors. People who live in the community would probably help pay for inspectors through a tax or fee. That might mean that your rent or property taxes go up.

(a) Do you think a housing maintenance code might help improve your house, apartment, or neighborhood? Y//N
(b) Do you think it would be worth paying for? Y//N

2. Fair Housing

Fair housing means that everyone should have the same access to housing, and rights to live in their housing without discrimination, regardless of their race, religion, nation of birth, gender, family size, or other “protected classes.” This project can help reduce housing discrimination and segregation by making changes to code language and government policies that are discriminatory or unfairly create problems for people based on race, gender, family status, etc.

(a) Can you think of some examples of how someone might face discrimination when looking for a home to rent or buy?

3. ADU – Accessory Dwelling Unit or “Granny Flat”

An ADU is a second, smaller home that a property owner can build on his/her lot. This can make room for an additional family member, or the property owner can rent it to someone else. This can help property owners increase their income, as well as increase the number of rental units available throughout the Aloha-Reedville area, without the need to find additional land to build on.
Right now, it is expensive and hard for property owners to build an ADU because of the development code and permitting process. The County is taking steps to make this process cheaper and easier.

(a) How could an ADU help your family or neighborhood?

4. Community Land Trust – To make buying a home more affordable

A Community Land Trust or CLT buys old homes, or builds new homes, and sells them at a reduced price to a new homeowner who wouldn’t normally be able to afford one. The price of the home can be as low as 50%-70% of what the price would be on the private market.

In return, if the homeowner ever wants to resell the home, after one year, ten years, or 100 years, the owner agrees to sell the house back to the CLT or at a reduced price, so that the home remains affordable for future Aloha-Reedville residents.

(a) Do you think a Community Land Trust would work for your family or in your neighborhood? Y // N

5. Corner Duplex Options – Allowing duplexes on corner lots

A duplex can look like a regular house or a small apartment building, and includes two smaller homes. Some Aloha-Reedville residents are looking for more additional housing options – bigger than an apartment, but smaller than a single-family house. If duplexes were allowed on corner lots, the smaller homes could be more affordable, without changing the nature of the neighborhood.

(a) Would you like to live in a corner duplex, or see more of them in your neighborhood? Y // N

6. Incentives for homeowners to improve or repair their homes

Some Aloha-Reedville homeowners would like to make improvements or repairs to their homes, but don’t have enough money or access to loans to do it. This program could establish a new incentive program for homeowners, or simply promote homeowner awareness of programs that already exist through the city and county.

In order for a new incentive program to work, it would need money for incentives and operations. People who live in the community would need to provide money for a new program through a tax or fee. That might mean that your rent or property taxes go up.

(a) Would you take advantage of an “Incentives for Homeowners” program, or like to see a program in your neighborhood? Y // N
(b) Would it be worth paying for a new program? Y // N
(c) Would it be better to promote programs that already exist? Y // N

7. Aging in Place – Finding ways to make sure residents can stay in their home, as they get older

As we move through life, our housing needs and preferences change. How can we find ways to make changes to our homes and neighborhoods so that we don’t have to move when we get older? We could explore future strategies, changes to the city code, or work to develop programs that could help seniors to age in place.

(a) How would an “aging in place” program or strategy help your family or community?

8. Employer-Supported Housing – How can we live closer to where we work?

We can reduce traffic and congestion if people lived closer to their jobs. Some jobs have programs to help employees buy homes closer to their job. This program could help promote those programs, and perhaps encourage more employers to offer them.

(a) What kind of support do you think an employer could reasonably provide you?

9. Residential Development

People want to live in Aloha-Reedville, because it’s such a great place! This means that, as the community grows, we may need to build new residential developments so that new people moving here will have a place to live. We can explore different tools to encourage new residential development to include housing options for people at all income levels. For private development, the County could provide incentives to ensure that some of the new homes are available to people and families of all incomes. Some of these incentives may have costs or require additional revenue, and some may require changes to the code. There are also state-level restrictions that limit how the County may require what is built in exchange for these incentives. All of these issues would need to be considered if the County were to design an incentive program. The County can also explore ways to assist non-profit developers, often called CDCs, to secure public funding to build all types of housing for different types of people, including seniors or larger families, and include social services and support, such as childcare, after-school programs and health services.

(a) Do you want new residential developments to provide housing opportunities for people at all income levels? Y // N
(b) Do you want the County to explore an incentive-based program for new private development? Y // N
(c) Do you want the County to explore ways to assist non-profit developers to secure public funding? Y // N
(d) Would you consider a new tax or fee to help pay for these programs? Y // N
Economic Development

Overall, the Aloha community represents a target market in many ways. It is very important to know the social, demographics and psychographic analysis of this market, its composition and segmentation, in order to promote or generate economic activities that meet the specific needs of this market. This question will help to understand the commonalities and differences of the members of the study sample.

1. Why do you live in Aloha?
   - Housing (cost, location, etc.)
   - Jobs
   - Schools (schools, community colleges, etc.)
   - Location (close to public transportation, roads, etc.)
   - Other reason, please specify: _________________________________

In the questionnaire of the study, we found a constant concern to improve the appearance and promotion of the city in order to increase business. We found that the members of the sample recommended by 90% the improvement in the overall appearance of the community and its promotion. These questions will help us to find out what kinds of attractions are here already, and what new things might help make the community more attractive. This can help provide useful information for future marketing promotion campaign for Aloha-Reedville. The questions will help us to understand the shopping habits of the members of this study sample and will be a good starting point to promote increased economic activity in the area.

2. Shopping and Attractions

   (a) What kind of attractions you would like to have / see in Aloha?
       - Cultural attractions (galleries, concert halls, museums)
       - New workplaces
       - Parks and recreational sites
       - Shopping
       - Other, please specify: _________________________________

   (b) Where do you do your shopping?
   (c) What do you buy?
   (d) How often?
   (e) What kinds of things would you like to buy, that you can’t get in Aloha-Reedville right now?

3. Physical Attributes

   (a) Do you think Aloha is an attractive place? Y // N
       If you answered yes, why?
       If you answered no, why?
   (b) If you could add or remove something from Aloha, What would be?
4. Interactive activity

The participant will place a post it on the location of their home or business in the community, this activity would help us to identify the geographical distribution of the members of the sample.

(a) Where do you live?
(b) Where do you do your shopping?
(c) Attractions? / Needs?

Participants will choose a business, attraction, shopping place, etc., actual, or wished-for by them, in their answers and will be located on the map, in that way we could know the geographical zones of commercial and marketing interest to the members of the sample.
APPENDIX C

Response to Action Items – December 2, 2013

Healthy and Active Living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Findings &amp; Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Support development of parks and having a safe environment for families to enjoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Markets</td>
<td>Support with the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is highly supported as a business opportunity for immigrant and refugees who want to participate in farmers markets as a starting point to pilot their business prior to investing in loans. Farmers markets supports newly arrived immigrant and refugee business owners a place for engaging in their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Entry fees into farmers markets to open a stand can be steep for someone beginning their business so allowing a gradual fee from $0.00 – regular pricing to allow their business to transition and grow. The county and community-based organizations should work with any future market owner to accomplish this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Allow a space for new vendors to showcase their services and products for maximum exposure within the first three months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Business education for vendors if they are interested in expanding their business and helping them to explore other avenues to expand their business, in partnership with organizations such as the Aloha Business Association, Adelante Mujeres, or Portland Community College’s Small Business Development Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and Neighborhood Trails</td>
<td>Support with the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: Provide community leaders support to host gatherings so communities which do not frequent these trails can experience them for the first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Neighborhood Bikeways

