



### **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee**

12 pm – 2 pm, Wednesday, November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019

West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District Office, Conference Room  
2701 NW Vaughn Street – Suite 450, Portland, Oregon 97210

#### **AGENDA**

**12 pm** – Welcome/check-in/announcements – Susan/All

**12:10 pm** – Approval of October 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting summary – Susan/All

**12:20 pm** – Financial Report, possible funding request, and DEI work plan check in – Scott/Laura

**12:25 pm** – “Whose Land Report”; where do we go from here? – Scott/All

**12:55 pm** – Review Organizational DEI Goals and provide recommendation to the Board – Scott

**1:20 pm** – Long-Range Business Plan - Community Engagement Plan & Equity Criteria  
Updates/Discussion — Mary

**1:50 pm** – Action items review (*including upcoming meeting times*) – Scott/All

**2 pm** – Adjourn

**DRAFT -- WMSWCD Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Committee Meeting Summary – DRAFT  
October 23, 2019 Noon to 2:00 pm, WMSWCD Office**

**Attending:** Scott Gall (Co-Chair); Michele Levis, Mary Logalbo, Renee Magyar, Terri Preeg Riggsby, Randi Razalenti, Laura Taylor.

**Welcome/Check-In/Equity Shares** - The following announcements were shared.

Mary announced that on November 7<sup>th</sup> the Community Engagement Liaisons (CELS) orientation for the Long Range Business Plan (LRBP) will be taking place. On November 14<sup>th</sup> Mary will be having a planning meeting with Cliff Jones on his feedback about the equity lens pauses in the LRBP Community Outreach & Engagement Plan and having him implement a train the trainer for each key member that will facilitate the pauses throughout the process.

Laura announced that she sent an invite to staff regarding an equity lens meeting on the District's internship job announcements regarding lived and professional experience. She also shared the District's last internship job announcement with Verde, Wisdom of the Elders, and Environmental Professionals of Color to get feedback regarding any unintended consequences, pitfalls of the announcement and the potential change regarding lived experience. Verde responded quickly with the recommendation of limiting the number of qualifications and making the job announcement shorter. Laura also shared a link with staff and the DEI Committee of the American Dream Score from MovingUp. It's a way to reflect on your own personal advantages and challenges in life and how that relates to others.

**Action Item** - Michele announced wanting to check in on the status of further DEI trainings, and volunteered to connect with Juan Carlos at Metro regarding any trainings that Metro may be a part of that the District can join as well as any online trainings that Juan recommends.

**Approval of the September 25, 2019 Meeting Summary & Financials Review** – Mary, Renee, and Laura all had several small spelling changes throughout the document and provided those to Randi to update the final version of the summary. Mary had additional content to add and changes in existing content throughout the document and went over those changes with the group and provided Randi with a tracked changes version in which to create an approved version. The changes are too numerable to list here and can be made available as requested. The group approved the summary with the associated changes.

To keep the DEI budget on the agenda as a regular check-in item, Scott pulled the DEI budget from the regular District budget as a reminder to the group of what the DEI Committee is working with for this fiscal year. There had not yet been any monies spent for DEI work this fiscal year, and therefore an expense report was not provided. If this report were to be shown again some changes that would be incorporated to make it less confusing are to take out the prior years, take out the rows where there are zero dollar amounts, and either take off Program Cuts or have an explanation. The explanation regarding this column was that the monies were moved to communications related to the CELs for the LRBP update, which is imbedded in DEI work.

**Community Outreach & Engagement Plan Brainstorm** – Mary brought the group's attention to the Community Outreach & Engagement Plan document and reviewed the tools that will be used to engage with communities and the phased timeline. She asked the group for thoughts regarding going to other community meetings to solicit feedback and how to pair-down our list of partners to get feedback that will inform the LRBP update. The feedback from the group included the following:

- It may be a more accessible to change the word "barrier" to "hesitation" when asking folks that are new to the District what would cause pause for them to reach out for services.
- Giving folks that are new to the District information about specific projects that the District has worked on in addition to a general overview may help them better understand what the District does.
- Be very cautious of the time commitment that folks will need to spend in providing feedback. Incorporate asking follow-up questions within the first interview rather than going back to an answer on a later date and asking more about it. Consider going off-script to get more information as appropriate.
- Being really up front about time commitment and the purpose of the time commitment can be helpful.
- Consider combining phase 1 and phase 2 when possible. Streamline time commitment wherever possible for partners and community.
- Ask folks in phase 1 if they are willing to participate in phase 2.
- Final feedback survey link distribution: CELs, put in public places such as libraries, post in local newspapers *Southwest Neighborhoods SW News* and *NW Examiner*, and potentially send out postcard with the link to

**DRAFT -- WMSWCD Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee Meeting Summary – DRAFT**  
**Long Range Business Plan (LRBP) Update**  
**October 23, 2019 Noon to 2:00 pm, WMSWCD Office**

the District's tax lot.

