



Board of County Commissioners
 Clackamas County

Members of the Board:

Approval for Professional Services Contract for Research Justice Study for Communities of Color in
Clackamas County with Coalition for Communities of Color

Purpose/Outcomes	To gain better understanding of the needs of population groups that continue to experience racial disparity in order to better address those needs and ensure that the goals of our strategic plan are achieved for all people.
Dollar Amount and Fiscal Impact	Total contract not to exceed \$300,000.00.
Funding Source	\$150,000 General Funds, \$150,000 contributions from local governments and businesses
Duration	Effective upon execution through March 31, 2024
Previous Board Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Scan study with the Coalition of Communities of Color (CCC) authorized in May 2020 and report completed November 2020. • In July 2020, the Equity and Inclusion Office was established and continued work with CCC.
Strategic Plan Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build Public Trust through Good Government • Ensure Safe, Healthy and Secure Communities • Grow a Vibrant Economy
Counsel Review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Date of Counsel Review: 4-21-2021 2. Initials of County Counsel performing review: ARN
Procurement Review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the item process through Procurement? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> 2. This contract is a result of an RFP process
Contact Person	Martine Coblentz, 971-325-5766
Contract No.	#4013

BACKGROUND:

Although Clackamas County is a predominantly white county, there are many communities of color living, working and raising their children within the county borders. As demonstrated in the Board of County Commissioner’s [Town Hall on Race Issues in Clackamas County](#) on August 19, 2020, people of color experience bias and discrimination in communities throughout the county. The narrative that Clackamas County is “White” has created an invisibility factor on communities of color. Historically and currently, communities that are not a part of the dominant group are negatively impacted by the decisions, policies and initiatives from government entities. Today, a disparity currently exists with the impacts of COVID 19 and people of color in the county.

In June 2020, the Board of County Commissioners passed a motion for [Resolution Condemning Violence and Racism](#) against Black/African American and all people of color in Clackamas County. The County Administrator also established in August of 2020, the County’s first Equity and Inclusion Office

who is charged with leading the diversity, equity and inclusion efforts throughout the county. Additionally, the County hired the Coalition of Communities of Color (“CCC”) to conduct an environmental scan to:

1. Identify organizations and leaders in the County that represent and organize communities of color;
2. Recognize internal County and jurisdictional diversity, equity, and inclusion trends and occurrences;
3. Document external county factors such as demographics, politics and public policy, labor markets, housing, education, civic life, and other areas of interest that affect the quality of life for communities of color in Clackamas County;
4. Assess and analyze current CCC connections with Clackamas County including partners, constituents, and activities; and
5. Connect and help build relationships between the County Equity and Inclusion Office and community-based organizations/leaders of communities of color in the County.

The Environmental Scan report is attached.

This scan report provides evidence of the need for Clackamas County to better serve communities of color. It also serves as a guide to highlight next steps. Clackamas County would like to more clearly understand all of the demographic groups within it, each group’s distinct strengths, challenges and needs and begin to more meaningfully engage with those communities. It is critical that community partners, culturally specific organizations, cities, schools and other community based organizations, partner with communities of color so that everyone has an opportunity to thrive.

Over 15 local governments and businesses within Clackamas County supports the need of this effort by offering to contribute nearly a little more than half of the cost of this contract. This is a tremendous show of support from local stakeholders. Washington and Multnomah Counties have also done this work within the past 10 years and Clackamas County is now the final county in the Portland-metropolitan region to complete this work.

PROCUREMENT PROCESS:

This project was advertised in accordance with ORS and LCRB Rules on January 26, 2021. Proposals were opened on February 25, 2021. The evaluation committee comprised of 10 evaluators; 5 from Clackamas County and 5 from external agencies that have a stake in this project. The County received a total of 4 proposals from Coalition of Communities of Color, Keen Independent Research, Morant McLeod and Philliber Research Associates.

The Committee evaluated the proposals and made the recommendation that Coalition of Communities of Color be awarded the Contract.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the Contract with Coalition of Communities of Color.

Respectfully submitted,



Martine Coblentz
Equity and Inclusion Officer

Placed on the _____ agenda by Procurement.



**CLACKAMAS COUNTY
PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT
Contract #4013**

This Personal Services Contract (this “Contract”) is entered into between **Coalition of Communities of Color** (“Contractor”), and Clackamas County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon (“County”) on behalf of its department of County Administration and its Office of Equity and Inclusion.

ARTICLE I.

- 1. Effective Date and Duration.** This Contract shall become effective upon signature of both parties. Unless earlier terminated or extended, this Contract shall expire on **March 31, 2024**.
- 2. Scope of Work.** Contractor shall provide the following personal services: the services described in RFP 2021-06 Research Justice Study for Communities of Color in Clackamas County (“Work”), further described in **Exhibit A**, and as further described in Contractor’s proposal, attached as **Exhibit B** and hereby incorporated by reference.
- 3. Consideration.** The County agrees to pay Contractor, from available and authorized funds, a sum not to exceed three hundred thousand dollars (**\$300,000.00**), for accomplishing the Work required by this Contract. Consideration rates are on a time and materials basis at \$300.00 per hour, in accordance with the rates and costs specified in **Exhibit B**. If any interim payments to Contractor are made, such payments shall be made only in accordance with the schedule and requirements in Exhibit A and Exhibit B.
- 4. Invoices and Payments.** Unless otherwise specified, Contractor shall submit monthly invoices for Work performed. Invoices shall describe all Work performed with particularity, by whom it was performed, and shall itemize and explain all expenses for which reimbursement is claimed. The invoices shall include the total amount billed to date by Contractor prior to the current invoice. If Contractor fails to present invoices in proper form within sixty (60) calendar days after the end of the month in which the services were rendered, Contractor waives any rights to present such invoice thereafter and to receive payment therefor. Payments shall be made in accordance with ORS 293.462 to Contractor following the County’s review and approval of invoices submitted by Contractor. Contractor shall not submit invoices for, and the County will not be obligated to pay, any amount in excess of the maximum compensation amount set forth above. If this maximum compensation amount is increased by amendment of this Contract, the amendment must be fully effective before Contractor performs Work subject to the amendment.

Invoices shall reference the above Contract Number and be submitted to: Martine Coblenz via email mcoblentz@clackamas.us

- 5. Travel and Other Expense.** Authorized: Yes No
If travel expense reimbursement is authorized in this Contract, such expense shall only be reimbursed at the rates in the County Contractor Travel Reimbursement Policy, hereby incorporated by reference and found at: <https://www.clackamas.us/finance/terms.html>. Travel expense reimbursement is not in excess of the not to exceed consideration.
- 6. Contract Documents.** This Contract consists of the following documents, which are listed in descending order of precedence and are attached and incorporated by reference, this Contract, Exhibit A and Exhibit B.

7. Contractor and County Contacts.

Contractor Administrator: Andres Lopez, Ph.D. Phone: 503-970-3878 Email: Andres@coalitioncommunitiescolor.org	County Administrator: Martine Coblentz Phone: 503-655-7579 Email: mcoblentz@clackamas.us
---	--

Payment information will be reported to the Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) under the name and taxpayer ID number submitted. (See I.R.S. 1099 for additional instructions regarding taxpayer ID numbers.) Information not matching IRS records will subject Contractor payments to backup withholding.

ARTICLE II.

- 1. ACCESS TO RECORDS.** Contractor shall maintain books, records, documents, and other evidence, in accordance with generally accepted accounting procedures and practices, sufficient to reflect properly all costs of whatever nature claimed to have been incurred and anticipated to be incurred in the performance of this Contract. County and their duly authorized representatives shall have access to the books, documents, papers, and records of Contractor, which are directly pertinent to this Contract for the purpose of making audit, examination, excerpts, and transcripts. Contractor shall maintain such books and records for a minimum of six (6) years, or such longer period as may be required by applicable law, following final payment and termination of this Contract, or until the conclusion of any audit, controversy or litigation arising out of or related to this Contract, whichever date is later.
- 2. AVAILABILITY OF FUTURE FUNDS.** Any continuation or extension of this Contract after the end of the fiscal period in which it is written is contingent on a new appropriation for each succeeding fiscal period sufficient to continue to make payments under this Contract, as determined by the County in its sole administrative discretion.
- 3. CAPTIONS.** The captions or headings in this Contract are for convenience only and in no way define, limit, or describe the scope or intent of any provisions of this Contract.
- 4. COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW.** Contractor shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations, executive orders, and ordinances, as such may be amended from time to time.
- 5. COUNTERPARTS.** This Contract may be executed in several counterparts (electronic or otherwise), each of which shall be an original, all of which shall constitute the same instrument.
- 6. GOVERNING LAW.** This Contract, and all rights, obligations, and disputes arising out of it, shall be governed and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Oregon and the ordinances of Clackamas County without regard to principles of conflicts of law. Any claim, action, or suit between County and Contractor that arises out of or relates to the performance of this Contract shall be brought and conducted solely and exclusively within the Circuit Court for Clackamas County, for the State of Oregon. Provided, however, that if any such claim, action, or suit may be brought in a federal forum, it shall be brought and conducted solely and exclusively within the United States District Court for the District of Oregon. In no event shall this section be construed as a waiver by the County of any form of defense or immunity, whether sovereign immunity, governmental immunity, immunity based on the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States or otherwise, from any claim or from the jurisdiction of any court. Contractor, by execution of this Contract, hereby consents to the personal jurisdiction of the courts referenced in this section.

- 7. RESPONSIBILITY FOR DAMAGES; INDEMNITY.** Contractor shall be responsible for all damage to property, injury to persons, and loss, expense, inconvenience, and delay which may be caused by, or result from, the conduct of Work, or from any act, omission, or neglect of Contractor, its subcontractors, agents, or employees. The Contractor agrees to indemnify, hold harmless and defend the County, and its officers, elected officials, agents and employees from and against all claims and actions, and all expenses incidental to the investigation and defense thereof, arising out of or based upon damage or injuries to persons or property caused by the errors, omissions, fault or negligence of the Contractor or the Contractor's employees, subcontractors, or agents. However, neither Contractor nor any attorney engaged by Contractor shall defend the claim in the name of County or any department of County, nor purport to act as legal representative of County or any of its departments, without first receiving from the Clackamas County Counsel's Office authority to act as legal counsel for County, nor shall Contractor settle any claim on behalf of County without the approval of the Clackamas County Counsel's Office. County may, at its election and expense, assume its own defense and settlement.
- 8. INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR STATUS.** The service(s) to be rendered under this Contract are those of an independent contractor. Although the County reserves the right to determine (and modify) the delivery schedule for the Work to be performed and to evaluate the quality of the completed performance, County cannot and will not control the means or manner of Contractor's performance. Contractor is responsible for determining the appropriate means and manner of performing the Work. Contractor is not to be considered an agent or employee of County for any purpose, including, but not limited to: (A) The Contractor will be solely responsible for payment of any Federal or State taxes required as a result of this Contract; and (B) This Contract is not intended to entitle the Contractor to any benefits generally granted to County employees, including, but not limited to, vacation, holiday and sick leave, other leaves with pay, tenure, medical and dental coverage, life and disability insurance, overtime, Social Security, Workers' Compensation, unemployment compensation, or retirement benefits.
- 9. INSURANCE.** Contractor shall secure at its own expense and keep in effect during the term of the performance under this Contract the insurance required and minimum coverage indicated below. The insurance requirement outlined below do not in any way limit the amount of scope of liability of Contractor under this Contract. Contractor shall provide proof of said insurance and name the County as an additional insured on all required liability policies. Proof of insurance and notice of any material change should be submitted to the following address: Clackamas County Procurement Division, 2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City, OR 97045 or procurement@clackamas.us.

Required - Workers Compensation: Contractor shall comply with the statutory workers' compensation requirements in ORS 656.017, unless exempt under ORS 656.027 or 656.126.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required – Commercial General Liability: combined single limit, or the equivalent, of not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence, with an annual aggregate limit of \$2,000,000 for Bodily Injury and Property Damage.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required – Professional Liability: combined single limit, or the equivalent, of not less than \$1,000,000 per claim, with an annual aggregate limit of \$2,000,000 for damages caused by error, omission or negligent acts.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required – Automobile Liability: combined single limit, or the equivalent, of not less than \$1,000,000 per accident for Bodily Injury and Property Damage.
<input type="checkbox"/> Required – Abuse & Molestation endorsement with limits not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence if not included in the Commercial General Liability policy.
<input type="checkbox"/> Cyber Liability: combined single limit, or the equivalent, of not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence for network security (including data breach), privacy, interruption of business, media liability, and errors and omissions.

The policy(s) shall be primary insurance as respects to the County. Any insurance or self-insurance maintained by the County shall be excess and shall not contribute to it. Any obligation that County agree to a waiver of subrogation is hereby stricken.

- 10. LIMITATION OF LIABILITIES.** This Contract is expressly subject to the debt limitation of Oregon counties set forth in Article XI, Section 10, of the Oregon Constitution, and is contingent upon funds being appropriated therefore. Any provisions herein which would conflict with law are deemed inoperative to that extent. Except for liability arising under or related to Article II, Section 13 or Section 20 neither party shall be liable for (i) any indirect, incidental, consequential or special damages under this Contract or (ii) any damages of any sort arising solely from the termination of this Contract in accordance with its terms.
- 11. NOTICES.** Except as otherwise provided in this Contract, any required notices between the parties shall be given in writing by personal delivery, email, or mailing the same, to the Contract Administrators identified in Article 1, Section 6. If notice is sent to County, a copy shall also be sent to: Clackamas County Procurement, 2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City, OR 97045, or procurement@clackamas.us. Any communication or notice so addressed and mailed shall be deemed to be given five (5) days after mailing, and immediately upon personal delivery, or within 2 hours after the email is sent during County's normal business hours (Monday – Thursday, 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.) (as recorded on the device from which the sender sent the email), unless the sender receives an automated message or other indication that the email has not been delivered.
- 12. OWNERSHIP OF WORK PRODUCT.** All work product of Contractor that results from this Contract (the "Work Product") is the exclusive property of County. County and Contractor intend that such Work Product be deemed "work made for hire" of which County shall be deemed the author. If for any reason the Work Product is not deemed "work made for hire," Contractor hereby irrevocably assigns to County all of its right, title, and interest in and to any and all of the Work Product, whether arising from copyright, patent, trademark or trade secret, or any other state or federal intellectual property law or doctrine. Contractor shall execute such further documents and instruments as County may reasonably request in order to fully vest such rights in County. Contractor forever waives any and all rights relating to the Work Product, including without limitation, any and all rights arising under 17 USC § 106A or any other rights of identification of authorship or rights of approval, restriction or limitation on use or subsequent modifications. Notwithstanding the above, County shall have no rights in any pre-existing Contractor intellectual property provided to County by Contractor in the performance of this Contract except to copy, use and re-use any such Contractor intellectual property for County use only.
- 13. REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES.** Contractor represents and warrants to County that (A) Contractor has the power and authority to enter into and perform this Contract; (B) this Contract, when executed and delivered, shall be a valid and binding obligation of Contractor enforceable in accordance with its terms; (C) Contractor shall at all times during the term of this Contract, be qualified, professionally competent, and duly licensed to perform the Work; (D) Contractor is an independent contractor as defined in ORS 670.600; and (E) the Work under this Contract shall be performed in a good and workmanlike manner and in accordance with the highest professional standards. The warranties set forth in this section are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other warranties provided.
- 14. SURVIVAL.** All rights and obligations shall cease upon termination or expiration of this Contract, except for the rights and obligations set forth in Article II, Sections 1, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, and 31 and all other rights and obligations which by their context are intended to survive. However, such expiration shall not extinguish or prejudice the County's right to enforce this Contract with respect to: (a) any breach of a Contractor warranty; or (b) any default or defect in Contractor performance that has not been cured.

- 15. SEVERABILITY.** If any term or provision of this Contract is declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be illegal or in conflict with any law, the validity of the remaining terms and provisions shall not be affected, and the rights and obligations of the parties shall be construed and enforced as if the Contract did not contain the particular term or provision held to be invalid.
- 16. SUBCONTRACTS AND ASSIGNMENTS.** Contractor shall not enter into any subcontracts for any of the Work required by this Contract, or assign or transfer any of its interest in this Contract by operation of law or otherwise, without obtaining prior written approval from the County, which shall be granted or denied in the County's sole discretion. In addition to any provisions the County may require, Contractor shall include in any permitted subcontract under this Contract a requirement that the subcontractor be bound by this Article II, Sections 1, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 27 as if the subcontractor were the Contractor. County's consent to any subcontract shall not relieve Contractor of any of its duties or obligations under this Contract.
- 17. SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST.** The provisions of this Contract shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of the parties hereto, and their respective authorized successors and assigns.
- 18. TAX COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION.** The Contractor shall comply with all federal, state and local laws, regulation, executive orders and ordinances applicable to this Contract. Contractor represents and warrants that it has complied, and will continue to comply throughout the duration of this Contract and any extensions, with all tax laws of this state or any political subdivision of this state, including but not limited to ORS 305.620 and ORS chapters 316, 317, and 318. Any violation of this section shall constitute a material breach of this Contract and shall entitle County to terminate this Contract, to pursue and recover any and all damages that arise from the breach and the termination of this Contract, and to pursue any or all of the remedies available under this Contract or applicable law.
- 19. TERMINATIONS.** This Contract may be terminated for the following reasons: (A) by mutual agreement of the parties or by the County (i) for convenience upon thirty (30) days written notice to Contractor, or (ii) at any time the County fails to receive funding, appropriations, or other expenditure authority as solely determined by the County; or (B) if contractor breaches any Contract provision or is declared insolvent, County may terminate after thirty (30) days written notice with an opportunity to cure.
- Upon receipt of written notice of termination from the County, Contractor shall immediately stop performance of the Work. Upon termination of this Contract, Contractor shall deliver to County all documents, Work Product, information, works-in-progress and other property that are or would be deliverables had the Contract Work been completed. Upon County's request, Contractor shall surrender to anyone County designates, all documents, research, objects or other tangible things needed to complete the Work.
- 20. REMEDIES.** If terminated by the County due to a breach by the Contractor, then the County shall have any remedy available to it in law or equity. If this Contract is terminated for any other reason, Contractor's sole remedy is payment for the goods and services delivered and accepted by the County, less any setoff to which the County is entitled.
- 21. NO THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARIES.** County and Contractor are the only parties to this Contract and are the only parties entitled to enforce its terms. Nothing in this Contract gives, is intended to give, or shall be construed to give or provide any benefit or right, whether directly, indirectly or otherwise, to third persons unless such third persons are individually identified by name herein and expressly described as intended beneficiaries of the terms of this Contract.

- 22. TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE.** Contractor agrees that time is of the essence in the performance this Contract.
- 23. FOREIGN CONTRACTOR.** If the Contractor is not domiciled in or registered to do business in the State of Oregon, Contractor shall promptly provide to the Oregon Department of Revenue and the Secretary of State, Corporate Division, all information required by those agencies relative to this Contract. The Contractor shall demonstrate its legal capacity to perform these services in the State of Oregon prior to entering into this Contract.
- 24. FORCE MAJEURE.** Neither County nor Contractor shall be held responsible for delay or default caused by events outside the County or Contractor's reasonable control including, but not limited to, fire, terrorism, riot, acts of God, or war. However, Contractor shall make all reasonable efforts to remove or eliminate such a cause of delay or default and shall upon the cessation of the cause, diligently pursue performance of its obligations under this Contract.
- 25. WAIVER.** The failure of County to enforce any provision of this Contract shall not constitute a waiver by County of that or any other provision.
- 26. PUBLIC CONTRACTING REQUIREMENTS.** Pursuant to the public contracting requirements contained in Oregon Revised Statutes ("ORS") Chapter 279B.220 through 279B.235, Contractor shall:
- a. Make payments promptly, as due, to all persons supplying to Contractor labor or materials for the prosecution of the work provided for in the Contract.
 - b. Pay all contributions or amounts due the Industrial Accident Fund from such Contractor or subcontractor incurred in the performance of the Contract.
 - c. Not permit any lien or claim to be filed or prosecuted against County on account of any labor or material furnished.
 - d. Pay the Department of Revenue all sums withheld from employees pursuant to ORS 316.167.
 - e. As applicable, the Contractor shall pay employees for work in accordance with ORS 279B.235, which is incorporated herein by this reference. The Contractor shall comply with the prohibitions set forth in ORS 652.220, compliance of which is a material element of this Contract, and failure to comply is a breach entitling County to terminate this Contract for cause.
 - f. If the Work involves lawn and landscape maintenance, Contractor shall salvage, recycle, compost, or mulch yard waste material at an approved site, if feasible and cost effective.
- 27. NO ATTORNEY FEES.** In the event any arbitration, action or proceeding, including any bankruptcy proceeding, is instituted to enforce any term of this Contract, each party shall be responsible for its own attorneys' fees and expenses.
- 28. CONFIDENTIALITY.** Contractor acknowledges that it and its employees and agents may, in the course of performing their obligations under this Contract, be exposed to or acquire information that the County desires or is required to maintain as confidential. Any and all information of any form obtained by Contractor or its employees or agents in the performance of this Contract, including but not limited to Personal Information (as "Personal Information" is defined in ORS 646A.602(11)), shall be deemed to be confidential information of the County ("Confidential Information"). Any reports or other documents or items (including software) which result from the use of the Confidential Information by Contractor shall be treated with respect to confidentiality in the same manner as the Confidential Information.