**Support with exploring options:**

Recommendation: Support community biking programs for people that do not have access to bikes by expanding awareness of existing programs. For example, campuses have the Yellow Bike program providing community access to bikes.

http://www.eckerd.edu/green/transportation/yellowbike.php

### Neighborhood Quality/Business and Shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Findings &amp; Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Occupations</td>
<td>Support with the following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation: While we support the inclusion of home occupations, Aloha Unite strongly believes apartment residents should have same opportunity. While we recognize this recommendation lies outside the scope of a County Development Code criteria, and is a tenant/lease agreement issue, Aloha Unite partners felt it should be recorded in this report. Many apartment dwelling families reported wanting to start a home business. Apartment home occupations would provide economic prosperity for residents, and landlords should be encouraged to consider allowing these uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Maintenance Code and Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation: This action item is a key identified issue that we would like to see move forward as an implemented action item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Support with the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation: We wanted to explicitly address that ‘extended families to live together’ also means multi-generational communities creating spaces for elders as well as young adults (18-25) needing housing support. Culturally many communities live together not only for economic reasons but also for social support and to maintain cultural norms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation Programs</td>
<td>Support with the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation: This action item primarily supports the upkeep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and maintenance of home owners but does not address supporting housing rehabilitation programs for tenants in apartment units. We are recommending that landlords are monitored so that their property maintenance workers are trained in housing repairs and maintenance. In most apartment leases, tenants are not allowed to make their own repairs and put themselves at risk if repairs are done improperly or poorly. See attached Appendix – Housing Maintenance Code

Business and Shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Findings &amp; Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Local Businesses</td>
<td>Support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This action item is a key identified issue that we would like to see move forward as an implemented action item. Included in Community Options Survey Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Process Improvements</td>
<td>Support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use Commercial Center</td>
<td>Neutral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This action is discussed in attached appendix on - Supporting Local Businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development of a high use commercial center will directly impact existing local business owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development of the high use commercial center also needs to have involvement of the community. The Recommendations in the action plan currently states that engagement of community members are ‘currently underway’ however from speaking to several local business owners they have not been invited to participate in the framework plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Getting Around Safely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Findings &amp; Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Street Lighting

Support with the following:

The recommended action items should include that there will be some support for neighborhood and community involvement to make decisions about lighting in their neighborhoods but also a broader discussion about how the entire community feels about lighting in certain areas. There have been comments where some residential home owners do not want street lighting in their neighborhoods, noting that increasing traffic in these areas may impact the safety of pedestrians and bikers that use those pathways for commuting.

Addressing the broader community needs for street lighting in particular areas will also minimize the impact of costs to the community.

Currently, the feasibility study has a minimum requirement of 51% property owner agreement for a requested area. We recommend a minimum standard of participation, not only agreement, in order to move forward, and that the input of diverse community members (including renters) is likewise considered.

Street Crossing Improvements

Support.

The crossing improvement areas identified are in alignment with the broader community.

Sidewalks Near Schools

Support with the following:

Recommendation to support, along with all other infrastructure recommendations with regards to sidewalks, access areas and major street improvements.

Accessways

Support.

An emphasis on lighting in these areas is important and should strongly be considered when developing and planning.

Major Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Findings &amp; Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service Enhancements</td>
<td>Neutral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation to support community involvement in the Westside Service Enhancement Plan. Community feedback emphasizes the lack of safety at the bus stops. Another recommendation is advocating for more bus routes and increase transfer times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Street Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Support with the following: Recommending Wayfinding action item dropped to be included into this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hillsboro Planning Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Neutral. Need to consider the impact on local businesses and existing residential communities as streets are widened for expansion. The review of environmental and economic impact needs to be reviewed to mitigate adverse affects to those being displaced by any development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ENGAGING LATINO COMMUNITY MEMBERS REPORT

April, 2013

Centro Cultural de Washington County
This study is a three-year effort that involves the entire Aloha-Reedville community to express their views to improve the quality of life and take into account the impact of future growth.

The Hispanic community involvement is very important as it will obtain the point of view of this group in the community problems in the Aloha-Reedville study area.

The role assigned to the Centro Cultural in the Aloha Reedville project was to work with the Hispanic community who reside within the study area. Gather and document their opinions on community issues presented related to housing, transportation, labor and business etc. Along with other relevant areas of concern such as public safety (Police, Fire), street lighting, lack of sidewalks, schools, parks & recreation, etc.

Centro used different tools and methods to gather the desired information such as surveys, interviews, and personal visits to different households to share information about the project, and group meetings with Aloha-Reedville residents utilizing “The Meeting in the Box.”

**Methodology**

Centro was contracted to identify and locate the Hispanic population within the study area and identify the places, locations where Hispanics they congregate or social facilities they attend. We proceeded to communicate with the different businesses, churches and neighborhoods within the study area through phone calls, visits, emails and informational flyers. Once we obtained the necessary authorizations from churches, business and schools, the Centro team proceeded to gather and disseminate study information

Individual interviews: These were structured interviews, where the questions were created and determined beforehand, we also conducted unstructured conversations that allowed the team to range wherever the interviewee needed to go in relation to gathering the information for the study.

Group interviews: These were conducted similar to individual interviews, but involved two or more interviewees at a time, rather than one. In the Latino community group interviews have some advantages, in that interviewees can act as a check on one another and stimulate one another’s thinking. At the same time, the team interviewer was the facilitator, making sure that no one person dominates, and that everyone gets a reasonable chance to speak.

Community or other large meetings: These meetings allowed us to impact a broader range of people and gave them a chance to express their opinions and react to others, while drawing on a large pool of opinions and knowledge at one time, and uncover disagreements or differences that can then be discussed.

[www.co.washington.or.us/alohareedville](http://www.co.washington.or.us/alohareedville)
In regards to disseminating and gathering study information utilizing “Meeting in a Box”, we focused on condominiums and townhouses complex locations. Our initial contact was with the complex manager or owner and study team proceeded to deliver study information through fliers and invite neighbors to attend the group study meetings. At each meeting, participants chose the topic of interest they wanted to know about it and continue with the protocol set for this information gathering purpose within the confines of the MIB information tool, to capture the informational surveys.

**Results:**

1. The majority of the surveys were collected in the churches. Many were interested in providing the information requested at the same time it was quite difficult to get an appointment with the community leaders.

2. Working with Hispanic businesses in the area was a positive experience and much easier to gather the study information. The business owners, after explaining our purpose, proceeded to give permission for the survey activity at the entry to the business.

3. In condominiums and apartments, managers are not allowed to make a decision of this nature and had to have the authorization of the owners, who in most cases did not respond to our request.

4. The Centro study team used the medium of radio and television (Univision, Portland) to disseminate Aloha-Reedville project study information.

5. Our goal was to complete 300 surveys in Spanish and surpassed. We collected 311 surveys, translated results into English and placed the results in Survey Monkey.

6. We organized six meetings with study residents in their homes utilizing the MIAB tool. The team completed 26 MIA surveys.

7. The team introduced a new method of gathering study information among the Hispanic community utilizing electronic voting method to indicate the services and areas of concern within the study area.

8. When the Centro study team asked participants to write down their name and address on the attendance rooster the participants felt very uncomfortable and hesitant to provide this information.

www.co.washington.or.us/alohareedville
Conclusion

1. Sunday in our experience was the best day to disseminate study information and gather surveys.

2. The Aloha-Reedville study information distributed to the Hispanic community that was made available in Spanish was a great help in gathering community responses.