- Consider having an offline version of the survey for those without internet access.
- If we were to engage in an open house, think about the location and timing to try to engage new people.
- Take advantage of Montgomery Park's tenant fair next year to engage a diverse group of folks who work in the District and the timing may work out well.
- Create a table for each phase that includes a list of participants or potential participants, and how much time is expected to spend on the phase.

**Action Items:**

- *Renee is creating a general info sheet and can incorporate specific projects that the District has worked on to convey what it is the District does for folks that are new to the District.*
- *Mary to send the revised community outreach questions that the tech staff massaged to the rest of the DEI Committee. Others need to provide feedback prior to Monday, October 28<sup>th</sup>.*
- *Mary will take a look at modifying the Community Outreach & Engagement Plan based on feedback at the meeting and will label the document with a version number and/or date.*
- *All: Send Mary any additional feedback as soon as possible.*

**Equity Lens Plan Feedback** – The group took a look at the equity pauses in the Community Outreach & Engagement Plan.

The following feedback was given:

The first equity pause should be moved before phase 2.1 & 2.2 begin. The best equity pause for the Board to be involved in would be the final one if they are only going to be involved in one. The equity pause after Phase 2.4 will be with CELs. Staff can make changes based on that feedback and then participate in a final equity pause that includes all staff and board and is facilitated.

**Long Range Business Plan (LRBP) Response to the "Whose Land" Narrative** – Due to time constraints, this agenda item will be deferred to a general DEI Committee meeting.

**Action Item Review** – no time for review; see noted action items throughout document.

**Next Meeting:** Next regular meeting is Noon to 2:00 pm, November 27<sup>th</sup> (day before the Thanksgiving Holiday). The December meeting is December 18<sup>th</sup> (LRBP focus).

Notes taken by Randi Razalenti, October 23, 2019.

# DEI

Item	DEI Program Budget	DEI ACTUAL SPENDING THROUGH 11/14/19	Other program	Amount	Total	Program Cuts
Organizational Development & Training	\$5,000	\$0			\$5,000	
Contractor & Community Organization Services for Culturally Relevant Program Materials Research & Development (*May include survey work, translation services and/or novel materials creation)			Communications	2,500	\$2,500	
Contractor &/or Community Organization Services for Requested Translation Services	\$2,000	\$0			\$2,000	
Green workforce initiative	\$0		Urban/grant	45,000	\$45,000	
Partnship Development and Maintenance			Education	2,000	\$2,000	
CEL's - Contractes Services for Partnership Development & Engagemnt (Community Liaison Leaders Input)	\$0				\$0	(5,000)
Equity Lens Implimentation (Includes review of Long Range Business Plan, Policies and Financial Plan)	\$4,000	\$0			\$4,000	
Contracted Services for Additional Demographics Data Planning & Collection	\$0		Communications	6,500	\$6,500	
<b>DIVERSITY, EQUITY &amp; INCLUSION PROJECTS TOTAL</b>	<b>\$11,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>			<b>\$67,000</b>	

# DEI

Item	Notes
Organizational Development & Training	New interns and staff/board are trained in Racial Equity 101 within 1 year of onboarding. Requested staff and board to be offered annually.
Contractor & Community Organization Services for Culturally Relevant Program Materials Research & Development (*May include survey work, translation services and/or novel materials creation)	Xfer to Communications
Contractor &/or Community Organization Services for Requested Translation Services	Provide translation services to allow access to program services and events.
Green workforce initiative	pilot program that implements Verde monitoring and maintenance training and program implementation
Partnship Development and Maintenance	Build and strengthen partnerships partners representing historically underserved communities
CEL's - Contractes Services for Partnership Development & Engagment (Community Liaison Leaders Input)	A committee of community leaders that serve as liaisons for racially and ethnically diverse historical District will be hired to review and inform District policy and programming including the Long Range
Equity Lens Implimentation (Includes review of Long Range Business Plan, Policies and Financial Plan)	Work with a consultant with firm grounding in equity to facilitate conversations and decisions arour
Contracted Services for Additional Demographics Data Planning & Collection	Demographic data and related qualitative data will be collected, evaluated and reported out on to u hold ourselves accountable to goals.
<b>DIVERSITY, EQUITY &amp; INCLUSION PROJECTS TOTAL</b>	