Contractor agrees to hold Confidential Information in strict confidence, using at least the same degree of care that Contractor uses in maintaining the confidentiality of its own confidential information, and

not to copy, reproduce, sell, assign, license, market, transfer or otherwise dispose of, give or disclose Confidential Information to third parties or use Confidential Information for any purposes whatsoever (other than in the performance of this Contract), and to advise each of its employees and agents of their obligations to keep Confidential Information confidential.

Contractor agrees that, except as directed by the County, Contractor will not at any time during or after the term of this Contract, disclose, directly or indirectly, any Confidential Information to any person, and that upon termination or expiration of this Contract or the County's request, Contractor will turn over to the County all documents, papers, records and other materials in Contractor's possession which embody Confidential Information. Contractor acknowledges that breach of this Contract, including disclosure of any Confidential Information, or disclosure of other information that, at law or in good conscience or equity, ought to remain confidential, will give rise to irreparable injury to the County that cannot adequately be compensated in damages. Accordingly, the County may seek and obtain injunctive relief against the breach or threatened breach of the foregoing undertakings, in addition to any other legal remedies that may be available. Contractor acknowledges and agrees that the covenants contained herein are necessary for the protection of the legitimate business interests of the County and are reasonable in scope and content.

Contractor agrees to comply with all reasonable requests by the County to ensure the confidentiality and nondisclosure of the Confidential Information, including if requested and without limitation: (a) obtaining nondisclosure agreements, in a form approved by the County, from each of Contractor's employees and agents who are performing services, and providing copies of such agreements to the County; and (b) performing criminal background checks on each of Contractor's employees and agents who are performing services, and providing a copy of the results to the County.

Contractor shall report, either orally or in writing, to the County any use or disclosure of Confidential Information not authorized by this Contract or in writing by the County, including any reasonable belief that an unauthorized individual has accessed Confidential Information. Contractor shall make the report to the County immediately upon discovery of the unauthorized disclosure, but in no event more than two (2) business days after Contractor reasonably believes there has been such unauthorized use or disclosure. Contractor's report shall identify: (i) the nature of the unauthorized use or disclosure, (ii) the Confidential Information used or disclosed, (iii) who made the unauthorized use or received the unauthorized disclosure, (iv) what Contractor has done or shall do to mitigate any deleterious effect of the unauthorized use or disclosure, and (v) what corrective action Contractor has taken or shall take to prevent future similar unauthorized use or disclosure. Contractor shall provide such other information, including a written report, as reasonably requested by the County.

Notwithstanding any other provision in this Contract, Contractor will be responsible for all damages, fines and corrective action (including credit monitoring services) arising from disclosure of such Confidential Information caused by a breach of its data security or the confidentiality provisions hereunder.

The provisions in this Section shall operate in addition to, and not as limitation of, the confidentiality and similar requirements set forth in the rest of the Contract, as it may otherwise be amended. Contractor's obligations under this Contract shall survive the expiration or termination of the Contract, as amended, and shall be perpetual.

29. KEY PERSONS. Contractor acknowledges and agrees that a significant reason the County is entering into this Contract is because of the special qualifications of certain Key Persons set forth in the contract. Under this Contract, the County is engaging the expertise, experience, judgment, and personal attention of such Key Persons. Neither Contractor nor any of the Key Persons shall delegate performance of the management powers and responsibilities each such Key Person is required to provide under this Contract to any other employee or agent of the Contractor unless the County

provides prior written consent to such delegation. Contractor shall not reassign or transfer a Key Person to other duties or positions such that the Key Person is no longer available to provide the County with such Key Person's services unless the County provides prior written consent to such reassignment or transfer.

30. COOPERATIVE CONTRACTING. Pursuant to ORS 279A.200 to 279A.225, other public agencies may use this Contract resulting from a competitive procurement process unless the Contractor expressly noted in their proposal/quote that the prices and services are available to the County only. The condition of such use by other agencies is that any such agency must make and pursue contact, purchase order, delivery arrangements, and all contractual remedies directly with Contractor; the County accepts no responsibility for performance by either the Contractor or such other agency using this Contract. With such condition, the County consents to such use by any other public agency.

31. MERGER. THIS CONTRACT CONSTITUTES THE ENTIRE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE SUBJECT MATTER REFERENCED THEREIN. THERE ARE NO UNDERSTANDINGS, AGREEMENTS, OR REPRESENTATIONS, ORAL OR WRITTEN, NOT SPECIFIED HEREIN REGARDING THIS CONTRACT. NO AMENDMENT, CONSENT, OR WAIVER OF TERMS OF THIS CONTRACT SHALL BIND EITHER PARTY UNLESS IN WRITING AND SIGNED BY ALL PARTIES. ANY SUCH AMENDMENT, CONSENT, OR WAIVER SHALL BE EFFECTIVE ONLY IN THE SPECIFIC INSTANCE AND FOR THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE GIVEN. CONTRACTOR, BY THE SIGNATURE HERETO OF ITS AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE, IS AN INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR, ACKNOWLEDGES HAVING READ AND UNDERSTOOD THIS CONTRACT, AND CONTRACTOR AGREES TO BE BOUND BY ITS TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

By their signatures below, the parties to this Contract agree to the terms, conditions, and content expressed herein.

Coalition of Communities of Color

Clackamas County

 5/12/21
Authorized Signature Date

MARCUS C. MUNDY, EXECUTIVE
Name / Title (Printed) DIRECTOR

1084890-97 DNP / Oregon
Oregon Business Registry #

Chair

Recording Secretary

Date

Approved as to Form:

Andrew Naylor
Digitally signed by Andrew Naylor
Date: 2021.05.13 06:04:54 -0700

County Counsel Date

5/13/2021

EXHIBIT A
RFP 2021-06 RESEARCH JUSTICE STUDY FOR COMMUNITIES OF COLOR IN
CLACKAMAS COUNTY
ISSUED FEBRUARY 25, 2021



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #2021-06

FOR

**RESEARCH JUSTICE STUDY
FOR COMMUNITIES OF COLOR IN CLACKAMAS COUNTY**

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

**TOOTIE SMITH, Chair
SONYA FISCHER, Commissioner
PAUL SAVAS, Commissioner
MARK SHULL, Commissioner
MARTHA SCHRADER, Commissioner**

**Gary Schmidt
County Administrator**

**George Marlton
County Procurement Officer**

**Kim Randall
Analyst**

PROPOSAL CLOSING DATE, TIME AND LOCATION

DATE: February 25, 2021

TIME: 2:00 PM, Pacific Time

**PLACE: Clackamas County Procurement Division
Clackamas County Public Services Building
2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City, OR 97045**

SCHEDULE

Request for Proposals Issued.....	January 26, 2021
Protest of Specifications Deadline.....	February 4, 2021, 5:00 PM, Pacific Time
Deadline to Submit Clarifying Questions.....	February 16, 2021, 5:00 PM, Pacific Time
Request for Proposals Closing Date and Time.....	February 25, 2021, 2:00 PM, Pacific Time
Deadline to Submit Protest of Award.....	Seven (7) days from the Intent to Award
Anticipated Contract Start Date.....	March 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Section 1 – Notice of Request for Proposals.....	1
Section 2 – Instructions to Proposers.....	2
Section 3 – Scope of Work	8
Section 4 – Evaluation and Selection Criteria	12
Section 5 – Proposal Content (Including Proposal Certification).....	13
Attachment A – Environmental Scan.....	17

SECTION 1 NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Notice is hereby given that Clackamas County through its Board of County Commissioners will receive sealed Proposals per specifications until **2:00 PM, February 25, 2021 Pacific Time** (“Closing”), to provide Research Justice Study for Communities of Color in Clackamas County. No Proposals will be received or considered after that time.

RFP Documents can be downloaded from ORPIN at the following address:

<http://orpin.oregon.gov/open.dll/welcome>, Document No. C01010-2021-06-21.

Prospective Proposers will need to sign in to download the information and that information will be accumulated for a Plan Holder's List. Prospective Proposers are responsible for obtaining any Addenda, clarifying questions, and Notices of Award from ORPIN. Sealed Proposals are to be sent to Clackamas County Procurement Services – Attention George Marlton, Chief Procurement Officer at 2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City, Oregon, 97045 or the **preferred method** is to email to procurement@clackamas.us.

Contact Information

Procurement Process and Technical Questions: Kim Randall, krandall@clackamas.us.

The Board of County Commissioners reserves the right to reject any and all Proposals not in compliance with all prescribed public bidding procedures and requirements, and may reject for good cause any and all Proposals upon the finding that it is in the public interest to do so and to waive any and all informalities in the public interest. In the award of the contract, the Board of County Commissioners will consider the element of time, will accept the Proposal or Proposals which in their estimation will best serve the interests of Clackamas County and will reserve the right to award the contract to the contractor who’s Proposal shall be best for the public good.

Clackamas County encourages proposals from Minority, Women, and Emerging Small Businesses.

SECTION 2 INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS

Clackamas County (“County”) reserves the right to reject any and all Proposals received as a result of this RFP. County Local Contract Review Board Rules (“LCRB”) govern the procurement process for the County.

2.1 Modification or Withdrawal of Proposal: Any Proposal may be modified or withdrawn at any time prior to the Closing deadline, provided that a written request is received by the County Procurement Division Director, prior to the Closing. The withdrawal of a Proposal will not prejudice the right of a Proposer to submit a new Proposal.

2.2 Requests for Clarification and Requests for Change: Proposers may submit questions regarding the specifications of the RFP. Questions must be received in writing on or before 5:00 p.m. (Pacific Time), on the date indicated in the Schedule, at the Procurement Division address as listed in Section 1 of this RFP. Requests for changes must include the reason for the change and any proposed changes to the requirements. The purpose of this requirement is to permit County to correct, prior to the opening of Proposals, RFP terms or technical requirements that may be unlawful, improvident or which unjustifiably restrict competition. County will consider all requested changes and, if appropriate, amend the RFP. No oral or written instructions or information concerning this RFP from County managers, employees or agents to prospective Proposers shall bind County unless included in an Addendum to the RFP.

2.3 Protests of the RFP/Specifications: Protests must be in accordance with LCRB C-047-0730. Protests of Specifications must be received in writing on or before 5:00 p.m. (Pacific Time), on the date indicated in the Schedule, or within three (3) business days of issuance of any addendum, at the Procurement Division address listed in Section 1 of this RFP. Protests may not be faxed. Protests of the RFP specifications must include the reason for the protest and any proposed changes to the requirements.

2.4 Addenda: If any part of this RFP is changed, an addendum will be provided to Proposers that have provided an address to the Procurement Division for this procurement. It shall be Proposers responsibility to regularly check ORPIN for any notices, published addenda, or response to clarifying questions.

2.5 Submission of Proposals: Proposals must be submitted in accordance with Section 5. All Proposals shall be legibly written in ink or typed and comply in all regards with the requirements of this RFP. Proposals that include orders or qualifications may be rejected as irregular. All Proposals must include a signature that affirms the Proposer’s intent to be bound by the Proposal (may be on cover letter, on the Proposal, or the Proposal Certification Form) shall be signed. If a Proposal is submitted by a firm or partnership, the name and address of the firm or partnership shall be shown, together with the names and addresses of the members. If the Proposal is submitted by a corporation, it shall be signed in the name of such corporation by an official who is authorized to bind the contractor. The Proposals will be considered by the County to be submitted in confidence and are not subject to public disclosure until the notice of intent to award has been issued.

No late Proposals will be accepted. Proposals submitted after the Closing will be considered late and will be returned unopened. Proposals may not be submitted by telephone or fax.

2.6 Post-Selection Review and Protest of Award: County will name the apparent successful Proposer in a Notice of Intent to Award published on ORPIN. Identification of the apparent successful Proposer is procedural only and creates no right of the named Proposer to award of the contract. Competing Proposers shall be given seven (7) calendar days from the date on the Notice of Intent to Award to review the file at the Procurement Division office and file a written protest of award, pursuant to LCRB C-047-0740. Any award protest must be in writing and must be delivered by hand-delivery or mail to the address for the Procurement Division as listed in Section 1 of this RFP.

Only actual Proposers may protest if they believe they have been adversely affected because the Proposer would be eligible to be awarded the contract in the event the protest is successful. The basis of the written protest must be in accordance with ORS 279B.410 and shall specify the grounds upon which the protest is based. In order to be an adversely affected Proposer with a right to submit a written protest, a Proposer must be next in line for award, i.e. the

protester must claim that all higher rated Proposers are ineligible for award because they are non-responsive or non-responsible.

County will consider any protests received and:

- a. reject all protests and proceed with final evaluation of, and any allowed contract language negotiation with, the apparent successful Proposer and, pending the satisfactory outcome of this final evaluation and negotiation, enter into a contract with the named Proposer; OR
- b. sustain a meritorious protest(s) and reject the apparent successful Proposer as nonresponsive, if such Proposer is unable to demonstrate that its Proposal complied with all material requirements of the solicitation and Oregon public procurement law; thereafter, County may name a new apparent successful Proposer; OR
- c. reject all Proposals and cancel the procurement.

2.7 Acceptance of Contractual Requirements: Failure of the selected Proposer to execute a contract and deliver required insurance certificates within ten (10) calendar days after notification of an award may result in cancellation of the award. This time period may be extended at the option of County.

2.8 Public Records: Proposals are deemed confidential until the “Notice of Intent to Award” letter is issued. This RFP and one copy of each original Proposal received in response to it, together with copies of all documents pertaining to the award of a contract, will be kept and made a part of a file or record which will be open to public inspection. If a Proposal contains any information that is considered a **TRADE SECRET** under ORS 192.345(2), **SUCH INFORMATION MUST BE LISTED ON A SEPARATE SHEET CAPABLE OF SEPARATION FROM THE REMAINING PROPOSAL AND MUST BE CLEARLY MARKED WITH THE FOLLOWING LEGEND:**

“This information constitutes a trade secret under ORS 192.345(2), and shall not be disclosed except in accordance with the Oregon Public Records Law, ORS Chapter 192.”

The Oregon Public Records Law exempts from disclosure only bona fide trade secrets, and the exemption from disclosure applies only “unless the public interest requires disclosure in the particular instance” (ORS 192.345). Therefore, non-disclosure of documents, or any portion of a document submitted as part of a Proposal, may depend upon official or judicial determinations made pursuant to the Public Records Law.

2.9 Investigation of References: County reserves the right to investigate all references in addition to those supplied references and investigate past performance of any Proposer with respect to its successful performance of similar services, its compliance with specifications and contractual obligations, its completion or delivery of a project on schedule, its lawful payment of subcontractors and workers, and any other factor relevant to this RFP. County may postpone the award or the execution of the contract after the announcement of the apparent successful Proposer in order to complete its investigation.

2.10 RFP Proposal Preparation Costs and Other Costs: Proposer costs of developing the Proposal, cost of attendance at an interview (if requested by County), or any other costs are entirely the responsibility of the Proposer, and will not be reimbursed in any manner by County.

2.11 Clarification and Clarity: County reserves the right to seek clarification of each Proposal, or to make an award without further discussion of Proposals received. Therefore, it is important that each Proposal be submitted initially in the most complete, clear, and favorable manner possible.

2.12 Right to Reject Proposals: County reserves the right to reject any or all Proposals or to withdraw any item from the award, if such rejection or withdrawal would be in the public interest, as determined by County.

2.13 Cancellation: County reserves the right to cancel or postpone this RFP at any time or to award no contract.

2.14 Proposal Terms: All Proposals, including any price quotations, will be valid and firm through a period of one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days following the Closing date. County may require an extension of this firm offer period. Proposers will be required to agree to the longer time frame in order to be further considered in the procurement process.

2.15 Oral Presentations: At County's sole option, Proposers may be required to give an oral presentation of their Proposals to County, a process which would provide an opportunity for the Proposer to clarify or elaborate on the Proposal but will in no material way change Proposer's original Proposal. If the evaluating committee requests presentations, the Procurement Division will schedule the time and location for said presentation. Any costs of participating in such presentations will be borne solely by Proposer and will not be reimbursed by County. **Note:** Oral presentations are at the discretion of the evaluating committee and may not be conducted; therefore, **written Proposals should be complete.**

2.16 Usage: It is the intention of County to utilize the services of the successful Proposer(s) to provide services as outlined in the below Scope of Work.

2.17 Review for Responsiveness: Upon receipt of all Proposals, the Procurement Division or designee will determine the responsiveness of all Proposals before submitting them to the evaluation committee. If a Proposal is incomplete or non-responsive in significant part or in whole, it will be rejected and will not be submitted to the evaluation committee. County reserves the right to determine if an inadvertent error is solely clerical or is a minor informality which may be waived, and then to determine if an error is grounds for disqualifying a Proposal. The Proposer's contact person identified on the Proposal will be notified, identifying the reason(s) the Proposal is non-responsive. One copy of the Proposal will be archived and all others discarded.

2.18 RFP Incorporated into Contract: This RFP will become part of the Contract between County and the selected contractor(s). The contractor(s) will be bound to perform according to the terms of this RFP, their Proposal(s), and the terms of the Sample Contract.

2.19 Communication Blackout Period: Except as called for in this RFP, Proposers may not communicate with members of the Evaluation Committee or other County employees or representatives about the RFP during the procurement process until the apparent successful Proposer is selected, and all protests, if any, have been resolved. Communication in violation of this restriction may result in rejection of a Proposer.

2.20 Prohibition on Commissions and Subcontractors: County will contract directly with persons/entities capable of performing the requirements of this RFP. Contractors must be represented directly. Participation by brokers or commissioned agents will not be allowed during the Proposal process. Contractor shall not use subcontractors to perform the Work unless specifically pre-authorized in writing to do so by the County. Contractor represents that any employees assigned to perform the Work, and any authorized subcontractors performing the Work, are fully qualified to perform the tasks assigned to them, and shall perform the Work in a competent and professional manner. Contractor shall not be permitted to add on any fee or charge for subcontractor Work. Contractor shall provide, if requested, any documents relating to subcontractor's qualifications to perform required Work.

2.21 Ownership of Proposals: All Proposals in response to this RFP are the sole property of County, and subject to the provisions of ORS 192.410-192.505 (Public Records Act).

2.22 Clerical Errors in Awards: County reserves the right to correct inaccurate awards resulting from its clerical errors.

2.23 Rejection of Qualified Proposals: Proposals may be rejected in whole or in part if they attempt to limit or modify any of the terms, conditions, or specifications of the RFP or the Sample Contract.

2.24 Collusion: By responding, the Proposer states that the Proposal is not made in connection with any competing Proposer submitting a separate response to the RFP, and is in all aspects fair and without collusion or fraud. Proposer also certifies that no officer, agent, elected official, or employee of County has a pecuniary interest in this Proposal.

2.25 Evaluation Committee: Proposals will be evaluated by a committee consisting of representatives from County and potentially external representatives. County reserves the right to modify the Evaluation Committee make-up in its sole discretion.