3. The meeting in the box (MIB) is designed for use in condominiums and townhouses. Attendance at meetings where the information tool was used received a positive response by 60% of the participants invited. It was enthusiastically received by the community who participated in the meetings.

4. The majority of the Hispanic community participants turned main issue was around the area of housing and receiving information of the duties and rights they have as tenants.

5. Electronic voting method was an efficient tool for Hispanic community participants to learn about the possible options and solutions to issues and problems raised during the course of the study.

6. 90% of the participants surveyed by Centro were of Mexican origin.

7. Sometimes, gathering information among the Hispanic community issues, problems, or needs can’t be assessed by using information that’s expressed entirely in numbers, percentages, amounts, frequency, size, etc. Numbers can be worked with easily, and they yield exact and valuable information, but they sometimes won't answer questions like "Why?” or “How?” or describe relationships fully. For some questions, study team needed to add or substitute qualitative methods and different ways of gathering reliable information such as people’s motives, opinions, and feelings, for instance.

Challenges:

1. It was difficult to communicate with church leadership to schedule the study events.

2. It was hard to reach apartment building owners to schedule events. Many of the apartment and condominium manager’s did not have the authority to allow the team on site for the study purpose.

3. MIAB informational tool needed to be facilitated by staff. They were not self-facilitated so that limited the number of meetings we could have.
4. The survey for this study group was long and that made it a challenge to complete.

5. The greatest difficulty was obtaining the participation and interest from the members of the Hispanic community in the study area. Most of the Hispanic population didn’t know they actually resided in the study area and thought they were part of the surrounding incorporated cities. After explaining the purpose of the project, participants became aware of the importance of participation and proceeded to contribute their ideas.

Suggestions

Centro study team strongly suggests incorporating more qualitative methods of gathering information from the Hispanic community. The basic reason to use qualitative methods is that there are some kinds of questions and some dimensions of community assessment that can be better addressed by them than by quantitative methods. The methods used were determined by the questions the study team was asking. The qualitative methods can better answer the how and why questions, and also provide other information in the process. The questions need to connect directly with the population within the Latino community with which this part of the study was concerned. In assessment, the best sources of information are those closest to what’s being assessed since they experience it more than anyone else. The questions need to involve the population of interest, or the community at large, in helping to assess the issues and needs of the community. This buy-in to participation by the community fosters a sense of ownership and support for the efforts. The following is a list of suggestions:

1. The surveys should be short, direct questions of the topic and make it easier for the participant.

2. Distribute the Hispanic community the outcome of the study.

3. Follow up on identified community problems.

4. Organize training workshops for the community to know the laws.

5. If this type of study or any other study conducted in the future within the Latino community, it would be beneficial to start meetings in participants homes, as people who participated felt more comfortable and safe by completing the surveys in their homes with people that agreed with similar ideas and needs in the neighborhoods where they lived. Then continue to gather the study information in public places, in other words reverse the order.
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INTRODUCTION

The Aloha-Reedville region is a largely unincorporated area within Washington County. As part of a larger public involvement effort for the Aloha-Reedville area, Riley Research Associates (RRA) was asked to provide a statistically valid benchmark survey of Aloha-Reedville area residents.

The initial baseline survey of 394 Aloha-Reedville area residents was conducted in August 2011, while the benchmark was completed in January 2014. The benchmark survey serves to assess trends and changes in resident knowledge and perceptions, as well as preferences regarding governance options.

METHODOLOGY

Riley Research Associates worked with key team members from JLA Public Involvement and Washington County to update the baseline questionnaire to reflect current issues. Key team members on development included Eryn Deeming Kehe with JLA Public Involvement, as well as Mike Dahlstrom and Kimberly Armstrong from Washington County.

The sample of 607 produces a margin of error of +/- 4%, at a 95% level of confidence. The survey was conducted from December 18th, 2013 to January 14th, 2014, between the hours of 3:30 and 8:30pm. Weekend hours were also utilized. At least three attempts were made for a phone number before considering it unusable.

RRA conducted interviews with 607 Aloha-Reedville area residents, ages 16 and older. The landline contact list was enhanced with cell phone numbers. The 600+ sample was requested in order to ensure reliable comparisons between samples collected in both the Aloha and the Reedville areas. As in 2011, RRA maintained a Spanish-language interviewer on staff throughout data collection to conduct interviews with non-English speaking Hispanic residents. (Please see resident characteristics on page 46 for a complete profile).

Care was taken to create a profile of survey respondents that is comparable to current census demographics of the Aloha CDP (Census Designated Place). Due to the larger target sample size, RRA weighted the age and ethnicity of the 2014 sample, to better reflect the population of the region.

Following is a question-by-question summary of results, with highlights for statistically significant demographic differences, where applicable. Due to rounding and/or multiple response questions, not all responses add up to 100%. The questionnaire appears in the appendix. Verbatim responses and cross tabulations are in a separate document.

---

1 Cell phone numbers were included in the contact list. However, due to the lack of cell phone towers in the Aloha-Reedville region, relatively few such numbers could be geographically targeted.
EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW: AREA ISSUES

Many issues were very important to Aloha-Reedville residents, namely public safety, a vibrant economy and local jobs, and education opportunities. While the proportion of those answering very important generally decreased from 2011, nearly all issues were named as very important by at least half of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Key</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1g. Public safety</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1j. A vibrant economy and local jobs</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1k. Education opportunities</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1e. Housing you can afford</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1b. Reducing traffic congestion</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1a. Safe and convenient access to transit services</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1d. Safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1l. Reduction of blight, graffiti, and abandoned properties</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1i. A sense of community and community involvement</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1h. Availability of community services</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1c. Recreation opportunities</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1f. Access to shopping</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents were read four options regarding the future of the Aloha Reedville area, and asked which of the four options would likely get their vote, and which their least favorite option was. *Annexation* was the favorite choice among nearly one-third, followed by *no changes*.

Residents were asked why they indicated they would vote for that option.

- **Annexation**: Residents felt Beaverton and Hillsboro already has established services, more to offer, they are already paying taxes to the city, they don’t want to establish another government, and the option seems efficient and less expensive than the other options.
- **No changes**: Residents said they already feel like they have all the services they need, they don’t want to be part of a larger city and intentionally chose the smaller area to live, and are concerned about increased costs, fees, and property taxes.
- **Incorporate**: Residents appreciate the small feel of their area and don’t want to be part of a larger city, they want to be able to have a say in what happens in their community, they want their money to be reinvested in their own community, and want to see Aloha-Reedville be its own entity.
- **Form Districts**: Residents feel this would be a less expensive option, and don’t want to be part of a larger city.
Residents also indicated their least favorite option for the future of Aloha-Reedville. The least favorite option was *no change*, followed by *incorporating the area*.

**Chart: Q13. Which Option is your Least Favorite?**

- **No changes**: Total - 30%, Aloha - 30%, Reedville - 30%
- **Incorporation**: Total - 25%, Aloha - 25%, Reedville - 25%
- **Annexation**: Total - 20%, Aloha - 20%, Reedville - 20%
- **Form districts**: Total - 15%, Aloha - 15%, Reedville - 15%
- **Don't know/Refused**: Total - 10%, Aloha - 10%, Reedville - 10%
Residents were read a list of potential improvements, and asked to rate the attractiveness of each (on a ten-point scale where 10 is “very attractive). Ratings were highest for making improvements to major roads, more sidewalks and crosswalks, and long-term financial stability for the Aloha Community Library. There was only a one-point mean difference between the top-rated improvements and the lowest-rated.