West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District

# Executive Summary: Whose Land is Our Land?

Spatial exclusion, racial segregation, and the history of the lands of West  
Multnomah County

**DRAFT**

Indi Keith  
Field Conservationist Intern  
2019

## Introduction

This report examines the ways in which the historical relationships between land and marginalized people in Oregon, Portland, and West Multnomah County are still impacting the District's work and the communities we serve today. As an organization that has committed itself to integrating diversity, equity, and inclusion into our work at every level, we face the challenge of serving a region where access to home- and landownership, proximity to green space and healthy landscapes, and exposure to environmental hazards is substantially influenced by one's race. How did we get here? This report will call attention to some of the legal, social, and institutional factors that have determined how land, homes, and natural resources have been made available to white communities by removing them from communities of color over the course of the past 200 years. The histories explored here include those of the indigenous Chinookan people of the Lower Columbia and the tribes that now comprise the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde, the Chinese- and Japanese-American agriculturalists who farmed from the Columbia Gorge to Goose Hollow, and the African-American communities who have long lived and worked around the Willamette and Columbia Rivers despite generations of exclusion and displacement. Going further, this report will examine the subsequent state of environmental injustice and inequitable access to landownership these communities in our District are experiencing today. After 200 years of racial exclusion and segregation in West Multnomah County, our communities of color may stand to benefit substantially from participation in District programs but face higher barriers to accessing services and leadership with us than their white counterparts. By better understanding the dynamics of past and present racial injustice in West Multnomah County, and specifically how they impact our work in land and resource management, we as a District will be better prepared to challenge patterns of inequity through our work rather than reinforcing them.

## Native Land Loss and the Colonization of the Portland Basin

We are not the first people to live on or look after this land. The Chinook of the Lower Columbia are West Multnomah's first land managers and stewards. They have survived roughly two centuries of a government and society intent on their eradication and the erasure of the traditional lifeways and land use they practiced for millennia on the land we are now attempting to restore. In particular, laws like the Dawes Act of 1887 and the termination of the reservation system in 1954 eroded the ability of Native Americans of western Oregon to own and benefit from the use of contiguous acres of land, instead "checkerboarding" and subdividing properties in ways that prevent most beneficial uses. So much of our work building up the health of our soils, protecting and restoring native plant communities, shielding the last of our prairies and oak savannahs from redevelopment- is an attempt to recover what was razed in the colonization of the Portland Basin. We've benefitted from that colonial project ourselves through our rights to live, work, and recreate on land that was ceded in exploitative treaties in 1857, from Forest Park to Sauvie Island. As beneficiaries who have set out to work for equity and justice, we have a responsibility to include the voices, concerns, and interests of the people who started this work, and to ally our efforts to restore the traditional functions of West Multnomah ecosystems with ongoing efforts to restore the traditional cultural knowledge of the first people of this land.