2.26 Commencement of Work: The contractor shall commence no work until all insurance requirements have been met, the Protest of Awards deadline has been passed, any protest have been decided, a contract has been fully executed, and a Notice to Proceed has been issued by County.

2.27 Best and Final Offer (“BAFO”): County may request best and final offers from those Proposers determined by County to be reasonably viable for contract award. However, County reserves the right to award a contract on the basis of initial Proposal received. Therefore, each Proposal should contain the Proposer’s best terms from a price and technical standpoint. Following evaluation of the best and final offers, County may select for final contract negotiations/execution the offers that are most advantageous to County, considering cost and the evaluation criteria in this RFP.

2.28 Nondiscrimination: The successful Proposer agrees that, in performing the work called for by this RFP and in securing and supplying materials, contractor will not discriminate against any person on the basis of race, color, religious creed, political ideas, sex, age, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, physical or mental handicap, national origin or ancestry, or any other class protected by applicable law.

2.29 Intergovernmental Cooperative Procurement Statement: Pursuant to ORS 279A and LCRB, other public agencies shall have the ability to purchase the awarded goods and services from the awarded contractor(s) under terms and conditions of the resultant contract. Any such purchases shall be between the contractor and the participating public agency and shall not impact the contractor’s obligation to the County. Any estimated purchase volumes listed herein do not include other public agencies and County makes no guarantee as to their participation. Any Proposer, by written notification included with their Proposal, may decline to extend the prices and terms of this solicitation to any and/or all other public agencies. County grants to any and all public serving governmental agencies, authorization to purchase equivalent services or products described herein at the same submitted unit bid price, but only with the consent of the contractor awarded the contract by the County.

SECTION 3 SCOPE OF WORK

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Clackamas County, on behalf of the Equity and Inclusion Office within County Administration seeking Proposals from vendors to provide a Research Justice Study Communities of Color in Clackamas County.

Please direct all Technical/Specifications or Procurement Process Questions to the indicated representative referenced in the Notice of Request for Proposals and note the communication restriction outlined in Section 2.19.

3.2 BACKGROUND

Although Clackamas County is a predominantly white county, we know that there are many communities of color living, working and raising their children within the county borders. As demonstrated in the Board of County Commissioner's [Town Hall on Race Issues in Clackamas County](#) on August 19, 2020, we know that people of color experience bias and discrimination in communities throughout the county. The narrative that Clackamas County is "White" has created an invisibility factor on our communities of color. Historically and currently, communities that are not a part of the dominant group are negatively impacted by the decisions, policies and initiatives from government entities. Today, we see the disparity that currently exists with the negative impacts of COVID 19 and people of color in the county.

In June 2020, the Board of County Commissioners passed a resolution [Resolution Condemning Violence and Racism](#) against Black/African American and all people of color in Clackamas County. The County Administrator also established in August of 2020, the County's first Equity and Inclusion Office who is charged with leading the diversity, equity and inclusion efforts throughout the county. Additionally, the County hired the Coalition of Communities of Color ("CCC") to conduct an environmental scan to:

1. Identify organizations and leaders in the County that represent and organize communities of color;
2. Recognize internal County and jurisdictional diversity, equity, and inclusion trends and occurrences;
3. Document external county factors such as demographics, politics and public policy, labor markets, housing, education, civic life, and other areas of interest that affect the quality of life for communities of color in Clackamas County;
4. Assess and analyze current CCC connections with Clackamas County including partners, constituents, and activities; and
5. Connect and help build relationships between the County Equity and Inclusion Officer and community-based organizations/leaders of communities of color in the County.

The Environmental Scan report is attached as **Attachment A**.

This scan report provides further evidence of the need for our County to better serve our communities of color. It also serves as a guide to highlight our next steps. Clackamas County would like to more clearly understand all of the demographic groups within it, each group's distinct strengths, challenges and needs and begin to more meaningfully engage with those communities. It is critical that community partners, culturally specific organizations, cities, schools and other community based organizations, partner with communities of color so that everyone has an opportunity to thrive.

3.3. SCOPE OF WORK

3.3.1. Scope:

Clackamas County is seeking to contract with an organization who will provide a community based and research justice oriented study to better understand the lived experiences of Black, Indigenous and People of Color (“BIPOC”). Historical disparities for people of color have again surfaced during the pandemic, where we see disparate negative outcomes for BIPOC communities. The County is seeking an organization that approaches research through meaningful engagement, justice focus and a call to action. This organization will have a strong team of researchers who conducts both quantitative and qualitative data in order to bring about a more complete picture of communities of color in Clackamas County. The County is seeking an organization who has experience working with culturally specific organizations, is culturally responsive and has an equity approach to their work. This organization will look at all aspects of community life including (but not limited to) civic life, education, health and wellness, criminal justice, social wellbeing and community life, as part of creating the greater picture.

Preferred qualifications:

1. It is preferable that this organization have experience working in the Pacific Northwest, and has an understanding regarding the historical oppression of communities of color within the region, and awareness of the impact of dominant culture on communities of color today; and
2. It is preferable that this organization have experience conducting research with county government.

Deliverables:

1. Bring together community leaders, community based organizations, cities, school districts and other key stakeholders together facilitating a process to set priorities and approach for the research project. Utilizing the Environmental Scan report as a touch point;
2. Co-create with key stakeholders, culturally responsive and equity oriented research tools and strategies that uplifts community voice and brings to surface community experience that cannot be known through current quantitative data collected;
3. Engage communities of color, community leaders, diversity, equity and inclusion (“DEI”) actors in the County to ascertain the strengths, needs, challenges that face communities of color throughout the county. Engage regional partners as it relates to the needs, strengths and challenges of communities of color within Clackamas County to strengthen those relationships and partnerships;
4. Create a set of lessons learned through the qualitative data gathered diving deeper into the specific communities of color’s experiences characterizing the unique realities of various groups within the community;
5. Create a comprehensive report outlining the information gathered, lessons learned, strategies to integrate the learning and a call to action for the entire county community as a whole; and
6. Report out to communities, jurisdictions, organizations in the county on results of the process, giving structure for the call to action for all.

Community engagement for this project will include both the internal community of Clackamas County staff and elected leaders and the external community of the public, jurisdictional partners and others.

Clackamas County will provide:

1. Quantitative data collected from within the County.
2. Qualitative data collected from within the County.
3. Connections to the community based organizations, cities, school districts, and other key stakeholders.

Clackamas County recognizes the interconnected nature of the community and will therefore collaborate with cities, other government organizations, community based organizations, and community leaders to ensure that

the result of this research project will take into account all aspects of community life and will invite all people to actively engage in strategizing solutions.

3.3.2. Time Lines:

The work will be broken out in stages as follows with the following estimated time lines:

- **Stage 1 (6-10 months):** Establishing key stakeholders group to vet the preliminary analysis, set priorities, strategies and develop desired outcomes and goals.
- **Stage 2 (12 months):** Engage communities of color through culturally responsive tools and strategies to dig deeper into the BIPOC community experience and to begin to disaggregate experiences of communities of color to better understand their unique realities.
- **Stage 3 (5-6 months):** Draft preliminary findings after engagement with community. Share findings with key stakeholders (including community leaders and DEI actors) to hone the report findings. Develop a call to action based on the findings.
- **Stage 4 (5-6 months):** Finalize the report and present the call to action to community at large.

3.3.3. Term of Contract:

The term of the contract shall be from the effective date through approximately January 2024.

3.3.4. Budget:

The estimated budget for this project is between \$250,000 and \$300,000 over the life of this project, inclusive of all expenses. However, the budget should not be construed by Proposers as the default fee proposal. The County endeavors to obtain the best value it can for the quality and quantity of the work to be provided under the resulting contract.

3.3.5 Sample Contract: Submission of a Proposal in response to this RFP indicates Proposer's willingness to enter into a **Personal Service Contract** containing substantially the same terms of the below referenced contract, which can be found at: <https://www.clackamas.us/finance/terms.html>. No action or response to the sample contract is required under this RFP. Any objections to the sample contract terms should be raised in accordance with Paragraphs 2.2 or 2.3 of this RFP, pertaining to requests for clarification or change or protest of the RFP/specifications, and as otherwise provided for in this RFP. This RFP and all supplemental information in response to this RFP will be a binding part of the final contract.

Personal Services Contract (unless checked, item does not apply)

The following paragraphs of the Professional Services Contract will be applicable:

- Article I, Paragraph 5 – Travel and Other Expense is authorized
- Article II, Paragraph 27 – Confidentiality
- Article II, Paragraph 28 – Criminal Background Check Requirements
- Article II, Paragraph 29 – Key Persons
- Exhibit A – On-Call Provision

The following insurance requirements will be applicable.

- Professional Liability: combined single limit, or the equivalent, of not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence, with an annual aggregate limit of \$2,000,000 for damages caused by error, omission or negligent acts.
- Commercial General Liability: combined single limit, or the equivalent, of not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence, with an annual aggregate limit of \$2,000,000 for Bodily Injury and Property Damage.

- Automobile Liability: combined single limit, or the equivalent, of not less than \$500,000 per occurrence for Bodily Injury and Property Damage.
- Cyber Liability: combined single limit, or the equivalent, of not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence for network security (including data breach), privacy, interruption of business, media liability, and errors and omissions.

**SECTION 4
EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

4.1 An evaluation committee will review all Proposals that are initially deemed responsive and they shall rank the Proposals in accordance with the below criteria. The evaluation committee may recommend an award based solely on the written responses or may request Proposal interviews/presentations. Interviews/presentations, if deemed beneficial by the evaluation committee, will consist of the highest scoring Proposers. The invited Proposers will be notified of the time, place, and format of the interview/presentation. Based on the interview/presentation, the evaluation committee may revise their scoring.

Written Proposals must be complete and no additions, deletions, or substitutions will be permitted during the interview/presentation (if any). The evaluation committee will recommend award of a contract to the final County decision maker based on the highest scoring Proposal. The County decision maker reserves the right to accept the recommendation, award to a different Proposer, or reject all Proposals and cancel the RFP.

Proposers are not permitted to directly communicate with any member of the evaluation committee during the evaluation process. All communication will be facilitated through the Procurement representative.

4.2 Evaluation Criteria

<u>Category</u>	<u>Points available:</u>
Proposer’s General Background	0-30
Preferred Qualifications	0-10
Scope of Work	0-45
<u>Fees</u>	<u>0-15</u>
Available points	0-100

4.3 Once a selection has been made, the County will enter into contract negotiations. During negotiation, the County may require any additional information it deems necessary to clarify the approach and understanding of the requested services. Any changes agreed upon during contract negotiations will become part of the final contract. The negotiations will identify a level of work and associated fee that best represents the efforts required. If the County is unable to come to terms with the highest scoring Proposer, discussions shall be terminated and negotiations will begin with the next highest scoring Proposer. If the resulting contract contemplates multiple phases and the County deems it is in its interest to not authorize any particular phase, it reserves the right to return to this solicitation and commence negotiations with the next highest ranked Proposer to complete the remaining phases.

SECTION 5 PROPOSAL CONTENTS

5.1. Vendors must observe submission instructions and be advised as follows:

5.1.1. Complete Proposals should be emailed to Procurement@clackamas.us. The subject line of the email must identify the RFP title. Proposers are encouraged to contact Procurement to confirm receipt of the Proposal.

5.1.2. County reserves the right to solicit additional information or Proposal clarification from the vendors, or any one vendor, should the County deem such information necessary.

5.1.3. Proposal may not exceed a total of **40 pages** (single-sided), excluding of all exhibits, attachments or other information.

Provide the following information in the order in which it appears below:

5.2. Proposer's General Background:

- Description of the firm.
- Credentials/experience of key individuals that would be assigned to this project.
- Description of providing similar services to public entities of similar size within the past five (5) years.

5.3 Preferred Qualifications:

- Description of the firm's ability to meet the requirements in Section 3.3.1.
- Provide examples of similar work done in the Pacific Northwest that included community engagement.
- Please provide your experience in collaborating with other local governmental entities.
- Description of what distinguishes your firm from other firms performing a similar service.

5.4. Scope of Work

1. Tells us about your research approach when engaging with community. How do you engage with communities of color? How do you engage with community based and culturally specific organizations?
2. Tells us about your previous experience working with County government and/or other jurisdictions that is concerned with all levels of community life; education, health, transportation, criminal justice, businesses, etc.
3. When multiple jurisdictions are involved, how do you manage competing interests?
4. How do you ensure that the voices of marginalized communities are centered at the table?
5. What are the ways you have looked at intersectional identities to address the compounding impacts of communities of color?
6. What have you learned from your previous experience and what might you try differently this time?
7. Tell us about a successful outcome in your work, how do you characterize the success? What did you do to contribute to that success?
8. Tell us about how you have engaged community members and other key stakeholders in a COVID environment.
9. Tell us if you have experience working in the Portland Metro area, and what insights do you have that might benefit the work in Clackamas County?

5.5. Fees

Fees should be on a time and material with a not to exceed fee basis. Fees should be sufficiently descriptive to facilitate acceptance of a Proposal. List the not-to-exceed amount you propose for the service. Fees and fee schedules should outline all estimated expenses, hourly rates for all assigned individuals, anticipated travel, other reimbursable expenses.

5.6. References

Provide at least three (3) references from clients your firm has served similar to the County in the past three (3) years, including one client that has newly engaged the firm in the past thirty-six (36) months and one (1) long-term client. Provide the name, address, email, and phone number of the references. Please note the required three references may not be from County staff, but additional references may be provided.

PROPOSAL CERTIFICATION
RFP 2021-06 RESEARCH JUSTICE STUDY FOR COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

Submitted by: _____
(Must be entity's full legal name, and State of Formation)

The undersigned, through the formal submittal of this Proposal response, declares that he/she has examined all related documents and read the instruction and conditions, and hereby proposes to provide the services as specified in accordance with the RFP, for the price set forth in the Proposal documents.

Proposer, by signature below, hereby represents as follows:

- (a) That no County elected official, officer, agent or employee of the County is personally interested directly or indirectly in this contract or the compensation to be paid hereunder, and that no representation, statement or statements, oral or in writing, of the County, its elected officials, officers, agents, or employees had induced it to enter into this contract and the papers made a part hereof by its terms;
- (b) The Proposer, and each person signing on behalf of any Proposer certifies, in the case of a joint Proposal, each party thereto, certifies as to its own organization, under penalty of perjury, that to the best of their knowledge and belief:
 - 1. The prices in the Proposal have been arrived at independently, without collusion, consultation, communication, or agreement for the purpose of restraining competition as to any matter relating to such prices with any other Proposer or with any competitor;
 - 2. Unless otherwise required by law, the prices which have been quoted in the Proposal have not been knowingly disclosed by the Proposer prior to the Proposal deadline, either directly or indirectly, to any other Proposer or competitor;
 - 3. No attempt has been made nor will be made by the Proposer to induce any other person, partnership or corporation to submit or not to submit a Proposal for the purpose of restraining trade;
- (c) The Proposer fully understands and submits its Proposal with the specific knowledge that:
 - 1. The selected Proposal must be approved by the Board of Commissioners.
 - 2. This offer to provide services will remain in effect at the prices proposed for a period of not less than ninety (90) calendar days from the date that Proposals are due, and that this offer may not be withdrawn or modified during that time.
- (d) That this Proposal is made without connection with any person, firm or corporation making a bid for the same material, and is in all respects, fair and without collusion or fraud.
- (e) That the Proposer shall use recyclable products to the maximum extent economically feasible in the performance of the contract work set forth in this document.
- (f) That the Proposer accepts all terms and conditions contained in this RFP and that the RFP and the Proposal, and any modifications, will be made part of the contract documents. It is understood that all Proposals will become part of the public file on this matter. The County reserves the right to reject any or all Proposals.
- (g) That the Proposer holds current licenses that businesses or services professionals operating in this state must hold in order to undertake or perform the work specified in these contract documents.
- (h) That the Proposer is covered by liability insurance and other insurance in the amount(s) required by the solicitation and in addition that the Proposer qualifies as a carrier insured employer or a self-insured employer under ORS 656.407 or has elected coverage under ORS 656.128.
- (i) That the Proposer is legally qualified to contract with the County.
- (j) That the Proposer has not and will not discriminate in its employment practices with regard to race, creed, age, religious affiliation, sex, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, or any other protected class. Nor has Proposer or will Proposer discriminate against a subcontractor in the awarding of a subcontract because the subcontractor is a disadvantaged business enterprise, a minority-owned business, a woman-owned business, a business that a service-disabled veteran owns or an emerging small business that is certified under ORS 200.055.

(k) The Proposer agrees to accept as full payment for the services specified herein, the amount as shown in the Proposal.

Resident Bidder, as defined in ORS 279A.120

Non-Resident Proposer, Resident State _____

Oregon Business Registry Number _____

Contractor's Authorized Representative:

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Firm: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____ Phone: () _____

E-mail: _____

Contract Manager:

Name _____ Title: _____

Phone number: _____

Email Address: _____

**ATTACHMENT A
ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN STUDY**



ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN:

*Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) Experiences, Community Organizations, and Government Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Efforts within **Clackamas County***

NOVEMBER 2020

 Coalition of
Communities of
Color



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We want to thank Clackamas County for commissioning this work, especially for the support of Gary Schmidt, Sue Hildick, and all current County Commissioners. We are also grateful for the guidance of Martine Coblenz, Maria Magallon, and Csea Leonard at the Office of Inclusion and Equity.

We want to thank the Mayors and City Managers for sharing information about their DEI work, as well as Erin Schwartz, Ph.D. at Clackamas County Health, Housing, and Human Services, for providing demographic data about the county. Special thanks to the Leaders for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Council (LEDIC) and Clackamas Workforce Partnership for connecting us with their members and other DEI leaders in the county.

Finally, we would like to thank the student researchers, Shawn Canny and Isabelle Kemp, who helped us organize and analyze data.

PREPARED BY

Research Justice Institute

@ Coalition of Communities of Color
Andres Lopez, Ph.D -- Research Director
Mira Mohsini, Ph.D. -- Senior Researcher
Photo credit: David Gn (Adobe Stock)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
Executive Summary	3
Recommendations	4
PART II: INTRODUCTION AND STUDY DESIGN	7
Overview of Environmental Scan	7
Positionality of Researchers	8
A Note about Terminology	8
PART III: CLACKAMAS COUNTY DEI STORY	9
Setting the Table: Why Do this Now?	9
Land Acknowledgement	10
Demographics and Data Note	10
Mapping BIPOC-Serving Organizations in Clackamas County	13
PART IV: SITUATING GOVERNMENT DEI JOURNEYS	16
A Tiered Approach	16
Tier 1: Unclear About DEI Needs	16
Tier 2: New to the Journey	17
Tier 3: Resourced and Growing	17
PART V: TOP AREAS OF CONCERN AND TAKEAWAYS	19
Representation and Leadership	19
Education and Training	22
BIPOC-Informed Policy	24
Access and Services	25
Multilingual and Multicultural Communications and Engagement	27
Community Support and Connection	28
PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS	30
PART VII: APPENDICES	32
Appendix I: Data Sources	32
Appendix II: Community Survey	34
Appendix III: Questionnaires for Cities	37

PART I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Coalition of Communities of Color (CCC), Clackamas County, cities, and local community-based organizations have begun partnering to implement a multi-year community-driven and community-informed study into the everyday lived realities of communities of color in Clackamas county. The work starts with an environmental scan.

This environmental scan:

- Identifies organizations and leaders that represent and organize communities of color in the county.
- Recognizing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts, trends, and occurrences within various government entities throughout the county.
- Documenting factors such as demographics, public policy, labor markets, housing, education, civic life, and other areas of interest that affect the quality of life for communities of color in Clackamas County.
- Connecting and helping build relationships between the County Equity and Inclusion Officer and community-based organizations and leaders serving BIPOC communities in the county.
- Assessing and analyzing current CCC connections with Clackamas County, including partners, constituents, and activities.