While many improvements were considered attractive, only five garnered a majority (or near majority) in terms of which improvements residents would be willing to pay for. Most would be willing to pay additional fees for at least one service, and many indicated at least two services for which they would pay additional fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Improvement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% willing to pay additional tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Improvements to major roads</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. More sidewalks and crosswalks</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Long-term financial stability for the Aloha Community Library</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expanded street lighting</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Expanded law enforcement presence in the community</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Business advocacy to encourage a more vibrant local economy</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. More opportunities for community involvement in decision making</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Enhanced or expanded parks and trails</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Safer ways to travel by bike</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. More housing options that are affordable</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Expanded code enforcement</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A community center</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication Preferences

Television and newspapers remain the most commonly-used sources of local information and activities, followed by word of mouth/signs and the Internet. While television, Internet, and radio were mentioned at virtually the same rate in 2011 as in 2014, word of mouth/signs and community organizations were mentioned more frequently in 2014, and newspapers and community organizations were mentioned slightly less often.
EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW: RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT

The vast majority of residents have participated in at least one activity, namely voting and reading informational mailers from the County; just 8% answered none. The proportion indicating they participated in each activity has decreased slightly from 2011, though CPO (Community Participation Organization) membership has increased.

Q3. Involvement in Activities (Percentage Answering "Yes")

- Voting in elections
- Reading mailers from County
- Check the County website
- Contacting County agencies
- Attending public meetings
- Reading letters to the editor
- CPO membership
- Sending letter to editor
- None

The vast majority of residents have participated in at least one community involvement related activity, namely talking to neighbors; just 7% answered none. The proportion indicating they participated in each activity has decreased slightly from 2011. 
EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW: RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT (CONTINUED)

Residents were asked which, of all the list activities they had been read, they felt could have the most impact in terms of shaping plans for the Aloha-Reedville area. Voting and attending meetings were the top-mentioned activities. The proportion mentioning voting, having a CPO membership, contacting County agencies, and involvement with the Aloha Business Association (ABA) increased significantly from 2011.

The majority of residents feel Washington County listens to residents like them. However, fewer feel their thoughts and ideas impact decisions made in Washington County.
KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ALOHA AND REEDVILLE RESIDENTS

Aloha and Reedville residents were self-identified by indicating whether they were in the Beaverton or Hillsboro school district.

Q1. Aloha residents placed greater importance on a sense of community and community involvement.

Q2. Aloha residents are slightly more likely to rely on the Internet for local news and information; Reedville residents are more likely to rely on community organizations.

Q3. Aloha residents were more likely to indicate they had voted in recent elections and read media stories on County plans.

Q4. Aloha residents are more likely to indicate they talk with neighbors; Reedville residents are more likely to volunteer at local schools (including PTOs) and participate in youth sports or activities.

Q5. Aloha residents are slightly more likely to volunteer for local non-profit organizations and local government; Reedville residents are more likely to mention participating in a youth or adult sports league, contacting county agencies, involvement with the Aloha Business Association, or checking the County website for information.

Q6. Aloha residents are slightly more likely to feel Washington County listens to a great extent.

Q7. Aloha residents are slightly more likely to feel that they impact decisions made in Washington County.

Q11. Aloha residents are more willing to pay additional fees for more housing options that are affordable, enhanced or expanded code enforcement, and expanded street lighting.
AREA ISSUES

Q1. As I read through a list of issues, please tell me whether each issue is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you, in terms of the future quality of life in the Aloha-Reedville area (Rotated order):

Summary Table

Many issues were considered to be very important, namely public safety (86%), a vibrant economy and local jobs (81%), and education opportunities (73%). Nearly all issues were considered very important by the majority of residents, with the exception of a sense of community and community involvement, recreation opportunities, and access to shopping.

Overall, the proportion of Aloha residents and Reedville residents that named each aspect as very important was comparable. However, the proportion that considered a sense of community and community involvement very important was significantly higher in Aloha than in Reedville.

Benchmark Comparison
The top four highest rated issues have remained consistent from 2011 to 2014. While many issues had comparable importance, some issues were rated as less important in 2014, notably: reduction of blight, graffiti, and abandoned properties (-16%), housing you can afford (-9%), safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations (-9%), and a sense of community and community involvement (-8%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Residents answering “Very Important”</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1g. Public safety</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1j. A vibrant economy and local jobs</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1k. Education opportunities</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1e. Housing you can afford</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1b. Reducing traffic congestion</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1a. Safe and convenient access to transit services</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1d. Safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1l. Reduction of blight, graffiti, and abandoned properties</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1h. Availability of community services</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1i. A sense of community and community involvement</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1c. Recreation opportunities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1f. Access to shopping</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Insights

As in 2011, in general, Hispanic respondents (and those whose primary household language is Spanish) were more likely than other respondents to indicate the issues were very important to them. In addition, Females were generally more likely than males to indicate that each issue was very important. Renters were generally more likely than home owners to indicate that each issue was very important.

Other notable demographic differences of those answering “very important” include:

b. Reducing traffic congestion
   ✓ Years lived in area: 1-4 years (70%) vs. 5-9 years (43%) and 10+years (62%-64%)

c. Recreation Opportunities
   ✓ Age: 18-44 (53%) vs. 45+ (30%-38%)
   ✓ Resident engagement: those who engaged in no activity (79%) vs. those who did (39%-40%)

d. Safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations
   ✓ Resident engagement: those who have attended a county meeting/have a CPO membership (61%) and those who have engaged in no activity (57%) vs. those who engaged in a non-county activity (48%)

e. Housing you can afford
   ✓ Heard by/Impact Washington County: Those who feel they are not at all heard and have no impact (79%) vs. others (62%)

f. Access to shopping
   ✓ Disability: Those with a disability (53%) vs. those without (33%)
   ✓ Heard by/Impact Washington County: Those who feel they are not at all heard and have no impact (41%) vs. others (34%)

h. Availability of community resources
   ✓ Age: 45-54 (58%) vs. 16-44 (45% to 51%) and 55+ (49% to 52%)
   ✓ Years lived in area: 1-4 years (70%) vs. 5-9 years (46% to 51%)
   ✓ Resident engagement: those who engaged in no activity (72%) vs. those who did (46%-55%)
   ✓ Heard by/Impact Washington County: Those who feel they are not at all heard and have no impact (64%) vs. others (50%)
Q1. As I read through a list of issues, please tell me whether each issue is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you, in terms of the future quality of life in the Aloha-Reedville area (Rotated order): (Continued)

Demographic Insights (Continued)

i. A sense of community
   ✓ Age: 16-34 (53%) vs. 35-64 (43% to 47%) vs. 65+ (38%)
   ✓ Years lived in area: 1-4 (52%) and 10-14 (58%) vs. 5-9 years (39%) and 15+ (42%)
   ✓ Resident engagement: those who engaged in no activity (78%) vs. those who did (36%-47%)

j. A vibrant economy and local jobs
   ✓ Age: 16-54 (82% to 87%) vs. 55+ (77% to 78%)
   ✓ Heard by/Impact Washington County: Those who feel they are not at all heard and have no impact (92%) vs. others (80%)

k. Education opportunities
   ✓ Age: 16-44 (80%) vs. 45+ (67-70%)
   ✓ Resident engagement: those who engaged in no activity (89%) vs. those who did (71%-72%)

l. Reduction of blight, graffiti, and rundown or abandoned properties
   ✓ Age: 45-54 (63%) vs. 16-34 (41% to 52%) vs. 55+ (45% to 58%)
   ✓ Years in area: 1-4 (64%) vs. 10+ (52% to 55%) vs. 5-9 (34%)
   ✓ Resident engagement: those who engaged in no activity (58%) vs. those who did (48%-52%)
Q1. As I read through a list of issues, please tell me whether each issue is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you, in terms of the future quality of life in the Aloha-Reedville area (Rotated order):

Q1a. Safe and convenient access to transit services, including bus & MAX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark Total</th>
<th>Benchmark Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 In 2011, statement read as: Safe and convenient access to transit services.