## Alien Land Laws and the Elimination of Asian-American Agriculture

Asian-American farmers and ranchers have been integral to agriculture in our District and our region since the very beginning. From Hood River to Guild's Lake, Chinese and Japanese immigrant communities at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century turned tiny pieces of land into thriving farms that sustained rich soils, healthy crops, and a living for their families. The Oregon state legislature, encouraged by Governor Pierce (a member of the Ku Klux Klan) and the white farming communities and grange associations threatened by increased competition for land and market share, spent the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century passing increasingly stringent laws governing the right of foreign-born residents to own and work agricultural land. These Alien Land Laws were explicitly designed to take now-desirable land out of the hands of the people who'd made it that way. The internment of Japanese-Americans in Oregon accelerated this process, ushering even those families who'd managed to retain their farms into camps far from home. While some Japanese farmers were able to find neighbors and friends to care for their land while they were interned, more than 85% of Japanese-owned land was leased or sold by the Farm Security Administration (FSA), a federal agency tasked with preserving agricultural productivity on Japanese-owned farms. Anticipating the end of the internment era, the Oregon state legislature passed the strictest Alien Land Law yet, forbidding non-citizens from setting foot on agricultural land altogether. While a coalition of Japanese-American residents won a civil rights case in the Oregon Supreme Court that forced the legislature to repeal the Alien Land Laws in 1949, many remained unable to return to their land. The discounts and financial assistance the FSA offered to white buyers during internment weren't offered to returning Japanese farmers, and thanks to the substantial value these farmers had spent decades building up on their lands, these farms were simply too expensive for most people to buy back. Japanese-American communities were able to win many civil rights victories following World War II; however, Oregon's state government was successful in virtually eliminating the competition white farmers faced from Asian-American agriculturalists, while ensuring that the region's most valuable farmland returned to white ownership.

## Redlining, Urban Renewal, and Racial Exclusion in 20<sup>th</sup> Century Multnomah County

From the New Deal to the present day, black residents of West Multnomah County have faced an onslaught of explicitly and implicitly racist policies that have created tremendous barriers to land- and home-ownership. The Home Owner's Loan Corporation (HOLC) and the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) spent the post-war era practicing discriminatory lending that created deeply segregated neighborhoods across the country. The FHA facilitated low-interest loans to builders and developers with the condition that homes in their new suburbs would only be sold to white families. HOLC collaborated with the FHA to map and define the riskiness of lending to builders and homeowners in residential neighborhoods; if one black household lived within a neighborhood's borders, or if restrictions on black movement into the neighborhood were on the verge of expiration, HOLC would downgrade the neighborhood's rating and cut off lending to the "redlined" neighborhood. Homeowners and developers in neighborhoods like Palatine Hill, Slavin's Addition, and Sylvan Highlands also installed covenants on property deeds across the city that restricted owners from selling or renting to racial minorities. Major mortgage lenders continued to deny applications in historically redlined districts well into the 90s, forcing black home buyers to take out risky loans or continue renting. While the Fair



Housing Act of 1968 had ostensibly freed non-white households to buy homes in whatever neighborhood they chose, the properties were no longer affordable for families of color who'd been denied the three decades to build wealth and equity as a homeowner that their white counterparts had enjoyed.

The belief that the homes, buildings, and properties in non-white neighborhoods were substandard and undesirable would further devastate black communities in Portland during the urban renewal era of the 1960s and 70s. When the federal government began providing funds to local governments for highway construction and other infrastructure projects, influential planners like Robert Moses encouraged cities and counties to kill two birds with one stone and use these projects as an opportunity to clear areas of "urban blight", by which he meant the segregated and struggling neighborhoods into which black and immigrant families had been relegated for decades. The construction of the I-5/I-405 loop, the Veterans Memorial Coliseum, and the Legacy Emanuel Hospital expansion razed nearly a thousand black-owned homes between them. The owners of these homes were given 90 days of notice and a below-market-rate payment of \$15,000. The devastating economic and social impacts that these policies and programs had on Portland's communities of color were not accidental or coincidental; they were the result of intentional decisions on the part of public officials over the course of the century to devalue, disenfranchise, and disintegrate the wealth and wellbeing of these communities. This interruption of the intergenerational transfer of homeownership, exacerbated by racial income gaps and the housing market crash of the Great Recession, has created a black homeownership rate that has not substantially changed since housing discrimination became illegal in 1968, not to mention average net worths for black and Latinx individuals that barely clear 1/10<sup>th</sup> of the white average. The belief that black neighborhoods are inherently blighted and less valuable continues to be a self-fulfilling prophecy that prevents black communities from building wealth and accessing services like the ones offered by our district.