Six data sources informed the environmental scan:

1. A database of 164 organizations, businesses, government, networks, councils, and community efforts supported Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities, of which 64 were engaged during the scan process.
2. A community survey with 121 responses to 14 questions included demographics, the capacity at which folks work and organize BIPOC folks, and concerns about racial injustice and strategies for the county to address.
3. A questionnaire with six responses and three 30 minute interviews with government officials across the county about DEI efforts and concerns.
4. Data gathered from four racial equity listening sessions (held in Clackamas County, Sandy, Gladstone, and Milwaukie) and two town halls hosted by Clackamas County.
5. Document review of over 22 online sources around DEI efforts (task forces, resolutions, anti-racism Facebook groups, Black Lives Matter groups, and other community collaboratives) and nine county and city-specific reports, surveys, and data resources collected to assess or address BIPOC needs and concerns.
6. Four administrative datasets were utilized for framing BIPOC realities throughout the county, which included demographics by race/ethnicity, poverty data by race/ethnicity, languages spoken at home, and COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations, and deaths.

A critical finding of the scan was making sense of the different stages of local governments' DEI journeys. Clackamas County and many of its city governments landed somewhere among the following three tiers of understanding, planning, and action.

Tier One: Unclear About DEI Needs

- Develop an internal employee engagement process, such as surveys and listening sessions, about perceived gaps, needs, and strengths.

- Develop an external, public-facing engagement process through community listening sessions for city leadership to gain a baseline understanding of the challenges, strengths, and everyday experiences of BIPOC constituents.
- Engaging the community to form a community-based advisory group to provide DEI priorities and recommendations.

Tier Two: New to the Journey

- Formalize and dedicate resources to hiring permanent, full-time positions to lead DEI efforts internally and externally.
- Commit resources to provide staff members with DEI training so that there is conceptual clarity around racial equity.
- Begin developing short- and long-term strategic plans for applying a racial equity lens to policies, practices, budgets, and services within the government.

Tier Three: Resourced and Growing

- Build networks with other cities and government agencies engaged in this work to coordinate DEI efforts across jurisdictions and create “communities of practice.”
- Continue providing educational opportunities for staff (e.g., training, “Learning Labs,” affinity groups, book clubs, etc.).
- Invest in public-facing communication strategies to inform constituents about racial equity efforts and outcomes.
- Invest in independent equity audits that can evaluate DEI work.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The bulk of recommendations from this environmental scan focus on six critical areas of concern and strategy for racial justice briefly outlined below. It’s important to note that these recommendations are a starting place to understand BIPOC communities in Clackamas County better. These recommendations must be researched, vetted, and finalized by BIPOC communities in a comprehensive study resourced and supported by local governments and organizations.

Representation and Leadership

One of the largest areas of concern identified in this scan is the lack of BIPOC representation in leadership positions, power, and decision-making throughout the county. Folks recommend greater representation in those positions of power, the need to create an environment that is more welcoming and safe for BIPOC folks in Clackamas county, developing cultures of inclusivity and respect, and a focus on diversifying the workforce leadership.

Education and Training

The need for more education and training related to DEI was a significant data finding that appeared throughout narratives, stories, and testimonials from community members. Common requests included education and training on racial justice in schools and other educational opportunities, training, and conversations about racial justice for people in leadership positions across the county and their employees.

BIPOC-Informed Policy

The knowledge and experiences of communities of color in the county must inform government policies to create a more equitable county. Creating and implementing procedures informed by BIPOC perspectives entails developing meaningful community engagement strategies, providing spaces and forums where BIPOC voices lead, communication from governments back to the community that reflects understanding, and concrete action plans of proposed relevant changes.

Access and Services

Access to resources and specific services was another primary concern that came out of the various data sources. These concerns covered multiple areas such as housing, health care, transportation, internet, schools, and food. Many BIPOC folks also expressed concern with the lack of knowledge of existing services, suggesting the need for stronger BIPOC-focused communications. Also expressed was the need for assessing equity and addressing racially motivated incidents in schools and incentives for minority-owned businesses and workforce development.

Multilingual and Multicultural Communications and Engagement

Many county residents and employees expressed concerns about the lack of communication and engagement in non-English languages across various domains. Examples of diversifying linguist and cultural communication and engagement include verbal, print, digital job announcements, city/county planning efforts, public forums like town halls/listening sessions, and social services. Also uplifted was the need for multilingual and multicultural staff and support. Many county employees expressed pain for their experienced racism by speaking other languages at work or bringing up BIPOC language and cultural barriers.

Community Support and Connection

Many residents of Clackamas County shared how either they or their neighbors do not feel welcome. Community members gave many solutions to address these concerns, such as centralized information resource, community-specific gathering opportunities, and more cultural resources, advocacy, holidays, and foods. They also spoke about the county's need to take more deliberate steps to address white nationalist symbols and rhetoric and take a stance against Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), modeling allyship, and creating an anti-racist environment.



Milwaukie Bay. Photo Credit: Provided by the County.

OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

The Coalition of Communities of Color (CCC), Clackamas County, cities, and local community-based organizations have begun partnering to implement a multi-year community-driven and community-informed study into the everyday lived realities of communities of color in Clackamas county. This study aims to establish and promote a shared understanding of racial equity in Clackamas county, build community capacity, and advocate for and improve public investment and delivery of services to communities of color in the county.

In collaboration with the Clackamas County Office of Equity and Inclusion, the CCC will create partnerships with community-based stakeholders to co-create various phases of this research, from initial design to data collection and analysis disseminating research findings. The CCC uses a “[Research Justice](#)” framework, which means that our methods are entirely community-driven and participatory. We work from the explicit assumption that communities of color are the experts of their own experiences and have the right to research, the right to know, the right to be seen, and the right to be heard.

The first phase of this study is an environmental scan conducted between July and October 2020. The purpose of the scan is to establish baseline knowledge about county-wide diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts; how communities of color are being engaged throughout the county; a preliminary sense of the needs, challenges, and strengths of communities of color; and an initial understanding of the racial and ethnic demographic makeup of the county. This report provides details about lessons learned from the environmental scan phase of this research.

The goals of this four month-long environmental scan include:

- Identifying organizations and leaders that represent and organize communities of color in the county.
- Recognizing diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts, trends, and occurrences within various government entities throughout the county.
- Documenting factors such as demographics, public policy, labor markets, housing, education, civic life, and other areas of interest that affect the quality of life for communities of color in Clackamas County.
- Connecting and helping build relationships between the County Equity and Inclusion Officer and community-based organizations and leaders serving Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities in the county.
- Assessing and analyzing current CCC connections with Clackamas County, including partners, constituents, and activities.

These goals were achieved by collecting and analyzing a wide range of data from primary and secondary sources. Primary data was collected through surveys, listening sessions, and town halls. Secondary data was collected through administrative datasets, including data from the Census and American Community Survey (ACS); official government data dashboards, documents, and publications; websites and social media; reports from community-based organizations; and news coverage. For more details about the data sources used in this report, see Appendix I.

The knowledge generated in this environmental scan will inform the broader multi-year study by shedding light on which actors (public, nonprofit, business, schools, etc.) in the county are engaging with communities

of color, what disparities exist concerning communities of color in the county, and what kinds of systems, data collection strategies, policies, and programs exist to address these disparities. Drawing on this knowledge, the next phase of the project will entail assembling a steering committee of community stakeholders to guide the research process, including developing research questions and strategies for data collection, analysis, and dissemination. This research process, which is grounded in the lived experiences of communities of color, will contribute nuanced understandings of and data about community-based needs, challenges, strengths, and solutions that can inform decision-making and policy solutions.

The success of this research depends on the investment of resources, both in terms of time and funds, by multiple stakeholders, including City and County stakeholders, and community members. From the perspective of City and County stakeholders, this research will provide public agencies with in-depth information centered on community data that can profoundly shape the way governments and other public agencies serve communities of color in Clackamas county.

POSITIONALITY OF RESEARCHERS

Dr. Andres Lopez and Dr. Mira Mohsini, the authors and primary researchers, are trained in cultural sociology and cultural anthropology. Andres identifies as a second-generation Cuban American and a queer man of color, and Mira identifies as a second-generation South Asian American and queer woman of color. Our lived experiences and our academic training shape how we make meaning of data, what data we identify as valid and trustworthy, and the choices we make about how to analyze and report on data. We are stating our positionality to model a challenge to dominant ways of doing research, which presume that the researcher is a neutral and objective investigator. We recognize that all knowledge, even knowledge gleaned from numbers, is situated within cultural, historical, and political contexts that are never neutral. We recognize that all knowledge comes from some sociocultural position and often from a place of power. Transparency and clarity about researchers' positionality further validate research and data. Researchers must be honest about what influences how they approach the work, the unique lens they bring, and their process of attempting to reduce bias in their work instead of purporting that their research and data is entirely objective. Claims of objectivity demonstrate a lack of understanding of how power and research shape one another.

We view our unique identities as offering valuable perspectives that frame this research. Our disciplinary training and lived experiences have oriented us towards respecting and valuing the knowledge, expertise, and wisdom of communities of color. Too often, this knowledge – this community data – is dismissed as anecdotal and not trustworthy enough to be considered by governments in decision- or policy-making capacities. As queer researchers of color, we deeply understand how systems of oppression, including research, can silence and erase already marginalized voices and experiences while centering dominant one, mostly from white folks in the case of Oregon, as valid and objective. Our research approach is driven and informed by these voices, experiences, and understanding of power. This report is a reflection of these values.

A NOTE ABOUT TERMINOLOGY

Throughout this report we differentiate between “Clackamas county,” the geographic region, and “Clackamas County,” the government employer and institution. We also interchangeably use the terms “communities of color” and “BIPOC communities,” an acronym for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color.

SETTING THE TABLE: WHY DO THIS NOW?

The story of Clackamas county often begins with a statement about how the county is overwhelmingly white. Indeed, the racial and ethnic demographics support the statement. According to the American Community Survey (ACS), the estimated percentage of the population in Clackamas county that identifies as “White Alone” is 81 percent. Despite the overrepresentation of people who identify as white in the county – Oregon’s “White Alone” population is 74 percent – this seemingly harmless statement produces the effect of invisibilizing communities of color. It makes invisible the needs and challenges that communities of color experience while working, raising families, accessing services, and participating in civic life in the county. It also minimizes and marginalizes the strengths and solutions that BIPOC folks bring to their communities and the broader county.

The racial and ethnic make-up of Clackamas county, presented in Table 1 in the “Demographics and Data Note” section below, indicates that BIPOC communities are essential constituencies in the county. Compared with statewide trends, demographic trends in Clackamas county point to higher rates of growth for communities of color. BIPOC folks in Clackamas county are our neighbors, colleagues, teachers, children, and business owners. Communities of color live across the county, from urban Milwaukie to the rural hamlet of Mulino, and contribute in many ways to the well-being of communities and civic life. Due to systemic racism and the legacy of exclusionary policies and practices, communities of color also face specific challenges with access to resources, services, and opportunities. Rates of poverty, for instance, are disproportionately higher for all communities of color in the county (see Table 2 in “Demographics and Data Note”).

Clackamas county, like the nation itself, is in a critical moment defined by compounding crises, including COVID-19, incidents of discrimination and harm towards Black and brown people by public safety, and mounting evidence that climate change contributed to the devastating wildfires in the county. What has become clear is that these crises disproportionately affect communities of color (see Table 3 in “Demographics and Data Note”).

Clackamas County government and many cities throughout the county have demonstrated their commitment to racial equity by expanding their work and investing resources into DEI efforts. These efforts indicate that the needs, challenges, and strengths of communities of color are being recognized and strategies are being developed to meet those needs. At the County level, an internal survey of Clackamas County employees was conducted during the fall of 2019 to assess the varied perspectives on diversity and equity within the government. Out of 680 employees who completed the survey (predominantly white folks; 17 percent BIPOC; 8 LGBTQ+), the results suggested that the County is doing a satisfactory job of creating a welcoming environment and that employees are committed to providing equitable service delivery by reducing barriers to inclusion. However, BIPOC employee narratives in the survey and internal listening sessions expressed concerns about needing more workforce diversity, greater clarity around the County’s DEI vision and plans, and more education and accountability around implementing racial equity. Many of these findings resonate with community members’ perspectives when asked how the county could be a more welcoming place to live during external listening sessions, town halls, and in the community survey disseminated for this scan. Details of community perspectives, provided by folks who identify as BIPOC and white allies, are presented in Part V of this report.

In addition to the internal survey conducted in 2019, the County recently created the Office of Equity and Inclusion and hired three full-time staff members. The Office is tasked with “ensuring the County’s core values of equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) is embedded throughout all aspects of the County’s workforce, programs, and services.” To that end, the Office’s internal priorities aim to address ways that the County can embed equity, diversity, and inclusion throughout the agency. These efforts include workforce training and education, establishing recruitment and hiring practices to build a more diverse workforce, creating a sense of community and connection (particularly for marginalized employees), improving retention practices and processes, and providing a clear structure for workplace concerns. What happens within the sphere of government directly impacts what resources, services, and opportunities are available to communities and to what degree they are accessible. Clackamas County’s EDI efforts, which are discussed in more detail in this report, indicate a clear and growing need to understand, address, and advance racial justice in the county.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A land acknowledgement is more than a statement. It is about recognizing the past, present, and future of Indigenous flourishing, survival, and erasure on the land we now know as Clackamas county. It is about acknowledging the histories of genocide and stolen land, the continuing colonization of these lands, and Indigenous communities’ resilience on these lands. It is about being aware that Clackamas county has a long and rich history of BIPOC communities’ contributions. It is about challenging the narrative that Clackamas county is a white county.

“Present day Clackamas County is located on the traditional village sites of the Multnomah, Wasco (Wass-co), Cowlitz (Cow-litz), Kathlamet (Cath-la-mitt), Clackamas, Bands of Chinook (Cha-nook), Tualatin Kalapuya (Cal-ya-poo-ya), Molalla, and many other tribes who made their homes along the Columbia and Willamette Rivers. Let us also acknowledge the robust Native community made up of tribal diversity that originates from around the country and whose journeys have brought them to the Portland Metro Area byways of forced displacement or seeking opportunities. Today, these same communities celebrate their heritage, showing resilience and tenacity that would be greatly admired by their ancestors.”
(Acknowledgement by the Native American Youth and Family Center and CCC.)

DEMOGRAPHICS AND DATA NOTE

One of the environmental scan goals is to begin contextualizing the everyday lives of BIPOC communities in Clackamas county using both qualitative (words) and quantitative (numbers) data. The majority of this report focuses on qualitative data. One reason for this is because quantitative data on BIPOC communities is not always available or reliable. When data is not available on race/ethnicity, this typically indicates that race/ethnicity questions were omitted from a study, or that non-white communities were inadequately engaged during data collection resulting in unreliably low numbers. When data on race/ethnicity is collected and at least somewhat representative of BIPOC populations, it often uses umbrella categories like Asian to represent hundreds of communities. These larger racial categories are unreliable because they do not speak to communities’ specific experiences, such as differences between Chinese and Cambodian communities’ lived realities, promoting false shared experiences of those in that group. Lastly, data collection techniques nearly always fail to capture a representative sample of folks from each race/ethnicity category and generalize findings from a few folks in a specific population as the larger group’s dominant experience (e.g., 25 Pacific Islanders surveyed speaking for the entire state’s Pacific Islander population of 34,000). This is not to say that quantitative data is always inaccurate or unuseful. Still, it often – particularly when it comes to BIPOC

communities – lacks generalizability (one goal in quantitative statistical analysis) of specific populations and can be harmful if presented without context.

With these caveats and limitations in mind, we present available quantitative data about BIPOC communities in Clackamas county to offer some framing around the size and proportionality of those broader race/ethnicity categories (see Table I).

Table 1. Clackamas County Demographics by Race/Ethnicity

Adapted from American Community Survey, Table DP05, 2018 5-Year Estimate	Estimate	% Total (Estimate)
Clackamas County - Total Population	405,788	100
Identifies One Race Only	390,402	96.2
Identifies Two or More Races	15,386	3.8
Identifies as White Only	357,240	88
Identifies as Black or African American Only	3,753	0.9
Identifies as American Indian or Alaskan Native Only	3,054	0.8
Identifies as Asian Only	17,046	4.2
Identifies as Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	1,189	0.3
Identifies as Some Other Race	8,120	2
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	34,659	8.5

We use the term “framing” intentionally here as these data can help us, with limited specificity, begin to make sense of the percentages of different BIPOC populations in the county. As research has shown, it is a frame because BIPOC populations are often undercounted in administrative data sets like the Census. According to ACS data above, approximately 18.7 percent of Clackamas county residents identify as a race other than white, multiracial, some other race, or Latinx.

Another example of how quantitative data can frame our understanding of different realities across populations is by comparing one indicator, such as income, to make a case for specific programmatic strategies. For example, the County uses poverty data to draw conclusions about the level of needs of different BIPOC communities and measure the success of their social services (see Table 2). However, besides the limiting factors of this data mentioned above, poverty data singularly orient folks to thinking about BIPOC folks as only being defined by deficit and need. To be clear, while these data are important indicators for understanding the broader context in which many BIPOC communities exist, we recognize that it is systemic racism that produces the conditions reflected in these data, and not the individual failings of BIPOC folks that results in higher poverty rates.

Table 2. Clackamas County Poverty Data by Race/Ethnicity

Adapted from American Community Survey, Table S1701, 2018 5-Year Estimate	N	Percent Estimate
Clackamas County for Whom Poverty Status is Determined	402,449	100
Below Poverty Level - Total	34,195	8.5
Total Population - White Alone, not Hispanic or Latino	331,471	*
Below Poverty Level - White Alone, not Hispanic or Latino	24,736	7.5
Total Population – Black or African American Alone	3,643	*
Below Poverty Level - Black or African American Alone	563	15.5
Total Population – American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	3,019	*
Below Poverty Level - American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	627	20.8
Total Population - Asian Alone	16,871	*
Below Poverty Level - Asian Alone	1,639	9.7
Total Population - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander Alone	1,181	*
Below Poverty Level - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander Alone	146	12.4
Total Population - Some Other Race Alone	7,987	*
Below Poverty Level - Some Other Race Alone	1,178	14.7
Total Population - Two or More Races Alone	15,337	*
Below Poverty Level - Two or More Races Alone	1,861	12.1
Total Population - Hispanic or Latino Origin (of any race)	34,213	*
Below Poverty Level - Hispanic or Latino Origin (of any race)	5,147	15.0

Since the beginning of the coronavirus pandemic in early 2020, the data has clearly shown that the virus disproportionately impacts BIPOC communities (see Table 3). The data on poverty presented above can provide insight into the disproportionate rate of COVID-19 cases in BIPOC communities.

Table 3. Clackamas County COVID-19 Data by Race/Ethnicity¹

	Clackamas County 2018 ACS 5-Year Population Estimate		Clack. Co. COVID-19 Cases		Clack. Co. COVID-19 Deaths		Clack. Co. COVID-19 Hospitalizations	
All	405788		3477		68		278	
White	357,240	88.04%	2062	59.30%	47	69.12%	175	62.95%
Black/African American	3,753	0.92%	38	1.09%	0	0.00%	2	0.72%
Asian	17,046	4.20%	129	3.71%	4	5.88%	11	3.96%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	1,189	0.29%	26	0.75%	0	0.00%	1	0.36%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	3,054	0.75%	26	0.75%	0	0.00%	2	0.72%
Multiracial	15,386	3.79%	59	1.70%	0	0.00%	1	0.36%
Other/Unknown	8,120	2.00%	314	9.03%	13	19.12%	13	4.68%
Hispanic	34,659	8.54%	823	23.67%	4	5.88%	38	13.67%
BIPOC Totals	75,087	18.50%	1101	31.67%	8	11.76%	55	19.78%

A significant risk factor for contracting the virus is economic insecurity, and BIPOC folks are more likely to hold lower-wage jobs where working from home is not an option. While the data presented in Table 3 is incomplete and suffers from many of the limitations discussed above, it clearly illustrates the disparities. The data shows that “Hispanic” populations in Clackamas county are almost three times as likely to contract COVID-19, Pacific Islander and Native Hawaiian people are twice as likely to contract COVID-19, and BIPOC communities overall are twice as likely to contract COVID-19. The disparity is even starker when we see that BIPOC populations makeup over 30 percent of all COVID-19 cases in the county but are only 12 percent of the population.