Q1b. Reducing traffic congestion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark Total</th>
<th>Benchmark Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1. As I read through a list of issues, please tell me whether each issue is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you, in terms of the future quality of life in the Aloha-Reedville area (Rotated order): (Continued)

### Q1c. Recreation opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q1d. Safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1. As I read through a list of issues, please tell me whether each issue is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you, in terms of the future quality of life in the Aloha-Reedville area (Rotated order): (Continued)

**Q1e. Housing you can afford**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2014</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1f. Access to shopping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2014</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1. As I read through a list of issues, please tell me whether each issue is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you, in terms of the future quality of life in the Aloha-Reedville area (Rotated order): (Continued)

**Q1g. Public safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1h. Availability of community services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 In 2011, the statement read as: Availability of community resources.
Q1. As I read through a list of issues, please tell me whether each issue is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you, in terms of the future quality of life in the Aloha-Reedville area (Rotated order): (Continued)

Q1i. A sense of community and community involvement\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 In 2011, the statement read as: A sense of community.

Q1j. A vibrant economy and local jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1. As I read through a list of issues, please tell me whether each issue is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you, in terms of the future quality of life in the Aloha-Reedville area (Rotated order): (Continued)

**Q1k. Education opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1l. Reduction of blight, graffiti, and abandoned properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 In 2011, statement read as: Reduction of blight, graffiti, and rundown or abandoned properties.
RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT

Q2. The next couple of questions have to do with information and involvement in local activities. How do you tend to learn about local area news, plans, and activities? (Unaided, Multiple Responses):

Summary Table

*Television* and *newspapers* are the most commonly used sources of local information and activities (38% and 37%, respectively), followed by *word of mouth/signs* (32%) and the *Internet* (31%).

Information sources are generally comparable between Aloha and Reedville residents, though Aloha residents mentioned the *Internet* more frequently, and Reedville residents were more likely to mention *community organizations*.

**Benchmark Comparisons**

*Television, Internet, and radio* were mentioned at virtually the same rate in 2011 and 2014. *Word of mouth/signs* and *community organizations* were mentioned more frequently in 2014, and *newspapers* and *community organizations* were mentioned slightly less often in 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Total 2014</th>
<th>Total 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth / Signs / Flyers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet / Websites</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Benchmark Report Summary
Q2. The next couple of questions have to do with information and involvement in local activities. How do you tend to learn about local area news, plans, and activities? (Unaided, Multiple Responses): (Continued)

**Demographic insights**

While not necessarily statistically significant, some groups were more likely than others to use each type of information source. Those more likely to use each source include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Television</strong></th>
<th><strong>Internet</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 55+</td>
<td>Ages 16-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish language households</td>
<td>English language households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of 1-4 years</td>
<td>Residents of 10-14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with a disability</td>
<td>Those without a disability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Newspapers</strong></th>
<th><strong>Community Organizations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 65 and older, followed by those 45-64</td>
<td>Ages 35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic residents</td>
<td>Those without a disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of 15+ years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those without a disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Word of mouth/Signs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Radio</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Ages 55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35-44</td>
<td>Hispanic residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic residents</td>
<td>Spanish language households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of 1-4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2. The next couple of questions have to do with information and involvement in local activities. How do you tend to learn about local area news, plans, and activities? (Unaided, Multiple Responses): (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Television</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC / KGW / Ch 8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC / KATU / Ch 2</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox / KPTV / Ch 12</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television (unspecified)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS / KOIN / Ch 6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox News / CNN / MSNBC</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous TV stations</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS / Ch 10</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univision</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newspapers</strong></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregonian</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argus</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton Valley Times</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton paper (Unspecified)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribune</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro paper (Unspecified)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous newspaper</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers (unspecified)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word of mouth / Signs / Flyers</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers / billboards</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs or Billboards</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2. The next couple of questions have to do with information and involvement in local activities.

How do you tend to learn about local area news, plans, and activities? (Unaided, Multiple Responses): (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internet / Websites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local news websites</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google / Search</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo / MSN / CNN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/Website (unspecified)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OregonLive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Internet sources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook / Social media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County / Government sites</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Information/ Publications/Mailers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organization (list)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO newsletters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio (list)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q3. Please tell me if you have you participated in any of the following types of activities (Aided, Multiple Responses):

The most common activities included voting in recent elections (72%) and reading informational mailers from the County, others (63%).

Aloha residents were more likely than Reedville residents to indicate that they have participated in voting in recent elections and in reading media stories on County plans.

Some groups were more likely than others to indicate they have participated in no activity. Those include: respondents ages 16-34, Hispanic residents (and those whose primary household language is Spanish), those who have lived in the area for 5-9 years (followed by 1-4 years), renters, and those who feel they are not heard by Washington County.

**Benchmark Comparison**

Respondents were less likely in 2014 to indicate they have participated in many activities, namely reading letters to the editor (-18%), reading media stories on County plans (-18%), reading informational mailers from the County, others (-14%), and contacting County agencies (-12%). The proportion of respondents with a Community Participation Organization (CPO) membership increased by 6% in 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting in recent elections</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading informational mailers from the County, others</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading media stories on County plans</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking the County website for information</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting County agencies</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending public meetings</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading letters to the editor</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Participation Organization (CPO) membership</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending a letter to the editor</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. With regard to local community involvement, please tell me if you have participated in any of these types of activities (Aided, Multiple Responses):

Talking with neighbors is by far the most common activity, followed by using social networks, volunteering at local schools, participating in youth sports or activities, and volunteering with local religious organizations.

Those in Aloha are more likely than Reedville residents to talk with neighbors, and those in Reedville are more likely than those in Aloha to volunteer at local schools (including PTOs) and participate in youth sports or activities.

Some groups were more likely than others to indicate they have participated in no activity. Those include: respondents ages 16-34, Hispanic residents (and those whose primary household language is Spanish), those who have lived in the area for 1-4 years, renters, and those who feel they are not heard by Washington County.

Benchmark Comparison
While about the same proportion of residents participated in at least one activity in 2014 as in 2011, fewer residents indicated that they talked with neighbors (-15%), volunteered with local non-profit organizations (-7%), and used social networks (-6%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2014 Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>2011 Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with neighbors</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks, such as Facebook or Twitter</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering at local schools (including PTOs)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering with local non-profit organizations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in youth sports or activities</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering with local religious organizations</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aloha community events</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in an adult sports league</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering for local government commissions or committees</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with the Aloha Business Association</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. Based on the activities I just mentioned in the previous two questions, which activities or areas of involvement do you think could have the most impact, in terms of shaping plans or decisions for the Aloha-Reedville area? (Unaided, Multiple Responses):

Residents indicated the activities they felt would have the most impact on the area. Nearly one-third mentioned voting in elections, and nearly one-quarter mentioned attending public meetings.