## Land, Environment, and Justice in the District Today

In exploring the history of land and race in West Multnomah County, we've already seen how federal, state, and local policies have intentionally removed wealth and the beneficial use of land from communities of color and redistributed it to white communities over the course of the last two centuries. The result is a pattern of landownership that not only suppresses the ability of racial minorities to rebuild wealth and reestablish homes within our district, but also disproportionately exposes these communities to environmental hazards while reducing their access to environmental health benefits. Public green space in our district, from community gardens to Forest Park trails, is limited in traditionally redlined neighborhoods and to individuals who rely on public transportation. This makes it more difficult for marginalized communities to access the physical and mental health benefits associated with access to the natural areas our organization works to improve. Further, the industrial sanctuaries in riverfront neighborhoods like Guild's Lake, Linnton, and St. John's are home to many of the polluters responsible for our local Superfund site, which has degraded in-stream and riparian habitat and created a hazard extending up the food chain from the area's resident fish. Households in these areas are also the most exposed to the hazards associated with Portland's growing fossil fuel industry; Zenith Energy, a company that virtually created Portland's export market for hazardous tar sand crude ("dilbit") when they purchased a terminal in the Guild's Lake Industrial Sanctuary in 2017, has successfully dodged regulators and public disclosure requirements as they've shipped over \$71 million

of dilbit per year into the city by rail. Multnomah County's communities of color are disproportionately concentrated in the area exposed to a spill or explosion. Many of the same communities face disproportionate exposure to air toxins from industrial facilities and unfiltered diesel vehicles in a county that already has the dirtiest air in the state. A national study recently showed that air pollution is largely generated by white communities and breathed in by people of color. When communities of color are pushed out of safer and more desirable neighborhoods and onto the margins of industrial areas, and when pollution vectors like freeways are installed in the neighborhoods in which people of color already live, these communities are sentenced to lower life expectancies by virtue of the color of their skin.

West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District has resolved to work towards diversity, equity, and inclusion as an integral part of our conservation mission. We face our own barriers in this pursuit: as an organization that primarily works with landowners, we are missing large segments of already underserved communities thanks to centuries of exclusionary policy. As an organization that is overseen by a board primarily composed of people who own land in our district, we are drawing our leadership from a pool that does not represent the diversity of communities in our district. Finally, as a government agency, we have a great deal of trust and accountability to rebuild with communities of color, who have experienced these injustices at the hands of our counterparts in government. As a district, we are already making inroads towards rebuilding access, participation, and power to communities of color in their relationship to the lands of West Multnomah County. However, as we move forward in planning for the future of this organization, the pursuit of environmental justice must be integral to our approach: one's identity should not determine one's degree of protection from environmental hazard or one's ability to participate in the decisions that determine whether the place that one lives, works, or plays will be safe and healthy. By amplifying the voices of communities of color in our programs, our staff, and our leadership, we will not only be helping to restore some of what has been taken from these communities, but we will be ensuring that our conservation and restoration work is better informed, more resilient, and addresses a wider range of needs for the human and ecological needs that have always co-existed on this land.



## **WMSWCD Organizational Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Goals**

DRAFT Date: November 2019

The following includes overarching District goals for diversity, equity and inclusion. These goals are intended to provide clarity, commitment and accountability to the District and the communities it serves.

- a) Inclusivity: The WMSWCD is an inclusive organization that welcomes and engages all people in all facets of our organization, activities and programs.
- b) Diversity: The Board and staff of the District, the contractors we hire and the people who benefit from our work reflect the demographics of our service area.
- c) Equitable Engagement: The District meaningfully engages historically marginalized communities making, programs, and policy.
- d) Equity Accountability: The District works proactively and deliberately to understand and advance equity outcomes.
- e) Racial focus: WMSWCD will lead with racial inclusivity, diversity, equity and accountability actions and policies that result in positive outcomes for all.

How and why to use this document: By clearly stating our commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion as an organization, the District seeks to provide measures that hold ourselves responsible for progress. These goals also serve as a foundation and should be incorporated in the overall mission, goals, makeup, programs and services of the District. These goals provide the groundwork for the creation of refined diversity, equity and inclusion strategies with measureable objectives that feed into annual work plans for every staff and program at WMSWCD.

### **Why Center on Race?**

Our District has taken the initiative to review the history of racial disparity in Oregon, and how this history persists in the form of unconscious biases and cultural barriers that contribute to disparities in how we work, whom we work with and whom we serve. We recognize that gaining the perspectives of, and working with, communities of color will increase our organization's overall strength. The District acknowledges that racism requires attention and focus for long term change to take place. We understand that as we deepen our ability to understand and eliminate racial inequity, we are better equipped to transform individual actions, systems and institutions to enhance equity outcomes for all. While the District leads with race, we recognize that many other forms of oppression are perpetuated by the interactions of institutions, individuals, and culture operating amidst their historic contexts. Although we must prioritize our strategies, we maintain an approach that recognizes that all oppressions are inter-connected and, that by addressing some of the most glaring disparities, others oppressed may benefit. The District supports and encourages actions that lead to increased diversity, equity and inclusion outcomes for all.

