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Over a period of roughly two years, stakeholders in the western unincorporated area of Alameda County (also called “The Eden Area”) came together to identify, discuss, and debate the most important issues facing their communities and to develop a collective vision of livable communities and a prioritized set of actions. More than 800 people participated through community forums, town hall meetings, task force meetings, leadership committee meetings, survey completion, and a community charrette. This unique effort to improve quality of life, the Eden Area Livability Initiative (EALI), was initiated by Supervisor Nate Miley, with cooperation from Supervisor Alice Lai-Bitker. The Initiative has been supported by an environmental justice grant from the California Department of Transportation; funding from the office of Supervisor Miley; and in-kind contributions from the office of Supervisor Lai-Bitker, Alameda County departments, and other public agencies. Prevention Institute was selected through a competitive bidding process to work closely with Supervisor Miley’s office and community leaders to facilitate the community-driven EALI process.

At the outset, EALI faced substantial challenges including fatigue from participants in previous strategic planning efforts, uncoordinated services and decision making, a prevalent sentiment that the communities were moving in the wrong direction, and a group of unincorporated communities with distinct character and history that did not necessarily share a vision or sense of common destiny. What was needed was an innovative and thorough approach that successfully incorporated and maintained:

- Constant attention to community outreach and engagement of harder to reach groups
- A clear and thoughtful process
- Commitment to transparency, accountability, and credibility
- Leadership from government and the communities
- Flexibility and responsiveness
- A balance between vision and realism

After 18 months, participants have worked hard to build momentum for change and have achieved:

- A set of prioritized, implementable catalyst projects designed to improve community livability
- A shared vision and mutually agreed upon THRIVE Livability Factors
- Emerging leadership and cooperation among both community members and public agency staff

What we found was that people who live, work, learn, worship, and play in the western unincorporated area of Alameda County share a desire for livable communities that are safe; include distinctive character and look and feel inviting and attractive; offer educational opportunities for all; include ample spaces for commercial, civic, cultural, and recreational life; provide necessary health and other services; and have responsive, transparent, and inclusive government. The question, then, was how to move toward those communities? How to bolster civic pride and cooperation and lay the groundwork for long-term transformation?

This report captures and provides analysis of the EALI process and outcomes. It is in part intended to provide guidance for those who may want to replicate elements of the unique process in other communities. It is primarily, however, for those who participated as a record, reminder, and measure of accountability and for western unincorporated area residents who did not participate so that they understand what has been happening in their communities and are inspired to join the effort.
THE EDEN AREA LIVABILITY INITIATIVE

Alameda County launched the Eden Area Livability Initiative to improve the quality of life and health of the communities in the Eden Area of Alameda County. Led by Alameda County Supervisors Nate Miley and Alice Lai-Bitker, EALI came about to identify the existing needs of the Eden Area’s unincorporated communities, to build local capacity to address emerging issues, and to develop stronger partnerships with county government and other public agencies. EALI was initiated by Supervisor Miley in December 2004. In 2005, three town hall meetings were held and a citizens working group was formed. A Blue Ribbon Steering Committee was created in 2006-2007 to provide preliminary oversight, expand community involvement and ownership, and to guide the development of a planning and grant application review process. In 2006, funding was secured through a California Department of Transportation Environmental Justice Grant to support the engagement of low-income and minority community members in a planning process and identification of specific catalyst projects that address their interest in improved transportation, safety, and cooperative decision making. To support the project this funding was supplemented by funding from Alameda County. In 2007, through a competitive bidding process, Prevention Institute was engaged as a consultant on the project to work closely with Supervisor Miley’s office to develop and implement the planning process.

The following mission statement and objectives were developed to guide the EALI process in part based on the objectives from the CalTrans grant and with input from the Blue Ribbon Steering Committee.

Mission

To create, strengthen, and sustain a livable community in the western unincorporated areas of Alameda County

Objectives

- To increase community participation in decisions that affect the community
- To find a shared community vision
- To ensure coordination and implementation of this vision and plan between government and the community
- To strengthen relationships between government and the community

“Action without vision is a nightmare; vision without action is a daydream.”
—JAPANESE PROVERB

EALI TIMELINE

- 2007
  - Establish common principles
  - Identify community issues
- Fall 2007
  - Develop strategies
- Winter 2007-08
  - Prioritize activity
- Spring 08
  - Develop action plans
- Summer 2008 -
To ensure appropriate policy formation and implementation
To make the unincorporated communities of Alameda County a great place to live, work, go to school, visit, and play!