Those in Reedville were more likely than those in Aloha to mention participating in a youth or adult sports league. Reedville residents were also slightly more likely to mention civic engagement activities, such as contacting county agencies, involvement with the Aloha Business Association, and checking the County website for information. Aloha residents are slightly more likely to volunteer for local non-profit organizations and local government.

Voting in elections was the top response for all groups, with the exception of those who feel that Washington County does not listen to them. For this group, talking with neighbors slightly edged out voting in elections.

Benchmark Comparison
Residents were significantly more likely to mention voting in recent elections in 2014 than in 2011. They were also slightly more likely to mention a Community Participation Organization membership, contacting County agencies, and checking the County website for information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting in recent elections</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending public meetings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Participation Organization membership</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering at local schools, PTO meetings</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading informational mailers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with neighbors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in youth sports or activities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting County agencies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with the Aloha Business Association</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking the County website for information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering for local government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering with local non-profit organizations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aloha-Reedville Community events</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in an adult sports league</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks, such as Facebook or Twitter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading letters to the editor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering for local religious organizations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading media stories on County plans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending a letter to the editor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. To what extent do you think Washington County listens to the thoughts and ideas of area residents like you? (Aided, Single Response)

The majority of residents feel Washington County listens to area residents, though only 8% feel it is to a great extent. With 25% answering not much, 11% feel Washington County does not listen at all, and 7% are unsure.

Equal proportions of residents in Aloha and Reedville feel Washington County listens to an extent, though Aloha residents were slightly more likely to feel Washington County listens to a great extent.

Residents more likely to answer to a great extent include: Spanish language households, renters, those with a disability, and those who did not participate in any activity.

Benchmark Comparison
The proportion of respondents who feel Washington County listens increased slightly (+4%) from 2011, with those answering to some extent increasing by 5%. While the proportion who answered not at all marginally increased, those who were unsure decreased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Ref</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. To what extent do you believe your thoughts and ideas impact decisions in Washington County? (Aided, Single Response)

Two-fifths of respondents feel their thoughts and ideas impact decisions made in Washington County, though just 5% feel it is to a great extent. With 32% answering not much, 25% feel Washington County does not listen at all; 4% are unsure.

Virtually equal proportions of residents in Aloha and Reedville feel they impact decisions made in Washington County, though Aloha residents were slightly more likely to feel that way.

Residents more likely to answer to a great extent include: Ages 16-34, Hispanic residents, Spanish language households, renters, and those who did not participate in any activity.

**Benchmark Comparison**

The proportion of respondents who feel they impact decisions made in Washington County remained virtually the same as in 2011. There was a slight increase among those answering not at all, and a slight decrease among those who were unsure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Total Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8. To the extent you would like to see central gathering places, such as community centers, additional commercial or retail shops and restaurants, where would you like to see that kind of activity? (Unaided, Single Response)

Residents had many suggestions on potential locations for a central gathering place, with many mentioning the intersection of 185th and TV Highway.

Recommended locations were comparable between Aloha and Reedville residents.

Benchmark Comparison
Because different predetermined answer choices were selected in 2014, the benchmarking of secondary locations is more difficult. Looking at the responses for the top-response, fewer respondents mentioned 185th and TV Highway in 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185th and TV Highway</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185th and Baseline</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185th and Farmington</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington and Kinnaman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202nd / TV Highway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None / Not wanted</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / Refused</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 In 2011, the question was worded as follows: To the extent the Aloha-Reedville area has - or should have - a gathering place or a single community center, where would that gathering place or central location be?

7 While this was an unaided question in both 2011 and 2014, the predetermined list of locations was different, meaning that different responses were categorized under “miscellaneous” in 2011 and 2014, resulting in a less comparable benchmark.
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list)

Summary Table

Residents rated each idea from moderately high (7.7) to moderately low (6.7). The most attractive ideas included Improvements to major roads (7.7), more sidewalks and crosswalks (7.6), and long term financial stability for the Aloha Community Library (7.5). The least attractive ideas included expanded code enforcement, to better deal with things like hazards, stray dogs, and abandoned property (6.7) and a community center (6.7).

The top three improvements were the same for both Aloha and Reedville residents. In general, those in Aloha rated each improvement slightly higher than those in Reedville.

Though not necessarily statistically significant, some groups tended to rate the mean importance higher than others. Those include: females, Hispanic residents, and renters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Improvements to major roads</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. More sidewalks and crosswalks</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Long term financial stability for the Aloha Community Library</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Expanded street lighting</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Expanded law enforcement presence in the community</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Business advocacy to encourage a more vibrant local economy and improve shopping areas</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. More opportunities for community involvement in county and local decision making</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Enhanced or expanded parks and trails</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Safer ways to travel by bike</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. More housing options that are affordable</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Expanded code enforcement, to better deal with things like hazards, stray dogs, and abandoned property</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A community center</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

Q10a. Expanded code enforcement, to better deal with things like hazards, stray dogs, and abandoned property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Aloha)</td>
<td>(Reedville)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

**Q10b. Business advocacy to encourage a more vibrant local economy and improve shopping areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Participants</strong></td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

**Q10c. Enhanced or expanded parks and trails**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

**Q10d. A community center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Participants</strong></td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

Q10c. Expanded law enforcement presence in the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Aloha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

**Q10f. Improvements to major roads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td><strong>7.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

**Q10g. More sidewalks and crosswalks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean** 7.6 7.7 7.6
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

Q10h. Safer ways to travel by bike

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

**Q10i. More housing options that are affordable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

Q10j. Expanded street lighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

Q10k. More opportunities for community involvement in county and local decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Involvement Report - Appendix 5
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area. I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (Rotated list) (Continued)

**Q10l. Long term financial stability for the Aloha Community Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not at all attractive</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Very attractive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11. Most of the services I just mentioned are things that are usually provided by a city government (like Beaverton or Hillsboro).

Since the Aloha-Reedville area is unincorporated and not part of a city, new county services are usually paid for with new taxes or fees, which must be approved by those voters who would potentially be affected.

As I read through that list one more time, just say “yes” if I mention any feature or service that you would be likely to vote to support and pay an additional tax for, if it was on the ballot (Aided, Multiple Responses):

The vast majority of residents would be willing to pay an additional tax for at least one service (86%), and most indicating at least two services for which they would be willing to pay an additional tax. About half indicated a willingness to pay for improvements to major roads, long term financial stability for the community library, more sidewalks and crosswalks, expanded street lighting, and expanded law enforcement presence in the community. Even the lowest scoring service received support from nearly one-third of respondents.

While the top-five services were the same for both Aloha and Reedville residents, Aloha residents were more willing than Reedville residents to pay additional fees for more housing options that are affordable, enhanced or expanded code enforcement to deal with things like hazards, nuisances, and noise, and expanded street lighting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to major roads</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term financial stability for the community library</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More sidewalks and crosswalks</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded street lighting</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded law enforcement presence in the community</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer ways to travel by bike</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced or expanded parks, and trails</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for community involvement in county and local decision making</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community center</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing options that are affordable</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced or expanded code enforcement to deal with things like hazards, nuisances, and noise</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business advocacy to encourage a more vibrant local economy and improve shopping areas</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12. Aloha-Reedville residents have several options to help plan for the future.
a) One option is to do nothing. Some incremental transportation improvements may occur over time using existing county programs and funding, but otherwise no additional services or infrastructure.
b) Another option is to vote to incorporate and form an entirely new city. This would involve electing a council, and staffing some form of new city government to manage services to the new city’s residents. Property taxes would go up to fund any desired new services, but some state and other revenues may be available.
c) A third option is to join a city. Those in your geographic area would annex into Beaverton (or - based on school district boundaries -) Hillsboro. Property taxes would go up, but the city could provide some amenities like the ones we discussed through that city’s existing services and programs.
d) One additional option would be to form one or more county service districts. Property taxes would go up to pay for voter-supported services or amenities like the ones we just talked about.