## **Community Outreach & Engagement Plan**

### **Components of the 2021-2026 Long Range Business Plan (LRBP) Update**

#### **Plan Purpose:**

As West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District (WMSWCD) embarks on an update to our Long Range Business Plan (LRBP), it is critical that we incorporate the diverse perspectives and conservation needs of all within our district, to the best of our ability, as Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) is a foundational and ingrained value of our work.

This plan outlines a community engagement process that will assist WMSWCD in hearing the perspectives of those we have historically worked with in addition to those we have not yet worked with (but hope to). Community participants will review WMSWCD's current Conservation Scope, including our mission and vision statements, goals, and programs), to identify Conservation Scope opportunities, barriers to service, relevancy of our programs, and conservation priorities. Results of this review will be integrated into an updated LRBP that will guide the work of the District over the next five years.

#### **Plan Design Principles:**

- **Adaptability & Co-Designing:** Community engagement works best when it is an ongoing, flexible, and cumulative process enabling relationships and trust to build and strengthen over time. Community engagement events will be planned and designed with this in mind. We will enable groups or individuals to participate at whatever level they choose – from simply providing advice to co-designing the process, to undertaking some aspects of the engagement, to delivering projects.. While this document aims to provide an overall framework for community participation, we will remain flexible in our approach. We will utilize a range of methods to facilitate the widest possible participation from the diverse array of stakeholders we wish to engage with and to intentionally plan for communities that have been historically marginalized.
- **Intentional Engagement:** DEI values will be ingrained into this plan and the resulting LRBP update through intentional and targeted stakeholder engagement methods and roles that meaningfully include and focus on people of color. We will continue to engage rural and urban residents and land managers (both those we've worked with and those we haven't) to ensure we carry out a successful and inclusive community engagement plan.
- **Equity Pauses:** At regular intervals, staff will help facilitate "step back" reviews of issues, opportunities, and direction emerging from the process, and will self-critique (if feasible, will perform with stakeholders as well) on the level and effectiveness of DEI engagement and interpretation.

#### **Plan Key Phases** (Phases aligned with the broader *LRBP Update Strategy Timeline*):

- Phase 1. Information Gathering
- Phase 2. Direction Setting
- Phase 3. Plan Review & Release

#### **Stakeholders Engagement Methods:**

For those we have a relationship with (beneficiaries and partners, including residents, landowners and organizational partners), the following engagement methodologies are recommended:

- Staff-led (plus potentially board-led) interviews
  - Interviewees will be initially selected by a mix of strategic selection and random stratification to better ensure we are hearing from a diversity of perspectives and voices from both rural and urban realms.
- Online surveys
  - Openly-accessible surveys will be used throughout the phases to gather anonymous input from stakeholders.
- Focus groups
  - Focus groups will be held at pre-existing community spaces/meetings with an intentional plan that sets out to hear from a diversity of perspectives and voices from both rural and urban realms.
- Potential conservation scope participants
  - Facilitated meetings (community conversations) will address questions about current, short- and long-term needs, goals and challenges of WMSWCD focused on each theme with DEI as an ingrained value.

For those we don't yet have a relationship with, but hope to (with an emphasis on historically underserved communities of color, and urban and rural residents we've not yet engaged with) the following methodologies are recommended:

- A community liaison team will be organized & hired (through the PKS International LLC Community Engagement Liaison services "CELs" program) to engage and outreach to historically underserved racial and ethnic community members. Community liaisons will advise on conservation scope and engagement strategies, deliver community surveys and interviews, assist with outreach and recruitment for focus groups and participation in scoping conversations.
- Liaison-led (plus potentially board-led) interviews/surveys
  - Liaison-led stakeholder and community member interview/surveys will be strategically conducted to proactively seek out voices from those that are historically underserved and/or marginalized.
  - Additional Board-led interviews may be strategically conducted to hear from community members and/or organizations we've not yet worked with, but are interested in pursuing a relationship with should the Board select such partners and interviewers.
  - Additional Board-led interviews with other landowners, residents or other constituents within their zones (Zone Directors) or District wide (At-Large Directors)
- Online surveys
  - Openly-accessible surveys will be used throughout the phases to gather anonymous input from stakeholders.
- Focus groups
  - Focus groups will be held at pre-existing community spaces/meetings to hear directly from community members that the CELs have reached, along with voices from both rural and urban realms. Discussions will stem from an intentional plan that sets out to hear from a diversity of perspectives.
- Potential conservation scope participants

- Facilitated meetings (community conversations) will address key questions about WMSWCD’s Conservation Scope with DEI as an ingrained value.