With these considerations in mind, we like to think of quantitative data as an important tool for framing the broader context that informs BIPOC experiences, but it is not the only tool that can make sense of complex social and cultural structures that shape everyday life. Our hope here and in future research in these areas is to demonstrate the power of qualitative data to help make sense of quantitative data. A detailed discussion of this approach is not the central purpose of this report. However, it is a strategy we adopted to present data in this report, which centers the words and narratives of BIPOC community members that are often missed by the numbers.

MAPPING BIPOC-SERVING ORGANIZATIONS IN CLACKAMAS COUNTY

One goal of this environmental scan is to understand what organizations, including community-based organizations, government agencies, networks, and coalitions, serve BIPOC populations in Clackamas

¹ COVID-19 Regional Data Dashboard: <https://multco.us/novel-coronavirus-covid-19/regional-covid-19-data-dashboard>, accessed November 11, 2020.

county. A database was created to keep track of these organizations and categorize them according to whether they are culturally specific and based inside or outside the county (for more details about the database, see Appendix I). We found 28 culturally-specific organizations that operate in Clackamas county and 49 culturally-specific organizations that provide Clackamas county services but are located outside the county. The remaining 87 organizations that we identified in this scan are not culturally-specific. We mapped each organization based on addresses publicly available online to make sense of the county's spatial distribution of services (see Map 1).

Several organizations represented by red pins (indicating not BIPOC specific and based outside the county) are mapped inside the county. These are often larger organizations like health care systems that may have a branch or office inside the county. However, because they are not considered rooted in the county, they have been categorized in our database as located outside the county.

The main takeaways from this map include:

- Fewer culturally-specific organizations are located in Clackamas county than in Multnomah county
- Most culturally-specific organizations in the county are located in urban areas
- Communities of color in rural areas of the county must travel a great distance to receive services and support

The main takeaways from the 28 culturally specific organizations that operate in Clackamas county include:

- The top four areas of work for these organization are in Education (8), community-centered alliances, taskforces, and movements (6), faith/religious groups (3), and social services (3)
- The top four areas of the county these organizations serve: countywide (11), Tualatin (3), Lake Oswego (3), and Canby (3)

Note: We use organizations loosely here, referring to organizations in addition to businesses, networks, councils, taskforces, and community efforts that specifically support BIPOC communities.

Map 1. Community-based Organizations, Government Agencies, Networks, and Coalitions Serving BIPOC Communities in Clackamas County



A TIERED APPROACH

Identifying perspectives that can shed light on the varying dimensions of BIPOC experiences in Clackamas county is one of this environmental scan’s main objectives. A critical part of understanding these dimensions is learning about local government efforts to approach and address issues about diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). Gaining perspectives on how local governments, especially cities, across the county are engaging with these issues captures an array of information and data that can tell us how far along different jurisdictions are when it comes to addressing racial inequities and disparities. City-level perspectives give us a more granular picture of where the gaps, limitations, strengths, and opportunities lie and ultimately give us a better sense of where in the county BIPOC communities are more underserved and need greater support, resources, and investment.

To this end, we engaged cities and other local government entities across the county to learn more about how they are approaching DEI work. We asked City electeds and other government representatives to provide us with written responses to a set of questions (see Appendix III for the list of items). We then followed up with several cities to interview their city managers. The findings presented in this section reflect the data from the written responses and our conversations with city managers. For more details about these data sources, see Appendix I.

The data demonstrates that cities are at different points in their racial equity journey. It is also clear that all the cities and government entities we engaged are committed to going through this journey and that no city has it all “figured out.” To distinguish the different points at which local governments are in their racial equity journey, we use a three-tiered approach. In this tiered framework, we do not identify which cities and agencies are situated in each of the tiers – we certainly do not want to promote any sense of “shame” for those starting their racial equity journey. Instead, we intend to summarize a broad set of shared experiences that define each tier and recommend the next steps to advance government-led DEI efforts.

Tier One: Unclear about DEI Needs

Cities and other government entities in this first tier are at the beginning of their racial equity journey. People in leadership positions are starting to interrogate what racial equity means for their communities and public institutions. Government employees may be aware of other communities doing DEI work and recognize that “this could be a good thing.” However, there has not been much dialogue internally with employees or externally with community stakeholders, and therefore there is less urgent pressure to engage in DEI work. There is a lack of clarity about DEI needs and a perception that there is less public pressure for the government to be accountable for this work. As such, governments in this tier do not have formal or informal structures in place to begin these conversations.

To gain more clarity about DEI needs, local government entities in this tier can:

- Develop an internal employee engagement process, including tools such as surveys and listening sessions, about perceived gaps, needs, and strengths.
- Develop an external public-facing engagement process through community listening sessions for city leadership to gain a baseline understanding of the challenges, strengths, and everyday experiences of BIPOC constituents.

- Engaging the community to form a community-based advisory group to provide DEI priorities and recommendations.

Tier Two: New to the Racial Equity Journey

Cities and other government entities in this second tier have begun their racial equity journey. They realize that a plan for DEI is needed but may be new to many of the concepts and processes required to implement a DEI strategy. Cities in this tier are responding to internal and community pressure to address racial injustices. Externally, the impetus to address DEI may have been catalyzed by already existing tensions in the city, or by the more recent uprisings for racial justice following the murder of George Floyd in May 2020 (or both). Internally, employees, including leadership, may decide that some formal strategies and structures need to be implemented to ensure that a culture of inclusivity is being fostered. To this end, local governments in this tier may have informally identified staff members and a community-based team to lead these efforts, such as reviewing policies and practices, organizing listening sessions, and working to develop DEI goals and measurable metrics for progress.

To advance in their racial equity journey, local government entities in this tier can:

- Formalize and dedicate resources to hiring permanent, full-time positions to lead DEI efforts internally and externally.
- Commit resources to provide staff members with DEI training so that there is conceptual clarity around racial equity.
- Begin developing short- and long-term strategic plans for applying a racial equity lens to policies, practices, budgets, and services within the government.

Tier Three: Resourced and Growing

Cities and other government institutions in this third tier have a well-established track record of developing short- and long-term visions for DEI in their jurisdiction, as well as committing resources to implement DEI goals. Local governments in this tier have responded to demands and pressure from community members and recommitted to racial equity in the wake of the uprisings following the murder of George Floyd. Consequently, tier three entities have created or have plans to develop full-time DEI positions and have formalized DEI task forces and committees to guide and advance the work. Also, these efforts have buy-in from people in leadership positions. Processes for internal employee engagement and external community engagement are resourced, such as regular listening sessions, town halls, and focus groups. Other engagement tools, such as surveys, are used to gather input and feedback from employees and community members. Entities in this tier have conducted or are well-placed to conduct audits of internal policies and practices using well-developed racial equity lenses. Training and other educational opportunities are regularly offered.

To continue advancing racial justice, local government entities in this tier can:

- Build networks with other cities and government agencies engaged in this work to coordinate DEI efforts across jurisdictions and create “communities of practice.”
- Continue providing educational opportunities for staff (e.g., training, “Learning Labs,” affinity groups, book clubs, etc.).
- Invest in public-facing communication strategies to inform constituents about racial equity efforts and outcomes.
- Invest in independent equity audits that can evaluate DEI work.



Sunrise over Willamette River in Oregon City. Photo Credit: Provided by the County.

PART V: TOP AREAS OF CONCERN AND TAKEAWAYS

How do Clackamas county residents, and those who work in the county, articulate their experiences of race, racism, diversity, inclusion, and belonging? In this section, we want to provide space for the voices of people who live and work in Clackamas county. Here we present those who speak to the myriad of everyday lived experiences of communities of color from people who identify as BIPOC and those who identify as white. We view these perspectives as valid and reliable data that provide us with a more nuanced and complete picture of the top areas of concern expressed by those connected to Clackamas county. We also provide readers with the main takeaways and what can be learned from these data.

To present a complete picture, we gathered and analyzed hundreds of narratives and stories from people who shared their experiences in surveys and listening sessions and town halls hosted by County officials (for more details about these data sources, see Appendix I). What emerges from these data is a set of specific areas of concern repeatedly discussed across forums. The six areas of concern that identified include:

- I. Representation and Leadership
- II. Education and Training
- III. BIPOC-Informed Policies
- IV. Access and Services
- V. Community Outreach and Multilingual Communications
- VI. Community Support and Connection

Each area of concern listed above is introduced with some context and then broken down into several specific thematic areas. These thematic areas were uplifted by the narratives and stories of BIPOC folks and white allies. We present these narratives and stories as direct quotes and some details about the speaker while omitting information that may be personally identifying. Voicing BIPOC experiences is crucial for better identifying, understanding, and addressing areas of greatest need and opportunity for a county that hosts diverse communities of color.

I. REPRESENTATION AND LEADERSHIP

“[BIPOC people need] more than a seat at the table, let’s head the table.” (Speaker identifies as African American. Forum: Community survey)

Reviewing the data from surveys, listening sessions, and town halls clarifies that many people connected with Clackamas county recognize a lack of BIPOC representation in leadership positions, power, and decision-making throughout the county. The areas where BIPOC representation and leadership are most noticeably lacking include County and City offices and public school administrations. Community members voiced several strategies and recommendations to ensure that Clackamas county institutions are more representative of the needs and concerns of BIPOC communities.

Takeaway #1: Create an environment that is more welcoming and safe for BIPOC folks in Clackamas county. Time and time again, folks recounted stories of people in leadership positions failing to act in response to reported incidents of racism and other inequitable practices. Failure to act, whether by ignoring, dismissing, or not believing the experiences shared by BIPOC folks and white allies, may not necessarily come from a place of malice, but rather from a genuine lack of understanding of, and therefore empathy for,

BIPOC experiences. These leadership failures were explained partly because of the lack of representation of BIPOC voices and experiences in these positions of power.

“Canby, I am told, has one of the highest populations of Latinx folks in Clackamas County. It is also quite rural and quite conservative. I hear there have been instances of racist bullying at the local schools (things about “go back to your country” and “building the wall”) and when youth have brought the issue to school administration nothing has been done.” (Speaker identifies as Mexican and white, and organizes Latinx communities throughout the county. Forum: Community survey)

“Several years ago, the Jennings Lodge/Candy Lane school moved to become a full Spanish immersion program. Members of the CPO [Community Planning Organizations] were angry and I listened to community members denigrate native Spanish speakers at a public meeting with no comment from leadership. I stood up at the meeting and tried to, and made my points and tried and tried to cite a corrective action. I was not supported by leadership and after the meeting I should have and I didn’t follow up with leadership and hold them accountable for what they allowed...I cannot imagine had anybody been a person of color at that meeting how that would have felt, how they would have felt welcome. That is a direct arm of the County so one of the specific things that I would like to see moving forward is, as we talk about what the County is going to do and how diversity efforts are going to move through County offices and so forth, I’d like to see that extended to all of the branches, including the volunteer branches the CPOs, the hamlets, and every part that’s under the County umbrella because that shouldn’t have happened and I should have done more and I didn’t.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Town Hall on Race Issues in Clackamas County held on Wednesday, August 19, 2020)

“I have lived in Oregon City since 2016 and while I enjoy many things about the area, I have sometimes felt the urge to move somewhere more diverse and welcoming. I sometimes feel unsafe and not welcomed because of things like Confederate flags in my neighborhood and on trucks along McLoughlin on my way to work; reading the covenant in the deed to the house my wife and I bought the day we moved in saying no person of color was allowed to live here; the graffiti with the N-word (misspelled) at a park nearby. At the same time, I know not every part of Oregon City and Clackamas County are like that, and I often feel more comfortable in places like Canby, where there are more people that look like me.” (Speaker identifies as Central American. Forum: Community survey)

“We need the County to invest in programs that result in more contracting with small businesses run by underrepresented groups. We need to look at our recruitment and hiring practices and be willing to invest in strategies that bring more diversity to the Clackamas County workforce, since having diverse voices involved in decision making actually results in better decisions being made. We need the County to invest in art and cultural events that can be used to lift up unheard voices and share their stories. We need the County to lead with an equity lens first, and not as an addendum once decisions have already been made. I would recommend the Commissioners review the policy demand section of the Reimagine Oregon project, as they have listed a number of policies and programs that our County could consider to help address these and many other issues to improve equity and diversity in our county.” (The speaker identifies as African American. Forum: Town Hall on Race Issues in Clackamas County held on Wednesday, August 19, 2020)

Takeaway #2: Create cultures of inclusivity and respect. Many reflected on how dominant norms create cultures in workplaces, schools, and other institutions where BIPOC folks feel marginalized, overworked, and pressured to conform. Cultural shifts towards greater inclusivity and respect entail nurturing and supporting people with different racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds rather than consistently forcing them to comply with dominant cultural expectations. These cultural shifts can be best realized when people in leadership positions lead with these values.

“I continue to see people of color (specifically bilingual staff) be overworked and asked to do unrelated job duties to serve Spanish speaking clients, who have limited representation in Clackamas County. I see departments full of the dominant culture and no room for growth for people of color. It’s very sad to say that the solution is to ‘comply’ and lose your cultural identity in order to gain success in a county/world that is run by the dominant culture.” (Speaker identifies as Mexican. They recounted their experiences of growing up in Clackamas county and having to resort to violence as a way to defend themselves and their peers of color who were racially harassed at school. This respondent is currently working in the county. Forum: Community survey)

“It is painful to live in an institution where you have to deal with whiteness every day. There are talks about how to change things but to the extent of white comfort. We need to give more power to POC [people of color]. County leadership needs to be held accountable. Make sure that conversations go beyond white comfort and fragility.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Listening session for Clackamas County employees held on June 18, 2020)

“I think this is an opportunity for Sandy to demonstrate to leadership to do some things very right in being proactive, but also leadership in the sense of we can’t change people’s hearts... We can’t say stop hating people, you can’t legislate that out of people, but what we can do as a city and especially you as City Councilors and city leaders is demonstrate the values and the practices that show people there’s a better way, because there are going to be people who foster that hatred in their heart or have those biases that may not come out at all times, but we really want to make other people feel comfortable in growing and going forward. I would love to see Sandy be at the forefront of that and not just watching other people do it and making superficial changes.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Sandy City Council Listening Session on Racism, July 7, 2020)

Takeaway #3: Diversify the workforce, including leadership positions. To ensure welcoming and safe environments for BIPOC folks and create cultures of inclusivity, many people voiced their support for diversifying the workforce.

“We need a person of color to run for County Commissioner [sic]. We need more persons of color leading our criminal justice systems. We need more persons of color leading major departments within Clackamas County. We need our commissioners to state their commitment to reducing [racist] behaviors. I have written to the county commissioners and [Sheriff’s Office] complaining about various racist actions (most recent was the Clackamas County [Sheriff’s] and [Oregon State Police’s] support of the Trump rally caravan to downtown Portland) and they never respond.” (Speaker identifies as Hispanic and Latinx. Forum: Community survey)

“Hiring more people of color across the board in the county’s organizations and businesses, including (and especially) in leadership roles.” (Speaker identifies as Columbian American. Forum: Community survey)

“We are hiring to be more diverse. I want to know if all interviews are being asked EDI [equity, diversity, inclusion] questions and if the panel is diverse. Once people are hired, how is the management going to ensure that people feel safe?” (Speaker did not identify. Listening session for Clackamas County employees held on July 29, 2020)

II. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

“Continuous education for those in power.” (Speaker identifies as African American. Forum: Community survey)

“[S]upport and promote research on the history of racial exclusion of people of color and the genocide of [I]ndigenous peoples in the county and begin telling and highlighting the stories of communities of color in the area, from pre-colonization times until today.” (Speaker identifies as a Central American. Forum: Community survey)

The need for more education and training related to DEI was a significant part of the data collected through narratives, stories, and testimonials from community members. BIPOC folks and white allies often connected the inaction they experienced by those in leadership with the need for more education on anti-racism, Oregon’s white supremacist history, anti-bias and cultural sensitivity, and the long histories of BIPOC folks living in the region as a counternarrative to the pervasive erasure of these histories (especially Black and Indigenous histories and legacies in the county and region).

Takeaway #1: Education and training on racial justice in schools. Many expressed their concern about public schools in Clackamas county being places where racism is unchecked. The need to teach a diverse and inclusive curriculum in schools was regularly mentioned as a high priority area. Many BIPOC-identifying community members shared the impact on themselves and their children when seeing hate symbols like the Confederate flag in schools. Some suggested that better education about racial injustice – starting early on – would help students, teachers, and administrators become aware of the history of racism and why these kinds of symbols create an environment of fear and anxiety for many communities of color.

“Teach a more diverse and inclusive curriculum in the schools beginning with grade school. Better training for the police to deescalate situations, especially when interacting with POCs [people of color].” (Speaker identifies as Other Black and Other white. Forum: Community survey)

“Students at the high school don’t understand what this symbol [the Confederate flag] means and don’t understand the actual history of this symbol. I hope that beyond just the removal of this symbol, there can be an effort on the part of the school board and these wonderful students that are coming together to push back against this, to change some of the education that’s happening so that people can understand that this symbol is shameful and we should feel ashamed to display it because the ideas behind this symbol are incredibly violent and painful.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Sandy City Council Listening Session on Racism held on July 7, 2020)

“The [high school] is known for [racist] incidents and bullying – stricter guidelines and consequences when these incidents occur. Possibly some sort of education for offenders in the areas of bullying and racism?” (Speaker identifies as white. Forum: Community survey)

“Help the NCSD [North Clackamas School District] (Alder Creek MS and Rex Putnam HS especially) confront the systemic racism present in their curriculums, student cultures and teaching/administration policies” (Speaker identifies as African American. Forum: Community survey)

Takeaway #2: Opportunities for education, training, and conversations about racial justice for people in leadership positions and other employees. Many people discussed how trainings could foster a more inclusive and welcoming workplace. They felt that these trainings could provide a common language of understanding between white and BIPOC co-workers as well as provide tangible steps to address discrimination and bias.

“Continued training for leaders, including actionable, measurable steps to fight discrimination and bias. The same thing needs to happen for employers and employees in the county. At NAMI Clackamas I feel like I have hit a wall and need outside help in determining and implementing next steps. If I feel that way then I think other employers and nonprofits are having the same problems.” (Speaker identifies as white. Forum: Community survey)

“I’ve mentioned several times the need for cultural training. There’s a situation where I was placed outside of my supervisor’s office; I was not asked. It was actually traumatic for me when you come from a place where you are always watched. It felt like I was in a fish bowl. That training is going to be very important. We need to understand culture and what affects people. It’s like having been a war zone. If you’re not in a person’s shoes you can’t understand. If my management understood how it felt and traumatized me. But they didn’t. Cultural diversity training will help us understand.” (Speaker identifies as African American. Forum: Listening Session for Clackamas County employees held on July 29, 2020)

“Challenging conversations in County trainings where emotions were relevant, also within my team. I would like to encourage more of that but also to know that County is a safe place to have those conversations, and bringing this up isn’t going to get you a mark in your personnel file.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Listening Session for Clackamas County employees held on July 29, 2020)

“I think there needs to be mandatory diversity training for people working with people of color in any capacity and mandatory conversations about how their actions and words can contribute to how communities of color live. People need to be held accountable for their hate speech and talked to from leaders in the community stating that their offensive language will not be tolerated in this community.” (Speaker identifies as Mexican, Hispanic, and Latinx. Forum: Community survey)

“Education, education, EDUCATION. In the school, in the place of work. Remove symbols of hate. Observe, allow to observe and normalize other traditions, holidays, celebration...” (Speaker identifies as Other Hispanic or Latinx and Western European. Forum: Community survey)

“We all have to look at ourselves and say what am I doing how am I being culpable, even as a mom of a biracial kid. I’m white and there’s times that I probably downplay what’s happening to her and so we have to ask ourselves those hard questions. We have to put policies in place but mostly it’s about discussion/ It’s about education. It’s about learning and being willing to grow and that comes from these sessions. That comes from leadership. That comes from people saying, you know, I made a mistake and I did something wrong and this is how I can do better” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Town Hall on Race Issues in Clackamas County held on August 19, 2020)

III. BIPOC-INFORMED POLICY

“Identify, empower, and engage civic and community leaders of color in the process to determine what we want and need.” (Identifies as Black/African American. Forum: Community survey)

Another area of concern reflected in multiple data sources was the need for government policies to be informed by the knowledge and experiences of communities of color in the county. Creating and implementing policies that are informed by BIPOC perspectives entails developing strategies for meaningful community engagement and providing spaces and forums where BIPOC voices can be uplifted. The uprisings for racial justice following the murder of George Floyd certainly catalyzed the County and many local governments throughout the county to hold listening sessions and town halls to gather these data points. While these events are needed and can be a productive way for public officials to hear from their constituents, there were also concerns that these events would not result in concrete action plans of proposed relevant strategies. For BIPOC-informed policy to become the norm rather than the outlier or exception, government agencies must also ensure that BIPOC representation is realized at all decision-making levels and especially at leadership levels. As one respondent to the community survey stated, BIPOC folks need “more than just a seat at the table, let’s head the table.”

