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Orienting Ourselves to Place and Space Linking Race to Value
Four Key Practices that Resulted in Racial Geography in Sacramento

• Explicit use of racially restrictive covenants

• Informal enforcement of covenants

• Central city urban renewal programs

• Mortgage redlining
Example of Restrictive Covenant from Elmhurst neighborhood (aka East Sacramento), built into the deed of ownership:

No persons of any race other than White or Caucasian race shall use or occupy any structure or any lot except that this provision shall not prevent occupancy by domestic servants of a different race domiciled with an owner or tenant.
1930 – 1950 Residential Segregation

Note: 1938 Home Owners Loan Corporation Residential Security Map of Sacramento. Redlined areas of the West End are identified by the highlighted borders.

Figure 1(a) Comparison of 1938 Sacramento Residential Security Map and 1949 Sacramento Redevelopment Survey Area (source: Federal Home Loan Bank Board, National Archives: Record Group 195; map courtesy of T-Races [Testbed for the Redlining Archives of California’s Exclusionary Spaces])
1950 – 1980 Urban Renewal/Redevelopment

Note: Highlighted borders identify West End areas impacted by urban renewal programs and are strikingly similar to areas redlined by FHA in the above Residential Security Map

Figure 1(b) 1949 Redevelopment Survey Area Map of Sacramento (source: Sacramento City Planning, 1950)
Figure 3 Preliminary map of areas with racially restrictive covenants and mortgage deficient areas in Sacramento (source: author’s review of public records)
Subprime Lending and pattern of Distressed Properties: Short sales and foreclosures
What Happens When People Lose Their House?

Health
Education
Employment
Wealth Accumulation

are all contingent upon where we live
Focus Communities based on 2016 Community Health Needs Assessment Data

Disparate Health Outcomes in

- Chronic Diseases: diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke
- Chronic Disease Mortality
- Communicable Diseases: STI, HIV
- Mental Health and Substance Abuse
- Injury and Violence
- Other Conditions: asthma and dental/oral disease

Source: SHF HSC 2016 CHNA Report
Capitalizing Environmental Justice in the Sacramento Region: Building a Strategic Framework for Regional Action
Historical Legacies

- Race, Place, Discrimination and Displacement
- The Military Industrial Complex and Groundwater Contamination

Sacramento’s Old West End, a vibrant neighborhood with diverse residents and family-run businesses, was demolished in the 1960s to make room for the Capitol Mall and the 1-5 freeway. *Photo credit: Sacramento Public Library*

Aerojet tests a MK-72 booster rocket used in the Navy’s Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense system. *Photo Credit: Aerojet Rocketdyne*
Historical Legacies continued

• Vacant Lots and Empty Spaces in the Urban Core

Neighbors in Del Paso Heights conduct a walking audit of illegally dumped trash in their neighborhood. *Photo Credit: Tyrone Buckley*
Equity vs. Equality vs. Reality

Equity = Fairness
Equality = Sameness
Reality = Unacceptable
Knowing What We Know
How Do We Turn the Tide?
What Interventions and Solutions Do We Act Upon?
Principles of Community Engagement

http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/communityengagement

www.atsdr.cdc.gov/communityengagement/pce_printcopy.html
Community Engagement Defined

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) define community-engagement as:

“the process of working collaboratively with and through groups of people affiliated by geographic proximity, special interest, or similar situations to address issues affecting the well-being of those people.”

Source: CDC/ATSDR Committee on Community Engagement, 1997; McDonald, 2009
Community-engaged Research

- A framework or approach for conducting research
- May incorporate both qualitative and quantitative methods
- Recognizes and builds on community strengths
- Characterized by principles that guide the research
- Requires partnership development, cooperation and negotiation, collaboration with community partners and a commitment to addressing local health issues.

Source: Lasker & Weiss, 2003; Minkler, 2005; McDonald, 2009
Community-based Participatory Research Builds Community Capacity

• Communities identify problems
• Communities develop solutions
• Shared decision-making power
• Shared dissemination of data

Building a strong partnership takes time, attention and reflection

Source: McDonald, 2009
CBPR Principles

- Recognizes community as unit of identity
- Cooperative and co-learning process
- Systems development and local capacity building
- Long term commitment
- Balances research and action
- **Cultural Humility:** Lifelong reflection on power and privilege/co-learning
- **Core Values:** trust, respect, self-determination, mutuality of interests, perspective taking, reciprocity

Sources: Israel et al, 1998; Minkler et al, 2013
Qualitative Case Study

Inclusion Criteria

- Diverse health issue, geographic region, populations: American Indian/other communities of color/social identity who face disparities
- At least 3-year partnership history with projected research for at least 2 years; successful
- Intervention, capacity-building or policy research

Methods:
- Focus Groups and Partnership meeting observation
- 13-18 Interviews (university and community)
- Brief Partnership Survey: self-administered