**Phased Timeline** (Phases aligned with the broader **LRBP Update Strategy Timeline**)

**Phase 1. Information Gathering** (“Foundational Assessment”), September – December 2019

- For those we do have a relationship with, initial questions and conversations will focus on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats seen in WMSWCD’s Conservation Scope, with DEI as a foundational and ingrained value of our work.
  - Methods at this stage include staff-led interviews, online surveys, and focus groups.
    - Focus groups will be held at pre-existing community spaces/meetings with an intentional plan that sets out to hear from a diversity of perspectives and voices from both rural and urban realms.
- For those we don’t yet have a relationship with, questions will focus on overall engagement strategies as well as conservation scope opportunities, barriers to services, relevancy of programs, and conservation priorities.
  - Methods at this stage include liaison led surveys, online surveys and potential focus groups.
    - Focus group surveys will be held at pre-existing community spaces/meetings with an intentional plan that sets out to hear from a diversity of perspectives and voices from both rural and urban realms.
- Findings from this stage will be compiled and shared with staff, board and CELs for review.

<b>Phase 1 Participants</b>	<b>Tasks &amp; Expected Time Commitment</b>
Staff	Interviewing 4-6 partners & 2-3 program participants/residents and transcribing interviews (either 1:1 or via focus groups): 12 – 16 hours
Participating Board Members (Optional)	Interviewing partners & program participants/residents and transcribing interviews (either 1:1 or via focus group): 2-3 hours/interview
Liaison	Interviewing community members, meeting to form & discuss materials and reporting back on findings: 27 hours
Partners	Getting interviewed in person, over the phone or at a focus group meeting: 1 hour/Interview. Taking online survey: 15 minutes
Community Members	Getting interviewed in person, over the phone or at a focus group meeting: 1 hour/Interview. Taking online survey: 15 minutes

 **PRIOR TO MOVING TO THE NEXT PHASE, CONDUCT EQUITY LENS REVIEW(S) ON DECISION MAKING FRAMEWORK, SELECTING CONVERSATION PARTICIPANTS & QUESTIONS.**

## Phase 2. Direction Setting

### Phase 2.1 & 2.2 “Form Theme Groups, Plan & Hold Conversations”, December – May 2020

- Questions in this stage will *shift focus from what our current conservation scope is to what our future scope could/should be (with an emphasis on what we’ve heard in phase 1)* to best achieve our affirmed or modified mission and vision.
  - Findings from Phase 1 will be reviewed and considered in forming the key Conservation Scope questions that must be further discussed to inform our LRBP update.
  - Methods at this stage may include online surveys, additional focus groups, and community conversations *with an emphasis on allowing community members to engage with staff and board at their preferred level (details below)*.
  - Key decisions on what questions to ask in conversations with staff, board and stakeholders, and who should be participating in these conversations, will be solidified with community input and consideration.
- Facilitated meetings (community conversations) will address questions about current, short and long-term needs, goals, and challenges of WMSWCD, to be focused on each theme with DEI as an ingrained value. At least three meetings focused on the District’s Conservation Scope is anticipated, but the planning team might elect to hold more. These will be phased so that other theme teams may respond to one another and integrate suggestions from each other. The values of DEI are expected to be integrated and embedded into these theme conversations and further reviewed during equity pauses and lens reviews. Outcomes of each group session would include one or more of the following:
  - Conclusions/recommendations on direction and priority for the LRBP
  - Proposed new direction and language for the mission and vision
  - Requests for additional information
  - Guidance on research or assessment efforts
  - Questions, ramifications and/or suggestions for other Theme Conversation Groups
  - Additional topics to be taken up at future meetings

### Phase 2.4 Consolidate Input and Draft LRBP Outline (June – August 2020)

- The Project Manager will work with participants of the community engagement process, Theme Teams and conversation groups to synthesize input, updated mission and vision statements, discoveries and recommendations gained through the plan development into a high-level outline. The outline will then be reviewed and refined until it is solid and endorsed by the District’s staff & board and can be expressed in the actual LRBP document.
- A draft outline will first be shared with community members via CELs focus group and online platforms to gather responses to the LRBP update.