Takeaway #1: Engage and ask BIPOC folks about their needs and solutions. People expressed a desire for meaningful involvement in the processes of policy-making. Many folks also said how critical it is for a racial equity lens to be applied to all policies, programs, and plans from their very inception through to their implementation. A significant part of applying a racial equity lens means ensuring that BIPOC folks are at the table when decisions and plans are being made that directly impact them and provide space for BIPOC folks to shape, early on, the content direction of programs and policies.

“Identify, empower, and engage civic and community leaders of color in the process to determine what we want and need.” (Speaker identifies as African American, and has been an educator in Clackamas county for over 30 years. Forum: Community survey).

“Ensure that all government officials are incorporating racial lens practices/plans/policies and ensure that the voices of people of color are uplifted in their communities. Ensure that people of color have representation within government positions. Empower people of color to speak up and not be afraid/harassed for speaking up.” (Speaker identifies as Mexican. Forum: Community survey)

“Policy changes – curious about how employees will be involved in revising policy.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Listening session for Clackamas County employees held on July 29, 2020)

“Policies/procedures that address racism so that staff of color have support when faced with racism on their job. Currently, our management do not have the skills to support a diverse workplace and are unable to see when white supremacy is in action. It is always in action.” (Speaker Identifies as African American and Other white. Forum: Community survey)

Takeaway #2: Create tangible action plans for proposed relevant changes. During the listening sessions, many BIPOC folks recounted personal and community experiences that reflected the difficulty of navigating systems and services that are not implemented with their specific needs in mind. Others provided tangible policy recommendations that could produce positive outcomes for communities of color in the county.

“I lived in Clackamas county several times in my life and as an indigenous person my experience was not one that made me want to return. I have also done advocacy work for several years with residents of Clackamas County as well as CHA and have encountered a frustrating lack of resources for people of color. Many past clients have expressed feeling discriminated against in attempts to find assistance, housing, or employment. Community services are hard to locate and hard to travel to as Clackamas county is large and public transport is very limited compared to Multnomah County.” (Speaker identifies as American Indian. Forum: Community survey)

“We need the County to invest in systems that provide public access to information in ways that the public can understand, with information provided transparently so that we, as a community, can hold people accountable for their actions and measure their progress. We need the County to invest in fair and affordable housing programs so that we can improve the rates of home ownership. We need the county to invest in job creation programs and policies that will encourage people from diverse backgrounds to come to work in Clackamas county.” (Speaker identifies as African American. Forum: Community survey)

IV. ACCESS AND SERVICES

“Clackamas County needs safe spaces for immigrants or refugees, more stable-affordable-secure housing and transportation system, civilian oversight of policing, and universal access to home broadband.” (Speaker identifies as African American. Forums: Community survey)

Access to resources and specific services was another primary concern that came out of the various data sources. These concerns covered multiple areas such as housing, health care, transportation, internet, schools, and food. While these areas have some specific suggestions and needs, most folks talked about these areas broadly, listing concerns about existing services and those they wished Clackamas County provided. Many folks expressed a need for more general awareness of services for BIPOC folks and transparency around how they are conscious of and committed to anti-racist practices. One goal of advancing DEI efforts in the county is to better understand how to invest in specific communities to understand and address these inequities/disparities through access and services.

Takeaway #1: General concerns with a lack of knowledge of existing services. Various examples across the data sources, government, non-profit, and community members listed general concerns with social services, particularly around housing. These concerns were not paired with detailed narratives, but they still demonstrate the need for further support. Also, many folks talked about the overall lack of knowledge of existing services.

“Increased access to affordable and inclusive neighborhoods/housing, equitable healthcare, transportation access, safety, and affordability” (Speaker identifies as white. Forum: Community survey)

“Investment more in programs, services and policies that help eliminate racial disparities in health, education, income, and other factors” (Speaker identifies as Central American. Forum: Community survey)

“Clackamas county needs a better safety net system (health care, internet, shelters).” (Speaker identifies as White. Forum: Community survey)

“Invest in social services that are anti-racist and culturally specific.” (Speaker identifies as Native American. Forum: Community survey)

“First-time homeowners programs for individuals of color to become homeowners” (Speaker identifies as South American. Forum: Community survey)

“Invest more into social/mental health services with folks that are people of color running them or working at them.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Community survey)

“More awareness of services available to people of color” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Community survey)

Takeaway #2: Assessing equity and addressing racially motivated incidents in schools. More specificity was provided to evaluate quality across different systems and programs, emphasizing racial injustice in schools and the allocation of resources.

“Conduct audits of existing programs, services and policies to search for opportunities to advance racial equity and to correct or eliminate those that perpetuate or exacerbate racial disparities.” (Speaker identifies as Central American. Forum: Community survey)

“Equitable resource allocation for school districts in county and addressing of racially-motivated incidents in schools.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Community survey)

“School administrators who listen to students, speak out against racism, and visibly support LGBTQ+ students.” (Speaker identifies as Mexican. Forum: Community survey)

Takeaway #3: Incentives for minority-owned businesses and workforce development. The final group of suggestions in this area of concern was around bolstering BIPOC-owned businesses and incentivizing the hiring of a more diverse workforce.

“Employment, business opportunities and trusting a person of color on their merits, not the color of their skin.” (Speaker identifies as African American. Forum: Community survey)

“[I]ncentives for POC businesses to move into the area.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Community survey)

“Opportunities to build economic capital within communities of color and opportunities for leadership development and investment within communities of color.” (Speaker identifies as white. Forum: Community survey)

“We need to bring in businesses that are owned and sell products specific to communities of color.” (Speaker identifies as white. Forum: Community survey)

“More support and advertising of businesses.” (Speaker identifies as Mexican. Forum: Community survey)

V. MULTILINGUAL AND MULTICULTURAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT

“Translation services should not be an afterthought. Listening sessions/town halls should be conducted in Spanish and other minority languages on a regular basis.” (Speaker identifies as Western European. Forum: Community survey)

Numerous folks across the county expressed concerns about the lack of communication and engagement in non-English languages across various domains. According to the ACS 5-year estimate data in Clackamas County, 50,569 residents speak a language other than English in the home. That is approximately thirteen percent (6 percent Spanish, 4 percent Asian and Pacific Islander languages, and 3 percent other Indo-European languages) of the county’s population who may not receive accurate, if any at all, meaningful life-saving information about public health, employment, housing, and emergencies like wildfire evacuations, to name a few. Further, residents explained that folks with varying cultural backgrounds should offer communications and engagement services – not just white Americans and Latinx folks. Examples of diversifying linguist and cultural communication and engagement include verbal, printed, digital, job announcements, city/county planning efforts, public forums like town halls/listening sessions, and social services.

Takeaway #1: Translation services across all domains. It is evident when engaging with non-English speakers that the County and its cities need to do more work on translating information on websites, public services announcements, and direct services. It is also crucial that translation is provided in languages beyond Spanish and Russian.

“There are just as many blue collar Asians working in the food and service industry as there are Latinx and other immigrant communities. The Vietnamese, Burmese, Cambodians, Thai, Japanese, Koreans, and Chinese immigrants are often silent and invisible, due to innate cultural values. In Clackamas County, there are more Vietnamese speakers than there are Russian/Ukrainian speakers, yet. Please check the school district to confirm this.” (Speaker identifies as Asian Indian. Forum: Community survey)

Takeaway #2: Multilingual and multicultural staff and support. Folks also noted the importance of multilingual and multicultural staff in agencies and organizations to provide direct services in a language that

community members understand. Often, communication through interpreters delays services, and interpreters are not experts in the provided services. Further, in organizations where multilingual folks work, it should be encouraged for non-English languages to be spoken instead of stigmatized through harassment, jokes, stereotyping, and ignoring. While having linguistic and culturally diverse employees is essential to connect with communities, these folks should not be asked to take on translation labor (e.g., translating documents or listening sessions) outside of their job description. Instead, translation professionals should be hired to do this type of work. Participants mentioned feeling unsafe going to HR or their union; instead, they said a safe space was needed to go with racism or discrimination issues where they do not have to fear retaliation or inaction.

“Equitable, timely and culturally appropriate and timely access to all health care, including behavioral health, provided by people who “look like them,” not just other white people who have been trained.” (Speaker identifies as Western European. Forum: Community survey)

“Be more open minded about county employees using other languages in order to reach our communities of color.” (Speaker identifies as Japanese. Forum: Community survey)

VI. COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND CONNECTION

“I have heard from students, colleagues, neighbors and friends of color that their lived experience in Clackamas county is very isolating and at times, unsafe physically and emotionally.” (Speaker identifies as white. Forum: Community survey)

“Clackamas county has a strong presence of overtly racist residents. We see rather intimidating Trump/Blue Lives Matter flag wavers every day in our neighborhood.” (Speaker identifies as Latinx. Forum: Community survey)

Many Clackamas County residents shared how either they or their neighbors do not feel welcome, as if this is a place for white folks only. Community members gave many solutions to address these concerns, such as centralized information around resources, community-specific gathering opportunities, cultural resources, advocacy, holidays, and foods. They also spoke about the county’s need to take more deliberate steps at addressing white nationalist symbols and rhetoric and taking a stance against ICE. Understanding and addressing these issues requires robust engagement with communities of color in the county to make clear the most pressing needs and long-term solutions.

Takeaway #1: Centralized community-specific resources and opportunities. With the concern of not knowing what services are available to BIPOC folks, one solution is to have centralized information or a location to bring deliberation or action issues. This could be a digital platform run by the County, community gathering officially recognized by the County for BIPOC folks to gather and share information, and organizations led by communities of color that are well connected. Overall, folks highlighted the need for more outreach and formalized resources and opportunities for BIPOC communities.

Takeaway #2: Cultural resources, advocacy, holidays, and food. Community members believed that more representation in the community means more places to shop, eat, connect, and enjoy entertainment.

“Establish a list of stakeholders, which the Racial Justice Subcommittee of ClackDems has started.” (Speaker identifies as white. Forum: Community survey)

“More ethnic, non-Western, restaurants...Maybe celebrate official days for certain communities (eg. Mexican Independence Day, India ____, Russian ____, etc.). Especially if there’s like a big ethnic supermarket, hosting a little celebration there would be cool.” (Speaker identifies as white. Forum: Community survey)

“School food programs could and should embrace the ethnicities of their populations and provide food that is familiar and comforting. Merely providing a single item from within the community would ‘normalize’ them...and make the non-dominant folk feel more at home.” (Speaker identifies white. Forum: Community survey)

“Clackamas County needs to get clear about its relationship with ICE and make that public so that immigrant communities aren’t afraid of asking for help with things like food, domestic violence and shelter needs.” (Speaker identifies as white. Forum: Community survey)

“A systematic effort to marginalize the white nationalists in our community.” (especially in Law Enforcement) (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Community survey)

“More social outreach for equity work in rural communities.” (Speaker identifies as Black. Forum: Community survey)

“More opportunities for gatherings to actually get to know people of color.” (Speaker did not identify. Forum: Community survey)

“More news that includes positive depictions of POC.” (Speaker identifies as African American. Forum: Community survey)

PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations below come from an array of data sources collected over four months. This is not a comprehensive, community-led list of recommendations that would require considerably more community involvement and leadership over a more extended period to vet such findings. However, the list below can be considered a starting place for Clackamas County and its cities to begin formalizing short and long-term BIPOC community-centered strategies towards advancing racial justice.

Representation and Leadership

- Ensure that recruitment and hiring practices are intentional about diversifying the workforce and informed by equity.
- Build inclusive workplace cultures to nurture and provide support for people with different racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds.
- People in leadership positions should be publicly invested and committed to anti-racism.
- People in leadership positions should lead with DEI values and model equitable, inclusive decision-making.
- Be mindful of asking BIPOC folks, who are often already overworked, to contribute additional labor to compensate for the lack of representations (e.g., translation work).
- Invest in cultural events at the local level.
- Ensure that public contracting is equitable.
- An equity lens should be applied to all aspects of the work the County does, rather than being an afterthought.

Education and Training

- In consultation with BIPOC constituents, review public school curriculum to address racial biases.
- County and City governments to invest in racial justice/anti-racism trainings and educational content for leadership and other employees.

BIPOC-Informed Policy

- In collaboration with BIPOC constituents, develop racial equity plan/strategy at County and City levels.
- Create communications that reflect back to the community what was heard.
- Implement tangible action plans based on proposed changes articulated by BIPOC constituents.

Access and Services

- Community-informed, BIPOC-led/staffed social services.
- Communication campaign detailing BIPOC-specific services and support.
- County to clarify its relationships with ICE.
- Expanding and adding to first-time homeowner programs for BIPOC.
- Programmatic audits of existing programs to assess the perpetuating or exacerbations of racial disparities.
- Assessment of racially-motivated incidents in schools and policies to impose stricter guidelines and consequences of bullying and racism.
- Equitable resource allocation for schools, especially for those with large BIPOC populations.
- Incentives for BIPOC-owned businesses to move to the county and develop BIPOC workforce.

- Opportunities to build economic capital and leadership development within BIPOC communities.
- Support creating and sustaining county-specific community-based organizations.
- Advertising for BIPOC-owned businesses.
- Creating more opportunity for small business and lower-income housing which could be more attractive to BIPOC groups who are often pushed out of the area.

Multilingual and Multicultural Communications and Engagement

- Robust verbal, print, and digital communication plan that is multilingual and multicultural.
- Diversifying linguistic and cultural communication and engagement in job announcements, city/county planning efforts, public forums like town halls/listening sessions, and social services.
- Support and encouragement, instead of stigma, to speak languages other than English at work and for non-English speaking clients or constituents.
- Hire translation professionals instead of depending on multilingual employees to perform translation and interpretation labor outside of their job description.

Community Support and Connection

- Centralized location to bring BIPOC issues for deliberation or action.
- More community gatherings for BIPOC folks to socialize and organize.
- Establish a coalition of stakeholders and advocates to work on the issues that relate to racism in government and organizations (e.g., health care, housing, education, etc.).
- School administrators who listen to and support BIPOC and LGBTQ+ students and speak out against discrimination and violence students experience at schools.
- More cultural holidays, celebrations, appropriate food/nutrition services, and food stores.
- A systematic effort to marginalize the white nationalists in our community (especially in law enforcement).
- More social outreach for equity work in rural communities.
- More news and communication that include positive depictions of POC.

APPENDIX I: DATA SOURCES

Several approaches were used to gather information about communities of color in Clackamas county. These included

1. Conducting extensive online research to build a database of organizations serving, in some capacity, communities of color in the county
2. Disseminating an online survey in English, Spanish and Russian
3. Gathering written responses from mayors, city managers, and other public officials about Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) work being done in various jurisdictions and following-up with interviews
4. Conducting qualitative analysis on listening sessions and town halls on race
5. Conducting a document review
6. Utilizing administrative data from the Census and American Community Survey to gain a broader picture of demographic profiles of communities of color in the county

The authors of this report, Dr. Andres Lopez and Dr. Mira Mohsini, also collected data and gained insight about communities of color in Clackamas county by attending virtual community events, such as convenings of the Leaders in Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Council (LEDIC), town halls, city managers' monthly meetings, and a weekly standing meeting with the recently appointed County Equity and Inclusion Officer and her team.

Environmental Scan Database

Data were collected by conducting extensive online research on organizations that engage with communities of color in Clackamas county. These organizations were separated into the following categories:

- Culturally-specific organizations based in Clackamas county that engage with communities of color in the county
- Culturally-specific organizations based outside of Clackamas that engage with communities of color in the county
- Non-culturally-specific organizations based in Clackamas county that engage with communities of color
- Non-culturally-specific organizations based outside of Clackamas county that engage with communities of color

The database included 164 community-based organizations, businesses, government agencies, networks, councils, and other coalitions. Organizations were also categorized based on areas of work, such as faith, education, social services, health providers, youth services, workforce development, arts, business, and DEI work. Outreach was conducted with 64 of the organizations included in the environmental scan database.

Community Survey

Data was collected using a semi-structured survey (see Appendix II for the complete survey questions). Out of a total of 14 questions, five were open-ended and nine were close-ended. The survey was offered in English, Spanish, and Russian. The survey collected information on:

- Race, ethnicity, languages spoken using REaL-D question format² and gender
- What capacity respondents live, work, and organize with communities of color
- Top concerns and how the county be a better place to live for communities of color

The survey was disseminated online by conducting outreach with organizations and individuals identified in the environmental scan database. In addition, members of the Clackamas County Office of Equity and Inclusion shared the survey link within their own networks. Through a snowball sampling approach, we reached 121 respondents (116 in English; 5 in Spanish; none in Russian). The survey also helped us identify nearly a third of respondents who were interested in working with us during the next phases of the research.

Sampling limitations: The majority of survey respondents reported working in the nonprofit sector or in government, and as such their top concerns will look different than if the survey was completed by more community members and thus more representative of the broader community.

Questionnaires for Electeds and Interviews with Government Officials about DEI

Data was collected using a questionnaire sent to mayors, city managers, and other public officials that solicited written responses (see Appendix III for the complete questionnaire). We received responses from the cities of Estacada, Milwaukie, Canby, Gladstone, and Tualatin, as well as from the Clackamas County Department of Human Services. In addition to receiving written responses, the researchers from CCC and staff from the Office of Equity and Inclusion at Clackamas County conducted informal interviews, ranging from 30 minutes to one hour, with city managers. We were able to conduct three interviews with city managers representing the cities of Milwaukie, Tualatin, and Gladstone.

Listening Sessions and Town Halls

Data was collected by reviewing and coding notes taken by Clackamas County staff members at seven virtual internal employee listening sessions on race hosted by the County between June and August 2020. In addition, one recorded virtual town hall on race, which was hosted by the County on August 19, 2020 was coded and a second virtual town hall hosted by the County on September 30, 2020 was attended by researchers from the CCC.

Document Review

Data was collected by reviewing and analyzing material from online and social media content, county-wide internal organizational surveys, job descriptions, and DEI statements and resolutions from public agencies.

Administrative Datasets

Data was collected on demographic and other social indicators using American Community Survey data and COVID-19 Regional Data Dashboard.

² For more information about REaL-D, see the Oregon Health Authority's website: <https://www.oregon.gov/oha/OEI/Pages/REALD.aspx>, accessed November 11, 2020.

APPENDIX II: COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONS

The community survey reproduced below was translated into Spanish and Russian. We translated the survey into these two languages based on feedback we received from members of the Leaders in Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Council (LEDIC).

Survey Questions

Thank you for taking the time to share information with the Coalition of Communities of Color (CCC) to help us complete a “Leading with Race” Clackamas County report. We are thrilled that you are interested in joining Clackamas County and the CCC to better understand the needs, challenges, strategies, and resilience of communities of color living in the county. The success of this project is dependent upon a tremendous community-driven effort. Your responses are essential in developing our research project and centering the lives and experiences of communities of color.

Please provide whatever information you are comfortable sharing. All data collected by the CCC is confidential, and your identities will never be disclosed without your consent. Answering our demographic questions helps us better understand and serve the communities in our coalition.

Thank you for your support.

1. If you, or someone you know, would like to complete this survey in a language other than English, please select the language below. We will do our best to send you this survey in your preferred language. Please also enter your name and email address below, and then hit Submit at the end of the survey (skipping all other questions)

- Arabic
- Burmese
- Cambodian
- Chinese - Simplified Chinese
- Chinese -Traditional
- Farsi
- French
- German
- Hmong
- Japanese
- Korean
- Mien
- Oromo
- Romanian
- Russian
- Spanish
- Somali
- Thai
- Ukrainian
- Vietnamese

2. What is your first and last name?
3. What is your email address?
4. What is your home zip code?
5. Organizational Affiliation (if any)?
6. How do you describe the work you do?
7. Which areas do you have direct experience working with communities of color?
(check all that apply)

- Community member/organizing
- Non-profit
- Government -- City, County, State
- Community based organization
- Research/data
- Diversity Equity and Inclusion Work
- Business
- School District
- Other

8. Tell us about your lived, work, and organizing experience with communities of color in Clackamas County.

9. What are three things you believe are critical to accomplish to make Clackamas County a better place to live for communities of color?