THE EDEN AREA

The western part of the unincorporated areas of Alameda County is known as the Eden Area. This area is comprised of self-identified communities that share borders and contain approximately 130,000 residents. They include:
- Ashland,
- Castro Valley,
- Cherryland,
- Fairview,
- San Lorenzo, and
- smaller neighborhoods including Fairmont Terrace, El Portal Ridge, Hillcrest Knoll, and Five Canyons, among others.

A History of the Eden Area

In the 18th century and before, what are now the western unincorporated areas of Alameda County were populated by Native American people from the Oh-lone and Coastanoan tribes. In the 19th century, the area went through a number of phases and transitions from Spanish missions, to gold rush expansion, to the arrival of the railroad, to the development of large agricultural ranches and recreational getaways for wealthy Bay Area residents. By the early decades of the 20th century, the area became known as the “Heart of the Garden of Eden” because of its temperate climate and fertile soil. Everything—produce, chickens, cattle, flowers—grew in abundance.
A LOOK AT DEMOGRAPHICS IN THE EDEN AREA

POPULATION
The total population of the Eden Area is 123,290, making it equivalent to the fourth-largest city in Alameda County.

The graph depicts the population by race in the Eden Area.

RACE
The graph depicts the population by race in the Eden Area.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
Educational attainment in Eden Area communities among those who are 25 years and over.

POVERTY
Poverty is determined based on federal poverty rate.

The first three decades of the 20th century saw significant growth in the western unincorporated area. No period could compare with the explosive development of the World War II housing boom. The vast shipyards in the cities of Oakland and Alameda were enlarged and operated around the clock in support of the war effort. Hundreds of thousands of workers were lured to the area by the high-paying jobs at the yards. Unfortunately, housing couldn’t keep pace with demand and resulted in a serious crisis. The large fields of San Lorenzo’s farms provided ample open-space for the development of much-needed housing tracts.

The assembly line style home construction was written about in many building industry publications because of its remarkable results: 1,500 San Lorenzo houses were built in 500 days. Colliers magazine noted that “for their wartime $6,000, villagers got a package of house, a shiny new and accessible shopping center, a fine restaurant, movie palace and a round of activities in a social center supplied by the builder.” After World War II, more and more newcomers flocked to the Eden Area as they searched for affordable housing, quick access to job markets, and communities conducive to raising young families.

By 1960, the population had swelled to 72,700. By the mid-1960s, the Eden Area’s landscape changed from apricot trees and canneries to subdivisions and shopping centers. Growth continued through the 1970s and 1980s. The Eden Area’s population has continued to grow until the present day, with rich diversity within communities and across the entire area as well as distinct character and history in communities. The Area continues to strive to incorporate recent immigrant families looking for economic and social opportunities alongside families who have generations of local history.

What it means to be unincorporated

To “incorporate” means to form a municipal corporation, such as a city or town, with its own government. Thus, an unincorporated community is usually not subject to or taxed by a city government. Such regions are generally administered by default as part of larger territorial divisions such as townships, boroughs, counties, states, provinces, cantons, or parishes.

As part of an unincorporated area, the Eden Area communities experience lower tax burdens and also depend on Alameda County government agencies, as well as special districts, for services. For instance, law enforcement is provided by the Alameda County Sheriff’s Office and schools may be administered by neighboring school districts.

This situation raises some important challenges and opportunities. First, county agencies have responsibility for issues in communities across the county, so their attention is not focused exclusively on the unincorporated communities. One way to increase that focus is for the unincorporated communities to speak with a unified voice about priorities, rather than as six separate, smaller entities. Second, intrinsically, the resource pool for services is smaller in the unincorporated areas than in neighboring incorporated cities, so there is a need to prioritize activity carefully, coordinate across agencies to increase efficiency, create trust and communication between the county and community leaders, and maximize community involvement. The Livability Initiative was created, in part, to transform these challenges into opportunities—to leverage the flexibility that exists in unincorporated areas, the expertise of public agency staff, and the engagement and passion of community members to substantially improve local conditions.
The Eden Area Livability Initiative developed and followed a carefully laid out process with stages and benchmarks along the way. Of course, as with any process involving a large number of participants over an extended period of time, adjustments had to be made, and facilitators had to remain responsive to concerns and requests. What follows is a succinct account of the EALI process.