Phase 2 Participants	Tasks & Expected Time Commitment
Staff	Reviewing community feedback, setting up questions, conducting lens review and potentially participating in a subset of conversations: ~10 hours
Board Members	Reviewing community feedback, review of questions, conducting lens review and potentially participating in a subset of conversations: ~6-8 hours
Liaison	Providing feedback, conducting lens review and participating in conversations: 8 hours
Partners	Participation in 1 – 3 conversations that are each 2 hours: 2 – 6 hours
Community Members	Participation in 1 – 3 conversations that are each 2 hours: 2 – 6 hours

 **CONDUCT AN EQUITY PAUSE OR LENS REVIEW WITH COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT LIAISONS TO EXAMINE IF EQUITY AND INCLUSION ISSUES & COMMUNITY VOICES WERE HEARD IN DRAFT OUTLINE.**

 **CONDUCT A BOARD EQUITY PAUSE OR LENS REVIEW TO EXAMINE IF EQUITY AND INCLUSION IS CLEARLY AN INGRAINED VALUE IN THE DRAFT OUTLINE.**

### Phase 3. Plan Review & Release

#### Phase 3.2 LRBP Draft Review and Finalize Plan (October – December 2020)

- After the draft document is acceptable to District staff & board, broader feedback from stakeholders will be pursued. The work of getting and incorporating broader perspectives will be important in this step as it has been in those prior. This feedback effort may include, but not be limited to, focused discussions, surveys and/or a public comment period for the draft plan.
- An open house sharing the draft and inviting further feedback as well as additional potential focus groups, conversations and online surveying may be pursued.

 **PRIOR TO FINALIZING THE DRAFT, CONDUCT AN EQUITY LENS REVIEW OF RESPONSIVENESS TO COMMUNITY INPUT WITH COMMUNITY LIAISONS PARTICIPATING IN LENS IMPLEMENTATION.**

#### Phases 3.3 Plan Release, Communication and Outreach (January 2021 – October 2021)

- Preparing and distributing the final plan to the various engaged stakeholders and the general public should be considered. The release of the LRBP should be celebrated not as the end, but rather a beginning!
- LRBP is shared broadly with communication strategies developed throughout the planning process.
  - A gathering is held to release the plan and celebrate with partners.



<b>Phase 3 Participants</b>	<b>Tasks &amp; Expected Time Commitment</b>
Staff	Reviewing drafts, conducting lens review and providing feedback: ~8 hours
Board Members	Reviewing drafts, conducting lens review and providing feedback: ~6 hours
Liaison	Reviewing drafts, conducting lens review and providing feedback: 3 hours
Partners	Online review & feedback: 1 hour
Community Members	Online review & feedback: 1 hour

### **About the Community Engagement Liaisons (CELs) Team**

The liaisons are active community leaders or activists that are passionate about supporting and improving their community’s visibility and welfare. The majority of them (95%) are immigrants and people of color who are fluent in their native language(s) and active in their local community. Liaisons have consistently demonstrated professionalism, cultural understanding, and effective engagement with the underserved community groups that allow many city bureaus to serve broader range of residents and move forward with various planning. CELs liaisons are English-fluent, civic activists and are respected elders or activists in their respective communities they nurture.

CELs that have connections and/or reside within the District service area would be the most desirable since we are trying to reach out to our constituents as well as understand broader cultural concerns and issues to consider. In addition, a desire to reach out and engage with people from both urban and rural areas should be considered in the selection of the CELs.

For this process, CELs for the following communities will comprise the CEL Team. The communities selected are found to reside in the WMSWCD service area, according to the most recent, but dated, census and school data after a 2017 Demographic Data Analysis completed by Metro’s Research Center. The following list of communities was further refined and vetted by Ping Khaw who will be securing the CELs discussed:

- Arabic
- Black or African American
- Chinese
- Latinx (Spanish translation ability in written and verbal forms is required due to LEP data)
- Native American
- Slavic
- Somali
- Vietnamese