10. Would you be interested in taking some sort of leadership role in the Clackamas County Leading with Race project (e.g., steering committee member; providing data support)?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe/not sure yet

11. How do you identify? (Check all that apply).

- Woman
- Man
- Transgender
- Non-Binary
- Two Spirit
- Intersex
- LGBTQ

12. What communities are you part of? (Check all that apply).

- American Indian
- Alaska Native
- Canadian Inuit, Métis, of First Nation
- Indigenous Mexican, Central American, or South American

- Asian Indian
- Chinese
- Filipino/a
- Hmong
- Japanese
- Korean
- Laotian
- South Asian
- Vietnamese
- Other Asian
- African American
- African (Black)
- Caribbean (Black)
- Other Black
- Central American
- Mexican
- South American
- Other Hispanic or Latino/a/x
- Middle Eastern
- North African
- Eastern European
- Slavic
- Western European
- Other White
- Chamorro
- Guamanian
- Micronesian/Marshallese/Palauan
- Native Hawaiian
- Samoan
- Tongan
- Don't know
- Don't want to answer

13. Please list the languages you and/or staff members are comfortable speaking in with communities of color

14. Please share any links or information that may be helpful for CCC to engage communities of color and those advocating for them in Clackamas County

APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRES FOR CITIES

1. Who is leading the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion work in your city? (e.g., Formal DEI titled employees, other employees, community members, city leadership, etc.)
2. What is the driving force that began Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion work in your city? (e.g., police reform, ensure the provision of inclusive services, community pressure, strategic plan, any other details on why this is happening now)
3. What are the goals, outcomes, and strategies currently in place for your city to advance Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion work in your city?
4. What are the strengths (what's working/promising) and challenges (limitations/needed improvements) of achieving Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion efforts across your city?
5. Please provide a list of organizations and groups you have engaged with, are currently working with, or plan to engage around Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion work.

**EXHIBIT B
CONTRACTOR'S PROPOSAL**



Research Justice Study for Communities of Color: Clackamas County

Research Proposal | February 25, 2021

Summary

The Coalition of Communities of Color proposes a multi-year project in partnership with Clackamas County, local community-based organizations, and jurisdictional agencies to implement a community-based participatory action research¹ (CBPAR) project into the lived realities of communities of color in Clackamas County, Oregon. Building off of the knowledge developed during the Environmental Scan, we propose a three phase process for conducting a large scale CBPAR project. The three phase process includes:

- 1) Phase 1 (April 2021 - January 2022): Convene steering committee of 12-15 BIPOC community members, community leaders, and public sector representatives; co-construct research design and data collection strategies with steering committee members; identify individuals and organizations that can support and guide project implementation; collect and organize quantitative and qualitative data.
- 2) Phase 2 (February 2022 - September 2022): Convene culturally specific community sessions throughout the county; continue collecting and analyzing data; draft report and undergo culturally specific vetting process of research findings; finalize report and develop calls to action.
- 3) Phase 3 (October 2022 - April 2023): Finalize report design, branding, and translation; host workshops to train community members on how to present findings; engage in a community outreach tour to present findings.

The CCC believes that these efforts will lead to the following outcomes for Clackamas County and its communities of color:

- Build knowledge about and engagement strategies with communities of color
- Develop relationships with community leaders and organizations and build social capital
- Increase the regional capacity of the Coalition of Communities of Color to be a resource to Clackamas County
- Engender more civic, policy, and regional government participation by communities of color and community-based organizations in Clackamas County

The research proposal below outlines details of a multi-year community-based participatory research project.

¹ CBPAR details: <https://hc-v6-static.s3.amazonaws.com/media/resources/tmp/cbpar.pdf>

Background -- Coalition of Communities of Color

The mission of the Coalition of Communities of Color (CCC) is to address the socioeconomic disparities, institutional racism, and inequity of services experienced by our families, children, and communities. To achieve this mission, we organize our communities for collective action and social change in the pursuit of self-determination, wellness, justice, and prosperity. Formed in 2001, the CCC is an alliance of nineteen culturally specific community-based organizations with representation from eight broad and varying communities of color. These communities include African, African American, Asian and Asian American, Latinx, Middle Eastern and North African, Native American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, and Slavic.

The CCC supports a collective racial justice effort to improve outcomes for communities of color through policy analysis and advocacy, culturally appropriate data and research, environmental justice movement-building, and leadership development and training in communities of color.

The CCC has a successful track record of collectively advancing racial justice in Multnomah and Washington Counties. Our work across these counties includes building a collective understanding of racial inequities and shared vision for social justice; coordinating activities and strategies across member organizations; building community power by advancing our founding principles of cultural-specificity and cross-cultural collective action; working across sectors and jurisdictions to advocate for racial equity; practicing consensus-based decision making and open communications; and building intentional relationships across communities and organizations of color for over two decades.

This project takes advantage of the CCC's stature as one of the region's foremost providers of culturally specific data and research. The CCC spent years developing and implementing community-based participatory research about the lived realities of communities of color in Multnomah and Washington Counties. The successes of these efforts have helped to develop training modules on research and data justice which have been presented to over 50 entities within the last year. With this expertise and proven track record, the CCC is committed to growing its reach in Clackamas County and throughout the state of Oregon to help those jurisdictions be more responsive to their rapidly changing demographics.

Project Leads & Previous Work

This project will be led by Andres Lopez, Ph.D., Research Director, and Mira Mohsini, Ph.D., Senior Researcher, both of whom are based at the Research Justice Institute (RJI) at the CCC (resumes attached). Dr. Lopez is a trained sociologist and Dr. Mohsini is a trained anthropologist. Together they have over 20 years of experience doing community research utilizing collaborative, participatory, feminist, anti-racist, and queer methodologies. They bring their intersectional expertise to the table as powerful intermediaries between governments and

communities of color, and are building a vision for research and data justice that is impacting decision making from the local to state level.

In addition to these two project leads, the CCC is in the process of hiring a full-time Data Manager, who will also contribute key data analytics and data management skills, assuring the success of this project. A complex, multi-year project of this kind requires that the project leads commit significant time and resources throughout the project lifecycle. If awarded the grant, the RJI is committed to focusing on this project, and not taking on any other large scale CBPAR research projects during the proposed timeline for this work. With our singular focus on this CBPAR project, along with the new Data Manager role, the RJI will have minimal competing interests and more capacity to focus our efforts on Clackamas County.

Below are examples of RJI's work done in the Pacific Northwest and in collaboration with governmental entities.

Using a Research Justice and Data Justice framework to guide their work, the RJI has engaged in many culturally-specific, equity-focused, and community-informed research projects. Below is a summary of five projects that have been completed or are currently in progress. The experience and knowledge gained through these projects demonstrates that the RJI can produce culturally-specific research using appropriate methodologies and data collection tools. Further, the CCC's strong relationships with Black/African American, Latinx, Asian American Pacific Islanders, and Native stakeholders ensures that research methodology, data collection and analysis, and reporting will undergo appropriate cultural vetting.

(1) In partnership with Washington County, RJI embarked on a CBPAR called ["Leading with Race: Research Justice in Washington County."](#) This multi-year study, published in 2018, focused on the everyday experiences of BIPOC, immigrant, and refugee communities in the county in six areas: education justice, child welfare, criminal justice, economic justice, housing justice, and health justice. This project heavily informs RJI's approach proposed here with some updated strategies learned throughout and after this process was undertaken in Washington County.

(2) The RJI has partnered with Multnomah County Library on a culturally-specific project to transform the library to better support Black/African American families and their children. Over the past 15 months, the RJI has convened a steering committee of Black/African American community workers and researchers across the Portland metro area to co-construct culturally-specific programs, events, and evaluations. With COVID-19 and the turn towards a largely remote environment, the RJI has worked with the steering committee to organize creative online events, such as "Hip-hop and Wellness for Black Teens," as a way to connect with community members, share information about the library, and create engaging forums for data collection. Over the course of 2020, RJI collected over 350 surveys and engaged hundreds more

Black families with children across the metro area in this work. The RJI continues collecting data during Black History Month events. The final report will be completed this spring.

(3) With funding from the Oregon Health Authority's Office of Equity and Inclusion, RJI is conducting statewide behavioral health research. Over the last twelve months, the RJI has been working with a steering committee of statewide BIPOC folks and the Oregon Latino Health Coalition (OLHC) to co-construct a survey that can provide OHA with recommendations for how Coordinated Care Organizations can implement culturally and linguistically responsive services. The original scope of work was to engage communities across the state by conducting "train the trainer" sessions to provide community members with skills to conduct their own research. However, due to COVID-19, these types of community engagement efforts were not possible. Instead, the RJI convened steering committee members more frequently to co-construct the survey and assist with statewide survey distribution, which often required individual phone calls to community members. RJI's work with the steering committee and OLHC is also connected to OHA's statewide survey modernization efforts. The RJI has collaborated with a work group of Black/African American and Latinx researchers and community workers from across the state to provide recommendations on equitable research and data collection efforts, specifically in developing more equitable and culturally responsive health surveys.

(4) With funding from the Oregon Health Authority and in collaboration with the BIPOC Decolonizing Data Council, the RJI conducted a statewide project to gather BIPOC community data about experiences of COVID-19. RJI worked closely with twelve culturally specific organizations that are CCC members to co-construct a semi-structured survey to collect stories about how BIPOC communities are navigating the pandemic. The strategic over-representation of Native and Pacific Islander populations was carried out, since conventional sample size limitations often do not capture the depth of Native and Pacific Islander experiences. RJI was able to engage these communities in Oregon due to close collaboration with the Pacific Islander Coalition and several Native organizations and coalitions, including 7 Waters Indigenous Food Sovereignty Network, Native Wellness Institute, and Native American Community Advisory Council. Researchers at the RJI analyzed qualitative data using Atlas.ti and compiled findings in a report that elaborates on the elements of a "COVID story," how communities and dominant institutions have responded to the pandemic, and recommendations for actions that government agencies can take to ensure BIPOC community needs and strengths are being appropriately addressed.

These are just a few examples of RJI's community-centered and community-led participatory research efforts. The success and distinctiveness of RJI's work is due to years of community trust building, co-construction with the community throughout the research process, and the belief that BIPOC communities are experts in navigating and thriving in oppressive systems. It would be hard to compare any other organization in our region that has a stronger grasp on community data and how to utilize community data for systems change.

Project Decision-Making

A Steering Committee will guide the project's design and implementation. The Steering Committee will be composed of BIPOC community members from local jurisdictions, local community-based and BIPOC serving organizations, BIPOC community leaders, and CCC member organizations who organize community engagement in Clackamas County (e.g., Unite Oregon). The Steering Committee is responsible for developing the scope of the research, leading data collection efforts in their prospective communities of color, and collectively creating any recommendations as a result of the research. The Steering Committee structure ensures local partners are working together to inform the narrative of communities of color in Clackamas County.

Project Strategies & Activities

The environmental scan conducted last year identified key directives upon which to build: organizing BIPOC communities, engaging and strategizing with organizations/entities, collecting BIPOC data, and developing a call to action informed by six critical areas of concern (representation and leadership, education and training, BIPOC-informed policy, access and services, multilingual and multicultural communications and engagement, community support and connection). To address these needs, CCC proposes a three phase process to conduct and complete a CBPAR project on Clackamas County's BIPOC communities.

Phase 1: Build, Establish, and Plan -- CCC will begin by building relationships with key stakeholders such as community-based organizations, BIPOC serving organizations, BIPOC community groups and coalitions, BIPOC leaders, school districts, cities, and police departments across the county. By having numerous virtual relationship-building meetings with these stakeholders, we will be able to identify and establish a diverse steering committee that will be committed to our multi-year project. Once a committee is established, we will begin the planning process to co-construct the research strategy to inform how we will engage BIPOC communities and collect data. During this time CCC will also collect existing quantitative and qualitative data from communities, organizations, and governments to help frame BIPOC communities experiences in the county and to help guide the question development of the steering committee led data collection.

Phase 2: Research, Verify, Finalize, and Report -- CCC will co-construct the data collection tools, train on community data collection strategies, and support steering committee members in collaboration with community members to collect data. Once these data are collected, CCC will organize them and present them back to the steering committee and community members for a vetting process. This will ensure the steering committee has all of the community data needed to co-construct an action plan. This action plan will also be vetted by community members before a report draft is completed. Both the steering committee and key stakeholders will review the report draft before a final draft is ready for publishing.

Phase 3: Design, Train, and Disseminate -- CCC's marketing team will collaborate with Clackamas County to design and brand the final report. CCC will also ensure that the final report is translated into other languages. CCC will host a few "train the trainer" sessions to train community members and other stakeholders on how to use and share the report data and calls to action. CCC will work with the County to develop a dissemination plan and presentation tour. While this phase may seem fairly simple, the experience of conducting "Leading with Race" in Washington County, CCC learned that this phase of the project is expensive and extensive engagement efforts.

Timeline

Phase 1 (April 2021 — January 2022)

- Identify specific community-based organizations and leaders of communities of color in the County that can support and guide project implementation. Request their participation in the project and develop a scope of work.
- Identify and ask county and jurisdictional partners to provide financial and administrative support, particularly for data gathering and information reporting.
- Finalize the steering committee.
- Convene steering committee members to develop and finalize the research agenda, identify data sources and data collection instruments, and co-construct strategies for culturally appropriate data collection (e.g., focus groups, surveys, story circles, etc.).
- Collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data about communities of color in the county.
- Produce customized data sets for communities of color with the county and partnering cities.

Phase 2 (February 2022 — September 2022)

- Convene culturally specific community sessions across the county.
- Administer any other research tools in consultation with the steering committee (e.g., surveys).
- Draft report and share with steering committee members for feedback.
- Verify data and report findings with community leaders.
- Verify jurisdictional and administrative data with jurisdictional partners.
- Revise draft and produce final report.
- Develop a call to action and advocacy agenda.

Phase 3 (October 2022 — April 2023)

- Design, brand, and translate the research reports.

- Host train-the-trainer workshops to train community members to present and discuss the research findings.
- Present research findings.

Budget

Item	Activity	Cost
CCC Staff Time	Executive Director 0.05 FTE (\$5000), Lead Researchers 0.75 FTE (\$48,750 x 2), Data Manager 0.5 FTE (\$27,500)	\$130,000.00
Capacity Building	Partnerships with community partners participating in the research process (steering committee [\$3,000 x 10] & community review process [\$1,000 x 5 sessions])	\$35,000.00
Community Engagement	FTE for community-specific organizations to lead and organize focus groups (\$2,500 x 6), stipends for community participation (\$40 x 150), transportation costs, child care, and food (\$667 x 6).	\$40,000.00
Contract Services	Printing (\$30,000), Communications/translation (\$4,000), transcription (\$5,000), copy editing (\$1,000)	\$40,000.00
IT/Tech	Event IT (\$2,000) & data software packages (\$2,000)	\$4,000.00
Meeting Expenses	Meals, rental space costs, and event supplies (\$833 x 6)	\$5,000.00
Train the Trainer Workshop	To train community stakeholders (\$334 x 3) to present the report findings	\$1,000.00
Total Direct Cost		\$255,000.00
15% Admin Fee		\$45,000.00
Total		\$300,000.00



Research Justice in Clackamas County Updated Fee Schedule

Prepared by Coalition of Communities of Color
May 7, 2021

Overview

1. Up front amount for Phase 1: \$100K (April 2021)
2. Once steering committee is formed and starting Phase 2: \$130K (February 2022)
3. Upon submission of final deliverable at the end of Phase 3: \$70K (April 2023)

Pay Schedule Breakdown

Phase 1: April 2021 - January 2022

- Forming a steering committee and setting up MOUs with each SC member
- Convene SC meetings
- Setting up a database to organize primary and secondary data and create customized jurisdictional profiles to gain a macro understanding of communities of color

Hours: 334 (approx.) hours @ \$300/hr

Total: \$100,000

Phase 2: February 2022 - September 2022

- Data collection and analysis
- Continue convening with SC members
- Draft report and include feedback loops with community members

Hours: 433 (approx.) hours @ \$300/hr

Total: \$130,000

Phase 3: October 2022 - April 2023

- Design, brand, print, and disseminate research report
- Host train-the-trainer events on the findings of the research so that community members can report back to their communities
- Present research findings through the County and state

Hours: 233 hours (approx.) @ \$300/hour

Total: \$70,000

Project Outcomes

CCC's past work, "Leading with Race in Washington County" and "Multnomah County: An Unsettling Profile" Series, had such strong impact in our region that they are still commonly cited and downloaded. Based on these prior successes, the CCC is optimistic about the outcomes of a project to report on the lived realities of communities of color in Clackamas County. After evaluating our lessons learned from the research in Multnomah and Washington Counties, CCC propose the following outcomes below.

- *Build knowledge about and engagement strategies with communities of color in Clackamas County.* The project will bring Clackamas County's diverse communities into focus and help make visible less visible communities of color. The culturally specific findings will uplift community-specific assets, needs, and solutions. The research will help inform the properties of racial equity and lead to engagement strategies with communities of color that will help guide the County and municipalities in future work in policy decisions and programs.
- *Develop community and build social and cultural capital in Clackamas County.* The project will support communities of color in Clackamas County by heightening leadership roles for people of color in the County, building consensus and solidarity among communities of color, and broadening the overall community seeking to improve outcomes for communities of color in the County. Where possible, we will share existing CCC or CCC partner infrastructure tools and methodologies to assist community-based organizations in enhancing their operations. We will extend the current advocacy lens to prioritize, seeing the dial move on documented indicators. Finally, the project will bring additional resources into Clackamas County by providing the data and research needed for grant proposals and for funders to target their investments.
- *Increase the regional capacity of the Coalition of Communities of Color to be a resource to Clackamas County.* The project will strengthen the CCC's ability to support communities of color in Clackamas County, and significantly increase our relationships with organizations and leaders across the County. We will expand the reach of our Leadership Development Initiative to intentionally outreach to established and emerging leaders of color in the County.

The Coalition of Communities of Color looks forward to implementing this project on the lived realities of communities of color in Clackamas County.

We welcome any questions about our application.

References

Kathryn Harrington

Board Chair, Washington County Commission

155 N. First Avenue, Suite 300

Hillsboro, Oregon 97124

Contact: Elizabeth Mazzara Myers

Chief of Staff to Chair Harrington

Elizabeth_Mazzara-Myers@co.washington.or.us | 503.846.8862

Tyler TerMeer, PhD

CEO, Cascade Aids Project

520 NW Davis St., Suite 215

Portland, Oregon 97209

ttermeer@capnw.org | 503.278.3810

Sonja Ervin

Equity and Inclusion Manager, Multnomah County Library

919 NE 19 Ave.

Portland, Oregon 97232

sonjae@multco.us | 503.988.7807

Prepared by:

Andres Lopez, Ph.D.

Research Director, Coalition of Communities of Color

andres@coalitioncommunitiescolor.org

Mira Mohsini, Ph.D.

Senior Researcher, Coalition of Communities of Color

mira@coalitioncommunitiescolor.org

Andres Lopez, Ph.D.

Portland, OR 97219 | lopezpx@gmail.com | 503-970-3878 | www.lopezpx.com

ABOUT

Andres Lopez is a cultural sociologist and professional research and evaluation scientist. His scholarly work examines how individuals and groups in organizational and urban settings navigate everyday experiences of social inequalities. Utilizing pro-feminist, anti-racist, and queer lenses, he is particularly interested in how these experiences shape and are shaped by gender, race, and sexualities.

In addition to his academic expertise, Andres has over ten years of professional research and evaluation experience. He has worked with the United Way of Greater Kansas City, the Research Institute for Studies in Education, the Religious Leadership and Diversity Project, and on various National Science Foundation-funded projects. Further, many of his experiences have been collaborative, working with a broad range of stakeholders and constituents, including community members, university leaders, and government officials at the city, state, and national levels.