DEVELOPMENT OF A FRAMEWORK FOR LIVABILITY: THRIVE LIVABILITY FACTORS

EALI began with the development of a set of Livability Principles that could be used as a guideline in developing an integrated approach for future planning, development, land use, and service delivery decisions within the western unincorporated area of the county. The first set of Livability Principles (see appendix) were based on the Ahwahnee Principles,1 developed by the Local Government Commission in 1991 to provide a blueprint for movement toward more livable, walkable, transit-oriented communities. A revised set of livability principles were developed integrating Prevention Institute’s THRIVE framework.2 THRIVE is a tool that was designed to help people understand and prioritize the factors within their own communities to help improve health, safety, and the quality of life. The 13 factors included in THRIVE were developed through extensive research and oversight by a national expert panel. In July 2007, Prevention Institute presented the THRIVE framework at a series of three town hall meetings at different locations throughout the Eden Area. This discussion was followed at one site by a presentation from Dr. Tony Iton, Director of the Alameda County Public Health Department, on the status of health in the county and an activity on visualizing a healthy community facilitated by the department.

The two framework were integrated, resulting in a comprehensive set of factors that determine community livability, and which provided the conceptual basis for the Livability Initiative. The combined THRIVE Livability Factors were presented for review to community members, including the EALI Joint Leadership Committee. After a few changes were made, they were adopted as the basis and underlying framework for all EALI activity.

1 The Ahwahnee Principles for More Livable Communities were prepared in 1991. They outline a more suitable way to develop and redevelop our communities. They provide specific recommendations for communities and regions and include an implementation strategy. The principles or portions of the principles have been adopted in the general plans of over 120 local governments in California

2 The THRIVE framework was developed through an iterative process conducted from July 2002 - March 2003 and supported by The California Endowment and The US Office of Minority Health. Based on extensive research, Prevention Institute identified a set of community factors. The content was reviewed and ratified by the THRIVE national expert panel and incorporated into an interactive tool with input from a subcommittee of the expert panel. For more information, please see: www.prevention institute.org/pdf/THRIVE_execusumm_web_020105.pdf
THRIE LIVABILITY FACTORS

PLACE

1. **What’s Sold & How It’s Promoted** is characterized by the availability and promotion of safe, healthy, affordable, culturally appropriate products and services (e.g. food, books and school supplies, sports equipment, arts and crafts supplies, and other recreational items) and the limited promotion and availability, or lack, of potentially harmful products and services (e.g. tobacco, firearms, alcohol, and other drugs).

2. **Look & Feel** means a well-maintained, appealing, clean, and culturally relevant visual and auditory environment.

3. **Safety** is characterized by elements that support and enhance a public safety presence through collaborative efforts that promote safe routes throughout the neighborhood, blight removal, adequate lighting, quality of life concerns, and overall community well being.

4. **Parks & Open Space** is characterized by safe, clean, accessible parks; parks that appeal to interests and activities of all age groups; green space; outdoor space that is accessible to the community; natural/open space that is preserved through the planning process.

5. **Getting Around** is characterized by availability of safe, reliable, accessible, and affordable methods for moving people around. This includes public transit, walking, and biking.

6. **Housing** is characterized by the availability of safe and affordable housing to enable citizens from a wide range of economic levels and age groups to live within its boundaries.

7. **Air, Water & Soil** is characterized by safe and non-toxic water, soil, indoor and outdoor air, and building materials. Community design should help conserve resources, minimize waste, and promote a healthy environment.

8. **Arts & Culture** is characterized by a variety of opportunities within the community for cultural and creative expression and participation through the arts.

9. **Preserve Resources/Natural Terrain** is characterized by the preservation of the historical character and resources, natural terrain, drainage, and vegetation of the community.

10. **Defined Communities** are characterized by signage, public art, agricultural greenbelts, wildlife corridors, community gardens and other such unique community elements.

11. **Public Places** have a design that encourages the attention and presence of people of all ages and interests.

EQUITABLE OPPORTUNITY

12. **Racial Justice** is policies and organizational practices in the community that foster equitable opportunities and services for all. It is evident in positive relations between people of different races and ethnic backgrounds.

13. **Jobs & Local Ownership** is characterized by local ownership of assets, including homes and businesses, access to investment opportunities, job availability, and the ability to make a living wage.

14. **Education** is characterized by high quality and available education and literacy development for all ages.

PEOPLE

15. **Social Networks & Trust** is characterized by strong social ties among all people in the community – regardless of their role. These relationships are ideally built upon mutual obligations, opportunities to exchange information, and the ability to enforce standards and administer sanctions.