CBPR Conceptual Logic Model: 2013


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Structural Dynamics:</th>
<th>Group Dynamics</th>
<th>Intervention/Research</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social-economic status (SES), culture, spirituality, place, education, history, environment</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Community voice/community language</td>
<td>Safety: community voice/community language</td>
<td>Improved Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Trends: National/local governance &amp; funding/political climate</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies/Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Institutions, i.e., education; research (positive and negative)</td>
<td>Formal Agreements</td>
<td>Dialogue, listening &amp; mutual learning as flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustained Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic degree of collaboration &amp; trust between university &amp; community</td>
<td>Real power/resource sharing</td>
<td>Leadership/influence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in Power Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: capacity, readiness &amp; experience</td>
<td>Alignment with CBPR principles</td>
<td>Power dynamics/Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University: capacity, readiness &amp; reputation</td>
<td>Length of time in partnership</td>
<td>Self &amp; collective reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner/Agency Capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived severity of health issues</td>
<td>Individual Dynamics:</td>
<td>Participatory decision-making &amp; negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disparities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core values</td>
<td>Integration of local beliefs to group process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivations for participating</td>
<td>Task roles &amp; communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural identities/humility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge people on research team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal belief: Spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community reputation of PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Levels of Community Involvement

## Increasing Level of Community Involvement, Impact, Trust, and Communication Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Shared Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some Community Involvement&lt;br&gt;Communication flows from one to the other, to inform&lt;br&gt;Provides community with information.&lt;br&gt;Entities coexist.&lt;br&gt;Outcomes: Optimally, establishes communication channels and channels for outreach.</td>
<td>More Community Involvement&lt;br&gt;Communication flows to the community and then back, answer seeking&lt;br&gt;Gets information or feedback from the community.&lt;br&gt;Entities share information.&lt;br&gt;Outcomes: Develops connections.</td>
<td>Better Community Involvement&lt;br&gt;Communication flows both ways, participatory form of communication&lt;br&gt;Involves more participation with community on issues.&lt;br&gt;Entities cooperate with each other.&lt;br&gt;Outcomes: Visibility of partnership established with increased cooperation.</td>
<td>Community Involvement&lt;br&gt;Communication flow is bidirectional&lt;br&gt;Forms partnerships with community on each aspect of project from development to solution.&lt;br&gt;Entities form bidirectional communication channels.&lt;br&gt;Outcomes: Partnership building, trust building.</td>
<td>Strong Bidirectional Relationship&lt;br&gt;Final decision making is at community level.&lt;br&gt;Entities have formed strong partnership structures.&lt;br&gt;Outcomes: Broader health outcomes affecting broader community. Strong bidirectional trust built.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference: Modified by the authors from the International Association for Public Participation.

Figure 1.1. Community Engagement Continuum
Before Starting a Community Engagement Effort…

Be clear about the purposes or goals of the engagement effort and the populations and/or communities you want to engage.

Learn about the community’s perceptions of those initiating the engagement activities.
For Engagement to Occur, it is Necessary to...

Go to the community, establish relationships, build trust, work with the formal and informal leadership, and seek commitment.
Partnering with the community is necessary to create change and improve health.

Community collaboration requires long-term commitment by the engaging organization and its partners.
Continuum of Community Based Research:
Community Engagement Core: N.M. CARES Health Disparities Center
Present Interventions: Urban Greening
Grow Food – Plant Trees

@
Mackey Park
Nuevo Park
Root Cellar Community Garden
Del Paso Heights CG
True Beginnings Orchard & Grove
Current Tree Map

Date: 08/10/16

Legend:
Red = dead
Orange = poor
Yellow = fair
Measuring Success at Mackey

Survival Rate
- On Jan. 31, 2015
  - $N = 130$
- On Aug. 31, 2016
  - $N = 119$
  - \(91.5\%\) Success Rate
    - (119 alive/130 planted)

Carbon Sequestration
- 45 years from now (2060)
- Total CO2 stored: 13548 (kg/tree)
- CO2 emissions reduction equivalents: 74.3 (kg/tree)
Measuring Success at Nuevo

On April 1, 2017, N = 28, achieving a 100% success rate.
Root Cellar and Del Paso Heights Community Gardens
True Beginnings Orchard and Grove
40 fruit trees and 16 shade trees
May 2, 2017
Rio Linda and Grand Ave.
Future Interventions

Robertson Park

Suga' Cane CG

Additional Projects TBD
The Case for the Missing Trees: Expediting tree planting and care activities in under-canopied neighborhoods

Matthew Van Donsel
Community Engagement Manager
Take Aways

1. Trees have more than just eco benefits

2. Trees are critical to human health

3. We must do more to grow and protect our green infrastructure.
Our Mission

Building healthy, livable communities in the Sacramento region by growing the best urban forest in the nation.
Benefits of the Urban Forest

Urban forests are the trees and other plants that provide significant economic, environmental, social and health benefits in and around cities.
Sac Region: 7 Million Trees

Air
$35M Air Pollution Clean-up/Year
14M lbs of air pollution

Water
$24.5M Stormwater Runoff Cost/Year
2.45B gal of rainwater

Energy
$70M Energy Savings/Year
30% Summer Cooling Cost Savings
At this point, the ecological benefits of trees cannot be debated:

- Air Quality
- Rainwater capture
- Energy Savings
- Urban Heat Island
- Carbon Storage
Message:

Research has grown exponentially about how much trees impact our health. They can:

- Reduce stress
- Improve concentration
- Improve immunity
- Promote physical activity
- Lower blood pressure
- Accelerate healing
Message:

• More research is needed to understand clearly how trees impact our environment and our lives; however, we have enough research to start to advocate for change based on the health, social, and economic impacts of trees.

• In the face of climate change and hotter temperatures, it is vital our urban areas increase tree canopy.