



Community Action Network Dashboard Steering Committee 06/21/10 Meeting Notes

Attendees: Diane Miller (Envision Central Texas), Louise Lynch (Austin Travis County Integral Care), Darla Gay (Travis County District Attorney's Office), Beth Peck (Central Health), Ashton Cumberbatch (Seton Family of Hospitals), Susan Gehring (City of Austin Health and Human Services Department), Bill Gill (Capital Area Council of Governments), Roger Jeffries (Travis County Criminal Justice),

CAN Staff: Chantel Bottoms, Mary Dodd, Cristell Laurel, and Vanessa Sarria

Unable to Attend: John-Michael Cortez (Capital Metro), Frances Deviney (Center for Public Policy Priorities), Sherri Fleming (Travis County Health and Human Services and Veterans Service), Anjum Khurshid (Integrated Care Collaboration), Chris King (Ray Marshall Center University of Texas at Austin), Emily de Maria (United Way Capital Area), Amy Wong Mok (CAN Community Council), Ryan Robinson (City of Austin), Bob Rutishauser (Workforce Solutions-Capital Area), Jim Walker (Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project & UT Austin), Michael Wilson (St. David's Foundation)

Call to Order, Introductions, and Announcements: Ashton Cumberbatch, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

Review role of various CAN Councils and Committees to assist CAN in using the Community Dashboard to assess community conditions and to identify opportunities for collaborative action:

- **Presentation:** Mary Dodd stated that the Dashboard Steering Committee roles have included identifying and recommending indicators, helping to identify key community stakeholders to engage in Community Council forums, and offering advice to the CAN Board on managing the dashboard (tweaking indicators, setting targets or goals, and managing the details of the annual dashboard report). Mrs. Dodd presented a diagram showing the cyclical process for moving indicators in the right direction: 1) community indicators, 2) goals and targets, 3) assess and find inter-connections, 4) identify strategies for action, 5) take action, and 6) evaluate and share results. Dodd also reviewed the CAN structure. CAN's two primary bodies are the Board of Directors and the Community Council. The Board of Directors are appointed members, usually executives, from CAN partner organizations. The Community Council is a self-appointed body of volunteers. Another CAN Council, the Executive Committee, is made up of various leaders from the Board, Community Council, and other implementation teams such as the Dashboard Steering Committee. Dodd explained that CAN action typically takes three forms: 1) Individual partner action or action by a sub-group of partners, 2) a Board resolution in support of a policy or initiative, or 3) Board adoption of an initiative as a part of the CAN Work Plan, thereby committing substantial staff and other resources to its formulation and implementation. Dodd also presented a proposed timeline for CAN work in 2010 and 2011. The timeline proposes that 2010 be spent examining dashboard indicators and that 2011 be spent focusing on special populations and how they are impacted in relation to the indicators.
- **Discussion:** Louise Lynch questioned the rationale behind focusing on special populations in 2011. She suggested that such an approach encourages siloed thinking. Susan Gehring asked what CAN will get out of this approach other than what we already know: special populations are especially affected by the indicators. Darla Gay questioned whether recommendations being made about the indicators this year really suggest that we need to focus on special populations over the next year. Ashton Cumberbatch suggested that it might be better to examine each indicator for impacts on special populations rather than inviting representation from each potential special population to present at indicator forums. Roger Jeffries suggested that CAN could have forums on all of the indicators each year to help us measure progress and see how issues may be evolving over time. Mary Dodd noted that the Dashboard Steering Committee has the responsibility of improving the indicator reports. Darla Gay suggested that the indicator reports are helpful in identifying the intersections between the data.

- **CAN Community Council** provides a venue for indicator forums and considers whether to make recommendations for action to CAN Board.
- **CAN Annual Retreat** – Members of all CAN Councils and Committees will consider cross-jurisdictional issues and opportunities for collaborative action for the 2011 CAN Work Plan.
- **CAN Board** receives highlights of data, information and recommendations made by community stakeholders at indicator forums and also considers Community Council recommendations as well as input from Annual CAN Retreat and determines whether and which recommendations it would like to pursue as a part of the CAN Work Plan.

Overview of data, information, and recommendations shared at indicator forums in 2nd Quarter to be shared with CAN Board of Directors on July 9th:

- **Housing “cost burdened”:** Thirty-seven percent or 143,542 households in Travis County pay 30% or more of their income on housing. Seventeen percent or 64,704 households in Travis County pay 50% or more of their income on housing. The City of Austin Housing Market Study found that there is a need for an additional 37,600 units affordable to the 45,000 households in Austin that earn less than \$20,000 a year. A joint study by HousingWorks, the Austin Area Research Organization, the Urban Land Institute, and the Real Estate Council of Austin found that economic segregation creates housing pockets of poverty and negatively impacts schools, public safety, and employment. The [City of Austin Department of Neighborhood Housing and Community Development \(NHCD\)](#) is one stakeholder working to improve this indicator. Their 2009-2010 fiscal year plan included \$51 million for homeless and housing services. Most (\$32 million) went to Housing Developer Assistance and the majority of programs assisted households at or below 80% of the median family income. To read NHCD's Comprehensive Housing Market Study and learn about their recommendations to improve this indicator, visit <http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/housing/apr08chms.htm>. [HousingWorks](#), another stakeholder working to move the needle on this indicator, advocates for all kinds of housing in all parts of town. To read HousingWorks joint study and their recommendations to improve this indicator, visit http://www.housingworksaustin.org/docs/BRAA_Final_Report_0610.pdf.
- **Homelessness:** The proposed homeless dashboard indicator is currently under review. In 2008, more than 6,000 clients received HUD funded homeless services in Travis County. The [Ending Community Homelessness Coalition \(ECHO\)](#) found that there is a need for 1,889 additional permanent supportive housing units and more services for people who are homeless or at risk for being homeless. ECHO is one community stakeholder working to improve this indicator. ECHO recently released a Plan to End Community Homelessness. To read ECHO's plan and their recommendations for improving homeless indicators in our community, visit <http://www.caction.org/homeless/10YearPlan.htm>.
- **Vehicle miles traveled per capita:** In 2008, people drove approximately 25 vehicle miles per capita in Travis County. Lowering vehicle miles traveled per capita could indicate positive community changes such as mixed-use developments, greater use of alternative modes of transportation, or freight being shipped by rail instead of truck. However, lower vehicle miles traveled per capita could also indicate fewer people working and a slowing economy. [Capital Metro](#) is one organization working to move this indicator by providing options to private vehicle travel. The [Regional Transit Coordination Committee](#), an issue area group of CAN, works to improve this indicator by promoting full mobility and access to community services for all people. The [Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization \(CAMPO\)](#) is also working to improve this indicator through their new 2035 plan that will fund transportation centers in a way that supports high density “activity centers” connected by public transit. Read more about this indicator and recommendations to improve this indicator by visiting http://www.caction.org/councils/Community_Council/Presentations/May2010_RTCC.pdf.
- **Air quality:** The Austin Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) is in attainment of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) ozone standards for 2009, but the EPA is setting new standards for 2010 and our community is expected to be in non-attainment. Austin's ozone levels have been steadily decreasing just as EPA standards have required lower and lower levels. Ozone causes such problems as irritation to throat and lungs, diminished lung capacity, aggravation of asthma or other respiratory problems, increased health care costs and school absences, and damage to sensitive vegetation and trees. Ozone is caused by a chemical reaction between natural and man-made emissions. Common sources of ozone-causing gasses are: motor vehicles, industrial processes, electric power plants, construction equipment, lawn and garden equipment, and fueling facilities. During August to September, the high ozone months, up to 80% of the ozone in our area is from outside sources. A

nonattainment designation has significant, and long lasting implications for the region's transportation planning, economic development and quality of life. However, the increased cost of meeting EPA standards is expected to be off-set by reduced health care expenses. One stakeholder working to improve this indicator is the [Clean Air Coalition](#). This collaboration of local governments in our five county metropolitan statistical area works to develop plans to comply with the [Eight Hour Ozone Flex Plan](#). [Commute Solutions](#), a program of CAMPO, educates public and employers on benefits and options for alternative transportation. The [Austin Climate Protection Program](#) has the goal of making Austin #1 in leading the fight against climate change.

- **Discussion:** Darla Gay stated that the housing and homelessness indicators alone show that there are three diverse groups making recommendations rather than joining together collaboratively to make overarching recommendations. Louise Lynch stated that our community clearly needs a comprehensive housing plan, and that is not reflected in the recommendations. Roger Jeffries noted that collectively CAN partners have the ability to move the needle on indicators. They will consider collaborative action based on recommendations on an annual basis. Darla Gay suggested that there is the possibility of CAN action such as convening all of the housing planning bodies.

What are the key inter-connections between these indicators or previous indicators? Some of the key inter-connections noted were: mixed-use activity centers and energy conservation (which reduces power use, reduces emissions, improves livability, and reduces dependence on foreign oil). The committee suggested that in analysis of key inter-connections it is important to talk about their co-benefits (how improving one indicator benefits other indicators). Ashton Cumberbatch stated the Dashboard Steering Committee should also consider how these four indicators are related to the indicators that we've discussed previously. He suggested that at some point the group consider all of the indicators together to think about the broadest cross-cutting issues. Mary Dodd stated that this might be a good consideration for the CAN retreat. At the retreat we want to examine how interconnections bubble up to the surface.

Goals or Targets for Each Indicator – The CAN Board of Directors has requested goals or targets for each indicator so that we can better gauge how we are doing. How does the Committee suggest CAN go about identifying these goals/targets?: Diane Miller noted that the proposed timeline suggested that the Dashboard Steering Committee work on setting goals in the upcoming year. She stated that this would be a heavy workload and that the committee should begin talking about how we can do this. She expressed that the group would be hard pressed to create goals for all of the indicators in one year. Mary Dodd stated that our community does have some groups that have identified goals for some of the indicators. This may be a starting point for this conversation. Ashton Cumberbatch questioned whether the committee really needed planning sessions on setting goals. He wondered whether the committee could simply solicit experts to suggest goals and create some kind of average based on their findings. Louise Lynch stated that such a plan sounds great on the surface, but there are varying levels of expertise around the issues and varying levels of expertise on working with moving the needle on indicators. Diane Miller stated that each indicator is so complex that even if some change occurred, it would be too complicated to demonstrate how or why a change may have occurred. Ashton Cumberbatch stated that there is value in examining who already has goals for the dashboard indicators. It would be important to examine how they have gotten to their goals. For areas where there are not any goals, we could examine why stakeholders in these areas have not set goals.

Schedule for remaining Community Council indicator forums and CAN Retreat: Mary Dodd listed the upcoming community council forums on the indicators. She also announced that the CAN Retreat will take place on Wednesday, November 3rd from 8:30-11:30 at Goodwill, 1015 Norwood Park Blvd.

Adjournment: Ashton Cumberbatch, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m. The Dashboard Steering Committee stated that they would be willing to attend an additional meeting to discuss some of the interconnections between the indicators. A special meeting of the Dashboard Steering Committee was scheduled for Monday, July 12th from 10:00-11:30 at Seton, 1345 Philomena St., 3rd floor, conference room #301.