If you were asked to vote for one of these four options, which one of the four would most likely get your vote (Aided)? The options again are: No changes, incorporate and become a city, annex and join a neighboring city, or form one or more county service districts?
(Single Response)

Annexation slightly edged out no changes to be the top option (30% and 27%, respectively). The options to incorporate and to form districts also received support (20% and 14%, respectively); 9% were unsure.

Reedville residents were divided on their support, with 29% opting for annexation and 29% preferring no changes; the support for annexation was higher among Aloha residents, topping no changes by 5%.

Hispanic residents were more likely than non-Hispanic residents to prefer to incorporate the area, while non-Hispanic residents were more likely to prefer no changes. Renters were more likely than owners to prefer to incorporate the area, while owners were more likely to prefer no changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District Total</th>
<th>School District Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>School District Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form districts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13. What is your least favorite option? (Single Response)

(As necessary) The options again are: No changes, incorporate and become a city, annex and join a neighboring city, or form one or more county service districts?

*No change* was the least favorite option (28%), followed by *incorporation* (23%) and *annexation* (19%). With 14% mentioning forming *districts*, 15% were *unsure*.

Both Aloha and Reedville residents indicated *no change* was their least favorite option, though the proportion of Aloha residents citing this option was slightly higher. Those in Reedville were slightly less in favor than Aloha residents of *forming districts*.

Residents ages 16-44 were more likely than older residents to mention *no changes*. The top response for those ages 45-64 was *incorporation*, and the most-mentioned response for those ages 65 and older was *annexation*. Non-Hispanic residents were more likely than Hispanic residents to mention *incorporation* and *annexation* as their least favorite options. While the least favorite option for renters was clearly *no change*, owners were more divided between *no change* and *incorporation*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form districts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Refused</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESIDENT CHARACTERISTICS

### Q14. What is the primary language spoken in your home? (Single Response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Q15. May I ask your race or ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed race</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 In 2011, the ethnicity question was not broken down into as many specific categories, which is why the “Miscellaneous” percentage is so much higher in 2011.
Q15c. Are you Hispanic or Latino?\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16. May I ask whether or not you are disabled?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2014</td>
<td>Total 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85% 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) In 2011, this question was asked as part of “May I ask your race or ethnicity,” but was asked as a separate follow-up question in 2014.
Q17. Do you own or rent your residence? (If Own or Rent) Is that a house or multi-family building?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own condo / Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent house</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent apartment building</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent duplex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent condo / other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18. About how long have you lived in the Aloha Reedville area? (Your best estimate is fine) (Categorized)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19. May I ask your age? Which of the following categories includes your age? (Aided) (Categorized)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark Total 2014</th>
<th>Benchmark Total 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Beaverton (Aloha)</th>
<th>Hillsboro (Reedville)</th>
<th>Benchmark Total 2014</th>
<th>Benchmark Total 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record language survey was conducted in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
<td>Hillsboro (Reedville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9. Can you tell me whether your residence is in the Beaverton or the Hillsboro School District?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton (Aloha, Sunset, or Merlo HS)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro (Century or Liberty HS)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi, my name is _________________ with Riley Research Associates, and I’m calling Aloha-Reedville residents on behalf of Washington County, with a quick, confidential survey, to listen to your thoughts on local priorities.

(IF NECESSARY) I’m not trying to sell or sign you up for anything. We’re simply gathering feedback from local residents. The survey will take about five minutes. Is now a good time to ask you a few questions?

(IF LANGUAGE BARRIER, ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE LANGUAGE & RECORD) [Spanish speakers will be offered a Spanish language interviewer]

Q1. As I read through a list of issues, please tell me whether each issue is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you, in terms of the future quality of life in the Aloha-Reedville area (Rotated order):

Q1a. Safe and convenient access to transit services, including bus & MAX

1 Very important 3 Not important
2 Somewhat important 9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1b. Reducing traffic congestion

1 Very important 3 Not important
2 Somewhat important 9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1c. Recreation opportunities

1 Very important 3 Not important
2 Somewhat important 9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1d. Safe pedestrian and bicycle access to desired locations

1 Very important 3 Not important
2 Somewhat important 9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1e. Housing you can afford

1 Very important 3 Not important
2 Somewhat important 9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1f. Access to shopping

1 Very important 3 Not important
2 Somewhat important 9 (Unsure / Refused)
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Q1g. Public safety

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1h. Availability of community services
(Any services normally associated with living inside a city)

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1i. A sense of community and community involvement

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1j. A vibrant economy and local jobs

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1k. Education opportunities

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
9 (Unsure / Refused)

Q1l. Reduction of blight, graffiti, and abandoned properties

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
9 (Unsure / Refused)
Q2. The next couple of questions have to do with information and involvement in local activities. How do you tend to learn about local area news, plans, and activities? (Do not read list - select all that apply):

- Community organization (list)
- Internet/Website (unspecified)
- Newspapers (unspecified)
- Radio (list)
- Signs or Billboards
- Television (unspecified)
- Washington County Information/Publications/Mailers
- Word of mouth
- Schools
- Yahoo / MSN / CNN
- Google / Search
- OregonLive
- Local news websites
- Email
- Miscellaneous Internet sources
- Facebook / Social media
- County / Government sites
- Oregonian
- Argus
- Local (general)
- Tribune
- CPO newsletters
- Beaverton Valley Times
- Hillsboro paper (Unspecified)
- Beaverton paper (Unspecified)
- Miscellaneous newspaper
- ABC / KATU / Ch 2
- NBC / KGW / Ch 8
- Fox / KPTV / Ch 12
- CBS / KOIN / Ch 6
- Miscellaneous TV stations
- Fox News / CNN / MSNBC
- PBS / Ch 10
- Univision
- Flyers / billboards
- Church
- Other (list)
- (Don't know / Refused)

Q3. Please tell me if you have you participated in any of the following types of activities (Read list - select all that apply):

- Voting in recent elections
- Contacting County agencies
- Reading informational mailers from the County, others
- Attending public meetings
- Sending a letter to the editor
- Reading letters to the editor
- Reading media stories on County plans
- Checking the County website for information
- Community Participation Organization (CPO) membership
- (None)
- (Refused)
4. With regard to **local community involvement**, please tell me if you have participated in any of **these types of activities** (Read list – select all that apply):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Talking with neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Volunteering with local non-profit organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Volunteering at local schools (including PTOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Involvement with the Aloha Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Volunteering for local government commissions or committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Participating in youth sports or activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Participating in an adult sports league</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Other Aloha community events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Social networks, such as Facebook or Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Volunteering with local religious organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(None)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Refused)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5. Based on the activities I just mentioned in the previous two questions, which activities or areas of involvement do you think could have the most impact, in terms of shaping plans or decisions for the Aloha-Reedville area?** (Do not read list – select all that apply): (If they say "all of them", specify which few they feel are most effective)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Voting in recent elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Attending public meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Checking the County website for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Community Participation Organization (CPO) membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Contacting County agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Involvement with the Aloha Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Other Aloha-Reedville Community events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Participating in an adult sports league</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Participating in youth sports or activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reading informational mailers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reading letters to the editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reading media stories on County plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sending a letter to the editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Social networks, such as Facebook or Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Talking with neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Volunteering at local schools, PTO meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Volunteering for local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Volunteering for local religious organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Volunteering with local non-profit organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>(Don't know / Refused)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5b. Other actions**
Q6. To what extent do you think Washington County listens to the thoughts and ideas of area residents like you? (Read list, Single response)