WORK EXPERIENCE

Director of Research | The Coalition of Communities of Color, Portland, OR | January 2020-present

Directing all efforts of the Research Justice Institute (RJI) at the CCC. The RJI centers research justice and data justice efforts in support of communities of color in the Portland Metro Area and the state of Oregon to advance racial justice through cross-cultural collective action. We provide expert consultation to public and private institutions on research and data justice, conduct various community-based participatory research projects, and build the research and evaluation capacity of CCC member organizations, and collaborate with BIPOC researchers and scientists to elevate community data, and create pathways for sustainable and ethical community engagement efforts with BIPOC communities.

Student Success Assessment Coordinator | Oregon State University Ecampus, Corvallis, OR | June 2018- June 2019

Assessment of student success and retention of current online students to the Ecampus Student Success unit. Implement, monitor, analyze, report, and communicate student performance metrics, data, and trends in persistence and progression of online learners. Inform, guide, and develop strategies used by the Student Success unit, assess operational efforts, and identify trends to ensure the effective implementation, maintenance, and progress of Ecampus student success initiatives.

Graduate Research Assistant | Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR | Sept. 2015-July 2018

Conducting various multi-method research and evaluation projects with data from BANNER, CORE, and Data Warehouse and originally collected data – from conception and management to writing final manuscript. Monitoring student participation and evaluating graduate professional development offerings. Participation on the Graduate Student Success Team – coordinating, developing, implementing, and assessing graduate programming. Managing the Graduate Student Success Center, ordering promotional materials, creating event flyers and programming brochures, and communicating with the public via social media platforms. Serving various unit and university wide committees at the Dean's request. Archival research on Latina/o populations in Oregon & history of Ethnic Studies at Oregon State University.

Research Assistant | Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE), Iowa State University, Ames, IA | May 2013-August 2015

Conduct qualitative/quantitative research assignments – survey construction, regression, and crosstab analysis. Evaluating and assessing ISU benefits survey, faculty interaction survey, and Strengthening the

Professoriate NSF grant writing trainings and partnerships. Training graduate students, professional researchers, and faculty members on Social Network Analysis. Methodological development of process evaluation for the Iowa Governor's Statewide STEM Initiative. In-depth interviewing, leading focus groups, and content analysis of educational research initiatives and projects

Researcher | The Religious Leadership and Diversity Project, Columbus, OH | January 2014-June 2018

Conducted 15 in-depth interviews with senior pastors from various churches, developed code book for analysis, and am currently writing various papers for a national qualitative study on multi-racial church leadership. Principal Investigator: Korie L. Edwards, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University. Funded by The Lilly Foundation. \$493,101. www.rldp.net

Researcher | Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE), Iowa State University, Ames, IA | Sept 2015- July 2017

Social Network Analysis, technical writing, and data visualization for Iowa Statewide Stem Initiative Principal Investigator: Jeffrey Weld, Iowa Mathematics and Science Education Partnership, University of Northern Iowa. Funded by The National Science Foundation, \$1,199,624. www.findstemiowa.org

Researcher | The Kansas City Indian Center, Kansas City, MO | Jan 2012-March 2012

Developed a comprehensive needs assessment for the Native American population residing in the Kansas City metro area. Organized focus groups to collect data on Urban Native needs. Managed a team of students who helped conduct the research. Presented the project and findings to the executive board. Conducted numerous interviews to create an oral history of the Kansas City Indian Center

Researcher | Man in the Mirror Organization, Casselberry, FL | Sept 2011 – April 2012

Created a 53-question survey to test the success and beliefs of pastors and leaders and members of Man in the Mirror's men's ministry organization. Negotiated and develop strategies of survey distribution with executives of Man in the Mirror. Executed 30 pages of analysis, detailing the membership and comprehension of Man in the Mirror members

Researcher | The Office of Congressman Emanuel Cleaver, Kansas City, MO | Oct 2011-Dec 2011

Created numerous GIS maps redrawing the Kansas City school district boundaries that offered better racial and ethnic representation of the population. Managed a team of students who helped create the maps.

Researcher | United Way of Greater Kansas City, Kansas City, MO | Aug 2010-2011

Conducted a large-scale needs assessment for area code 64130 that consisted of quantitative, qualitative, and spatial (GIS) analysis. Managed student researchers who assisted in the collection of data. Facilitated focus groups of social service professionals. Executed GIS mapping for partnered agencies. Prepared briefing papers (including data, narrative, and graphs) for homelessness, Kansas City's economic standing, and other needs upon request. Presented findings at numerous UWGKC board of trustees.

PUBLICATIONS

Carter, A & **A.L. Lopez**. 2019. "Rebranding the 'Good Farmer:' Formula Story Revision and Masculine Symbolic Boundaries in U.S. Agriculture." *Feminist Formations*, Winter, 31(3)25-50

Lopez, A. L. 2017. Review of *The Face Of The Firm: Corporate Hegemonic Masculinity At Work* by Michele Rene Gregory. *Gender & Society*, 31(6): 860-862.

Lopez, A.L. 2017. Review of *Getting Off: Pornography and the End of Masculinity* by Robert Jensen. *Feminist Formations*, 28(3): 266-268.

Lopez, A.L. 2015. Review of *God's Gangs: Barrio Ministry, Masculinity, and Gang Recovery* by Edward Orozco Flores. *Men and Masculinities*, 19(2): 215-216

Pascoe, C.J. and **A.L. Lopez**. 2015. "Gender and Social Justice: A Conversation with Dr. CJ Pascoe," *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*, 4(2): 1-8.

Muñoz, S.M. and **A.L. Lopez**. 2013. "Social Justice Education in Higher Education: A Conversation with Dr. Susana Muñoz," *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*: 2(1): 1-9.

Lopez, A.L. 2014. "Gay Men, Straight Women, and Queer Sexism." On *Girl W/Pen!*

<http://thesocietypages.org/girlwpen/2014/11/05/gay-men-straight-women-and-queer-sexism/>

Lopez, A.L. and Mari Kemis. 2015. "SNA and Statewide STEM Program Evaluation." On AEA365 <http://aea365.org/blog/sna-tig-week-andres-lazaro-lopez-and-mari-kemis-on-sna-and-statewide-stem-program-evaluation/>

PUBLICATIONS UNDER REVIEW

Lopez, A.L. "Mobilizing Men: The organizational (Re)centering of Men in U.S. Men's Ministries." (Under Review at *Gender Studies*)

Carter, A, Schweingruber, D, and **A.L. Lopez**. "Mass Background Participant Observation as a Class Assignment (Under Review at *Teaching Sociology*)

PUBLICATIONS IN PREPARATION

Lopez, A.L. "Queer Spiritual Practices and Religious Orientations: Towards a Mutual Constitution of Religion and Spirituality." (Submitting to *Journal for the American Academy of Religion*)

Lopez, A.L. "When Spirituality Fails at Work: Masculinities and the Reproduction of Inequalities at Work." (Submitting to *Gender & Society*)

Lopez, A.L. "Spiritual Practices and Everyday Response to Stigmatization: Reconciling Inequalities through Self and Group Identification and Rationalization." (Submitting to *Cultural Sociology*)

AREA OF ACADEMIC EXPERTISE

Intersectionality (Gender, Race, Sexuality); Men and Masculinities; Research Methodologies; Work, Occupations and Gendered Organizations; Feminist Theories and Methods Sociology of Religion & Spiritualities; Anthropology of Religion; Cultural Sociology; Cultural Anthropology; Applied Sociology; Applied Anthropology; Research and Data Justice

SKILLS

Curriculum Design; Online Course Design; Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity Training; Public Speaking; Participant Observation; Ethnographic Interviewing; Survey Design; Oral Histories; Focus Groups; Photo Elicitation; GIS Mapping; Video Ethnography; Social Network Analysis

TOOLS

SPSS, Qualtrics, Atlas.ti, MS Office Suite

LANGUAGES

English (native), Spanish, French

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Applied Anthropology | School of Language, Culture, and Society, Oregon State University | 2019 (Doctoral coursework completed in Department of Sociology, Iowa State University | Fall 2014)

Graduate Certificate | Education for Social Justice, Iowa State University | 2014

M.A. Sociology | University of Missouri-Kansas City | 2012

B.A. Sociology/Gender and Diversity Studies | Xavier University | 2005

MIRA J. MOHSINI, Ph.D.

Portland, OR 97218 | mjmohsini@gmail.com | 989-798-6379 | www.miramohisni.com

Over 10 years' experience conducting accessible, data-informed research; developing curricula and facilitating programs and trainings on equity and inclusion; building strong relationships with diverse stakeholders across multiple sectors. Strong data collection, analysis, and communications skills.

WORK EXPERIENCE

Senior Researcher | The Coalition of Communities of Color, Portland, OR | July 2020-present

Co-developing the Research Justice Institute's data justice approach, and continuing to engage in community-based participatory action projects using a research justice approach throughout the state of Oregon. Advising government agencies, health care systems, and other institutions on data equity strategies. Co-convening organizations that serve Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities, and collaborating with BIPOC researchers and scientists to elevate community data, and create pathways for sustainable and ethical community engagement efforts with BIPOC communities.

Training & Equity Facilitator | Living Yoga, Portland, OR | March 2020-Present

Developing diversity, equity, and inclusion goals focusing on racial and economic justice; conducting research and analyzing data related to the intersection of personal and systemic trauma with mental health, disparities in criminal justice, health disparities, and economic/housing insecurity; conducting outreach and actively building a diverse network for Living Yoga's trauma-informed training; developing new curriculum on topics of equity and inclusion & facilitating online body-based resiliency training.

Researcher | The Coalition of Communities of Color, Portland, OR | Sept 2019-July 2020

Leading project funded by Oregon Health Authority to (1) understand barriers faced by communities of color in Oregon in accessing behavioral health services and (2) recommend culturally- and linguistically-responsive best practices for Coordinated Care Organizations; facilitating Steering Committee meetings using a Research Justice framework; training community-based organizations in data collection and analysis; conducting participatory data interpretation and analysis; community and stakeholder engagement. Leading survey-based research and analysis on the social and behavioral health profile of incarcerated Native Americans in Oregon in partnership with Red Lodge Transition Services.

Program Evaluator | Grounded Solutions Network, Portland, OR | Oct 2019-present

Developing program assessment framework for a nation-wide affordable housing and anti-displacement initiative in three U.S. cities; conducting semi-structured interviews, developing survey instruments, focus groups, and facilitating cultural domain research for program participants in Winston-Salem, Indianapolis, and San Antonio.

Instructor | Wayfinding Academy, Portland, OR | January 2020-present

Designing and facilitating a Learning Lab for students and community members on immigration, borders, and questions of legality. Focus of Lab is to breakdown myths and misinformation about immigration. Using storytelling and project-based work to enable students to develop platforms (i.e. podcast, blog/vlog, games, organizational toolkits) to raise public awareness and dismantle stereotypes about immigration.

Visiting Assistant Professor | University of Akron, Akron, Ohio | Sept 2016-June 2019

- Designed, managed, and led four collaborative projects: (1) refugee experiences in the U.S.; (2) documenting urban poor farms and infirmaries; (3) politics of urban revival, housing, and community

- development; (4) Muslim minorities and informal labor in India.
- Designed, organized, and delivered workshops on diversity, equity, and inclusion for faculty, staff, and students; conducted high school community outreach.
 - Developed and taught online, hybrid, and face-to-face courses on race and racism, gender studies, globalization, Islamophobia, qualitative and quantitative research methods, religion, and cultural diversity; awarded Faculty Champion award for teaching two experiential learning courses focused on community-centered research.

**Lecturer | Eastern Michigan University, Kalamazoo College & Western Michigan University |
Sept 2013-Jun 2016**

Developed and taught courses on race and ethnicity in the U.S., theories of society and culture, globalization, and women's studies; organized public lecture series on gender- and sexuality-based violence; secured research and teaching grants.

Community Engagement Director | Bobby McKenzie for Congress, Detroit, MI | Aug 2013-Nov 2014

Developed strategic plan for engaging with diverse communities in SE Michigan for a congressional race; organized focus groups with ten segmented constituencies; managed communications plans, including writing copy for press releases and social media; managed extensive databases of donor contacts and financial contributions; raised over \$675K in small individual donations.

**Postdoctoral Research Fellow | Goldsmiths College, London & International Research Center, Berlin |
Aug 2011-Aug 2013**

Designed two interdisciplinary research projects to examine how participants in informal craft economies in India are adapting to compete in the global market; conducted three months of ethnographic research in Delhi, interviewing artisans and gathering household survey data; conducted archival research in London.

Research Associate | Winmark Inc., London, UK | Jul 2010-Sept 2011

Interviewed over 100 clients for a law firm to assess potential gaps in service; led and managed project for a broadband internet provider to evaluate the need for high-speed internet in rural regions of the United Kingdom; conducted extensive competitor intelligence research for blue ship tech company.

Researcher | Development Alternatives, Delhi, India | Jan 2006-Sept 2009

Organized and facilitated focus groups, surveys, and interviews with at-risk communities on Indo-Nepal border to evaluate extent of human trafficking; authored two final reports on mitigating trafficking, and secured USAID funding; managed research and evaluation team for a livelihood generation project in rural Central India.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

Bose, C. & **Mohsini, M.** (Forthcoming). *Ways of studying craft: Notes across disciplines*. New York: Routledge.

Behrman, C., **Mohsini, M.**, Olson, E. (Forthcoming). *Remembering those who were meant to be forgotten: An interdisciplinary exploration of Schneider Park*. Akron: University of Akron Press.

Mohsini, M. (2017). Reflections on the art of radical interruption. *Fogged Clarity*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2RjcZi6>.

Mohsini, M. (2016). Crafting Muslim artisans: Agency and exclusion in India's urban craft communities. In Clare Wilkinson-Weber and Alicia DiNicola (Eds.), *Critical Craft: Technology, Globalization, Capitalism*. London: Bloomsbury.

Mohsini, M. (May 18, 2016). Who made that police badge? The shadow lives of a hidden workforce. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <http://goo.gl/91BfsK>.

Mohsini, M. (2011). Crafts, artisans and the nation-state in India. In Isabelle Clark-Deces (Ed.), *Blackwell Companion to the Anthropology of India*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

McKenzie, R.L., & **Mohsini, M.** (2011) Rethinking research methods: Introduction to the special edition. *Anthropology Matters*, 12(1). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2tJhuJO>.

SELECTED PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS & TRAININGS

- “Racial Justice Teach-In” | Abbvie, Inc. | Online | July 2020
- “Body-Based Resiliency Training” | Living Yoga | Online | May 2020
- “From Ally to Accomplice” | Prosper Portland | Portland, OR | February 2020
- “Exploring Muslim Veiling through Women’s Work and Mobility in India” | Rethinking Gender Series | University of Akron | Nov 2018
- “A Teach-In on the Importance of Collaboration and Accountability in Social Justice Work” | University of Akron | Feb 2018
- “Hypervisible: Racialization and Sexualization of Muslim Bodies” | University of Akron | December 2017
- “Making Sense of Charlottesville: A Civil Dialogue about Race, Citizenship and Belonging” | University of Akron | Oct 2017
- “Let’s Save the World! The (White) Savior Industrial Complex” | University of Akron | February 2017
- “Reflections on the Surveillance and Policing of Communities of Color in Metro Detroit” | Oakland County Diversity Summit | March 2016
- “Racial Justice and Institutional Transformation” | Kalamazoo College | June 2015

SKILLS

Curriculum Design; Online Course Design; Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity Training; Public Speaking; Participant Observation; Ethnographic Interviewing; Survey Design; Oral Histories; Focus Groups; Photo Elicitation; Rapid Participatory Assessment; Mapping; Video Ethnography; Cultural Domain Research

TOOLS

SPSS, Qualtrics, Nvivo, MaxQDA, ExpressScribe, Anthropac, H5P, Brightspace (D2L) & Canvas, Adobe Photoshop, Adobe Spark, Google Productivity Suite, MS Office Suite

LANGUAGES

English (native), French, Urdu, Hindi

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Anthropology | School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London | 2010

MA Anthropology and Development | London School of Economics | 2003

BA (Hons) Anthropology | University of Western Ontario | 2002

PROPOSAL CERTIFICATION
RFP 2021-06 RESEARCH JUSTICE STUDY FOR COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

Submitted by: Coalition of Communities of Color, Oregon
(Must be entity's full legal name, and State of Formation)

The undersigned, through the formal submittal of this Proposal response, declares that he/she has examined all related documents and read the instruction and conditions, and hereby proposes to provide the services as specified in accordance with the RFP, for the price set forth in the Proposal documents.

Proposer, by signature below, hereby represents as follows:

- (a) That no County elected official, officer, agent or employee of the County is personally interested directly or indirectly in this contract or the compensation to be paid hereunder, and that no representation, statement or statements, oral or in writing, of the County, its elected officials, officers, agents, or employees had induced it to enter into this contract and the papers made a part hereof by its terms;
- (b) The Proposer, and each person signing on behalf of any Proposer certifies, in the case of a joint Proposal, each party thereto, certifies as to its own organization, under penalty of perjury, that to the best of their knowledge and belief:
 - 1. The prices in the Proposal have been arrived at independently, without collusion, consultation, communication, or agreement for the purpose of restraining competition as to any matter relating to such prices with any other Proposer or with any competitor;
 - 2. Unless otherwise required by law, the prices which have been quoted in the Proposal have not been knowingly disclosed by the Proposer prior to the Proposal deadline, either directly or indirectly, to any other Proposer or competitor;
 - 3. No attempt has been made nor will be made by the Proposer to induce any other person, partnership or corporation to submit or not to submit a Proposal for the purpose of restraining trade;
- (c) The Proposer fully understands and submits its Proposal with the specific knowledge that:
 - 1. The selected Proposal must be approved by the Board of Commissioners.
 - 2. This offer to provide services will remain in effect at the prices proposed for a period of not less than ninety (90) calendar days from the date that Proposals are due, and that this offer may not be withdrawn or modified during that time.
- (d) That this Proposal is made without connection with any person, firm or corporation making a bid for the same material, and is in all respects, fair and without collusion or fraud.
- (e) That the Proposer shall use recyclable products to the maximum extent economically feasible in the performance of the contract work set forth in this document.
- (f) That the Proposer accepts all terms and conditions contained in this RFP and that the RFP and the Proposal, and any modifications, will be made part of the contract documents. It is understood that all Proposals will become part of the public file on this matter. The County reserves the right to reject any or all Proposals.
- (g) That the Proposer holds current licenses that businesses or services professionals operating in this state must hold in order to undertake or perform the work specified in these contract documents.
- (h) That the Proposer is covered by liability insurance and other insurance in the amount(s) required by the solicitation and in addition that the Proposer qualifies as a carrier insured employer or a self-insured employer under ORS 656.407 or has elected coverage under ORS 656.128.
- (i) That the Proposer is legally qualified to contract with the County.
- (j) That the Proposer has not and will not discriminate in its employment practices with regard to race, creed, age, religious affiliation, sex, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, or any other protected class. Nor has Proposer or will Proposer discriminate against a subcontractor in the awarding of a subcontract because the subcontractor is a disadvantaged business enterprise, a minority-owned business, a woman-owned business, a business that a service-disabled veteran owns or an emerging small business that is certified under ORS 200.055.

(k) The Proposer agrees to accept as full payment for the services specified herein, the amount as shown in the Proposal.

Resident Bidder, as defined in ORS 279A.120

Non-Resident Proposer, Resident State _____

Oregon Business Registry Number 108489097

Contractor's Authorized Representative:

Signature: Marcus C. Mundy Date: 02/25/2021
Marcus C. Mundy (Feb 25, 2021 15:28 PST)

Name: Marcus Mundy Title: Executive Director

Firm: Coalition of Communities of Color

Address: 221 NW 2nd Avenue

City/State/Zip: Portland, OR 97209 Phone: (503) 819-0134

E-mail: marcus@coalitioncommunitiescolor.org

Contract Manager:

Name Andres Lopez Title: Research Director

Phone number: 503-970-3878

Email Address: andres@coalitioncommunitiescolor.org