- 1 To a great extent
- 2 To some extent
- 3 Not much
- 4 Not at all
- 9 (Don't know / Refused)

Q7. To what extent do you believe your thoughts and ideas impact decisions in Washington County? (Read list, Single response)

- 1 To a great extent
- 2 To some extent
- 3 Not much
- 4 Not at all
- 9 (Don't know / Refused)

Q8. To the extent you would like to see central gathering places, such as community centers, additional commercial or retail shops and restaurants, where would you like to see that kind of activity? (Do not read list, Single response)

- 01 Farmington and Kinnaman
- 02 202nd / TV Highway
- 03 185th and TV Highway
- 04 185th and Baseline
- 05 185th and Farmington
- 06 185th and Baseline
- 07 185th and Baseline
- 08 185th and Farmington
- 97 (None / Not wanted)
- 98 Other (Specify)
- 99 (DK / Refused)

Q8b. Other location (be as specific as possible)

Q9. Before we start on the next few questions can you tell me whether your residence is in the Beaverton or the Hillsboro School District? (If unknown, probe for cross streets)

- 1 Beaverton (Aloha, Sunset, or Merlo HS)
- 2 Hillsboro (Century or Liberty HS)
- 8 Unsure (Specify cross streets)
- 9 (Refused)

Q9b. What are your cross streets or address, so we can categorize you later? (Record address if necessary)
Q10. Over the course of the last couple of years, Washington County planners have heard from a large number of residents, with ideas about ways to protect or improve the Aloha-Reedville area.

I’m going to read a list of some of the potential changes or improvements talked about most often, and I’d like to give you an opportunity to rate each idea.

Please rate each idea on a scale from one to ten, where one means not attractive and ten means extremely attractive. How attractive would it be to have… (rotated list)

01  1 - Not at all attractive   07  7
02  2     08  8
03  3     09  9
04  4     10  10 - Very attractive
05  5     99  (Don't know / Refused)
06  6

Q10a. Expanded code enforcement, to better deal with things like hazards, stray dogs, and abandoned property

Q10b. Business advocacy to encourage a more vibrant local economy and improve shopping areas

Q10c. Enhanced or expanded parks and trails

Q10d. A community center

Q10e. Expanded law enforcement presence in the community

Q10f. Improvements to major roads

Q10g. More sidewalks and crosswalks

Q10h. Safer ways to travel by bike

Q10i. More housing options that is affordable

Q10j. Expanded street lighting

Q10k. More opportunities for community involvement in county and local decision making

Q10l. Long term financial stability for the Aloha Community Library
Q11. Most of the services I just mentioned are things that are usually provided by a city government (like Beaverton or Hillsboro).

Since the Aloha-Reedville area is unincorporated and not part of a city, new county services are usually paid for with new taxes or fees, which must be approved by those voters who would potentially be affected.

As I read through that list one more time, just say “yes” if I mention any feature or service that you would be likely to **vote** to support and pay an additional tax for, if it was on the **ballot** (Read list – select all that apply):

01 Enhanced or expanded code enforcement to deal with things like hazards, nuisances, and noise.
02 Business advocacy to encourage a more vibrant local economy and improve shopping areas
03 Enhanced or expanded parks, and trails
04 A community center
05 Expanded law enforcement presence in the community
06 Improvements to major roads
07 More sidewalks and crosswalks
08 Safer ways to travel by bike
09 More housing options that are affordable
10 Expanded street lighting
11 More opportunities for community involvement in county and local decision making
12 Long term financial stability for the community library
13 (None)
14 (Don’t know / Refused)
Q12. Moving on, Aloha-Reedville residents have several options to help plan for the future.
   a) One option is to do nothing. Some incremental transportation improvements may occur
      over time using existing county programs and funding, but otherwise no additional services
      or infrastructure.

   b) Another option is to vote to incorporate and form an entirely new city. This would
      involve electing a council, and staffing some form of new city government to manage
      services to the new city’s residents. Property taxes would go up to fund any desired new
      services, but some state and other revenues may be available.

   c) A third option is to join a city. Those in your geographic area would annex into
      Beaverton (or - based on school district boundaries -) Hillsboro. Property taxes would go
      up, but the city could provide some amenities like the ones we discussed through that city’s
      existing services and programs.

   d) One additional option would be to form one or more county service districts. Property
      taxes would go up to pay for voter-supported services or amenities like the ones we just
      talked about.

If you were asked to vote for one of these four options, which one of the four would most
likely get your vote (read list)?

The options again are: No changes, incorporate and become a city, annex and join a
neighboring city, or form one or more county service districts? (Single response)

   1 No changes           4 Form districts
   2 Incorporate         9 (Don't know / Refused)
   3 Annexation

Q12b. Why did you make that choice? (Probe for specifics)

Q13. What is your least favorite option? (Single response)
(As necessary) The options again are: No changes, incorporate and become a city, annex and join
a neighboring city, or form one or more county service districts?

   1 No changes           4 Form districts
   2 Annexation          9 (Don't know / Refused)
   3 Incorporation

Q13b. And why is that your least favorite option? (Probe for specifics)
I have just a few questions to finish up, and again, this is a confidential survey (and I appreciate your time):

Q14. What is the primary language spoken in your home? (Single response)

1  English   6  Vietnamese
2  Spanish   7  Russian
3  Korean    8  Other (specify)
4  Chinese   9  (Refused)
5  Japanese

Q14b. Other language

Q15. May I ask your race or ethnicity?

01  White      06  Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander
02  Hispanic / Latino     07  Mixed race
03  Black or African American  98  Other (Specify)
04  Asian       99  (Refused)
05  Native American

Q15b. Other race/ethnicity

Q15c. (IF NOT SAID IN PREVIOUS QUESTION) And I also have to ask, are you Hispanic or Latino?

1  Yes   9  (Refused)
2  No

Q16. May I ask whether or not you are disabled?

1  Yes   9  (Refused)
2  No
Q17. **Do you own or rent your residence?**  (If Own or Rent) **Is that a house or multi-family building?**  (If multi-family, clarify which type)

1. Own house
2. Rent house
3. Rent apartment building
4. Rent duplex
5. Own condo / Other
6. Rent condo / other
7. (Refused)

Q18. **About how long have you lived in the Aloha Reedville area?**  (Your best estimate is fine)
(If less than 1, enter 1. If refused, enter 99)

Q18b. **Years in Aloha Reedville - categorized**

1. 1-4
2. 5-9
3. 10-14
4. 15-24
5. 25+
6. Refused

Q19. **May I ask your age?**

Q19. (Categorize, or if refused, ask) **Which of the following categories includes your age?**  (Read List)

1. 16-17
2. 18-24
3. 25-34
4. 35-44
5. 45-54
6. 55-64
7. 65+
8. (Prefer not to answer)

Those are all my questions. Thank you for your time and opinions.

If you would like more information on the Aloha Reedville planning project, you can Google “alohareedville” - one word, for more information, or I can give you the web site if you’d like: (www.co.washington.or.us/alohareedville).

Record gender

1. Male
2. Female

Record language survey was conducted in

1. English
2. Spanish

Record zip code