16. **Participation and Willingness to Act for the Common Good** is characterized by local leadership, involvement in community or social organizations, participation in the political process, and a willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good of the community.

17. **Norms/Expected Behaviors & Attitudes** are characterized by community standards of behavior that suggest and define what the community sees as acceptable and unacceptable behavior.

CROSS CUTTING

18. **Planning Integrated Communities** has communities containing housing, shops, work places, schools, parks, libraries, cultural art venues, and civic facilities essential to the daily lives of residents.

19. **Community Focal Points** have a combination of commercial, civic, cultural, and recreational uses.

20. **Health Care Access and Treatment** is characterized by preventative services, access, treatment quality, disease management, in-patient services and alternative medicine, cultural competence, and emergency response.
PLANNING DOCUMENT REVIEW

The primary objectives of the Eden Area Livability Initiative for county staff and staff from other public agencies include: better use of county expertise and resources; linking agency/department efforts to health and livability; and assisting staff to better understand community needs, priorities, and vision. One step toward achieving those objectives was a review—with a focus on implications for livability and health—of existing planning documents that affect this region of Alameda County. The intention of this analysis was not to assess specific documents or agencies and departments but rather to look for patterns in the collective.

Over 55 county and special district plans and reports were reviewed based on their responsiveness to the THRIVE Livability Factors and their primary mandates, goals, and recommendations. Based on this analysis, three primary findings emerged:

1. All 20 THRIVE Livability Factors are represented somewhere in the planning documents. The emphasis was clearly on physical improvements, economic development, and enforcement.
2. Few, if any, of the objectives and goals outlined in the plans can be accomplished by a single department independently; collaboration and some formal structure and support are needed.
3. Health and livability are implicit throughout the plans but are rarely explicitly articulated as goals or described as measures of success.

COMMUNITY FORUMS

In October of 2007, two community forums were held. The first, entitled “Identify the Issues Most Important to You,” was held Saturday, October 6, 2007 at the San Leandro Library. The second, entitled “Moving Forward with Your Priorities,” was held Saturday, October 27, 2007 at the Eden United Church of Christ. Ground rules were established with the Joint Leadership Committee prior to the first community forum and maintained throughout EALI meetings:

- Meetings are open to anyone who lives, works, owns a business, learns, plays, or attends services in the western unincorporated areas, but only those who live, work, or own a business should cast votes.

- Participation is expected; all voices and perspectives are welcome.
- All participants will actively listen with understanding when others are speaking.
- All participants will treat each other with respect and agree to respectfully disagree when necessary.
- In order for everyone to have a chance to participate, comments should be kept short and to the point.

Over 150 people participated in each forum. The October 6th forum began with an exercise in which participants identified the three issues that they felt were the biggest challenges for their community. The issues were then grouped into one of the ten following categories:

1. Economics
2. Education
3. Environmental Quality
4. Health Care & Social Services
5. Housing
6. Physical Appearance
7. Recreation & Culture
8. Safety
9. Social & Interpersonal Relations
10. Transportation

Participants then divided into ten topic-specific groups. These smaller groups first placed the issues along a continuum:

- Short Range: three to six months
- Mid-Range: six months to two years
- Long-Range: two years or longer
This was an important step because it enabled the differentiation between issues that should be addressed through the EALI process (mid- and long-range) and those that required more immediate attention (short-range). Supervisor Miley’s office catalogued the short-range issues and set up a series of Tracking of Community Problems and Concerns meetings. These meetings were held with county staff outside of EALI, concluding in winter of 2008. At the community forum, the small groups participated in a facilitated brainstorming session about potential solutions to mid- and long-range issues.

Once the brainstorming session was complete, participants had the chance to take a “gallery walk” and observe and add to the solution continuums created by all groups. As a second method of getting input about priority issues, community members completed a survey of the THRIVE Livability Factors to measure the effectiveness of current community efforts and to prioritize generally the factors in the community environment that required the most immediate attention and resources. Additional surveys were circulated at church and PTA meetings to get the most inclusive community perspective possible.

At the October 27th forum, Prevention Institute presented the priorities that emerged from the THRIVE livability survey and proposed how those could be translated into six topic-specific task forces. This proposal prompted a discussion among community members and staff from county and other public agencies regarding the task force topics. Specifically, facilitators proposed that Safety not stand alone as a task force but rather be infused throughout all of the other topics, while community members felt that safety was such a high priority it had to be explicitly addressed. Based on the feedback, the list of task forces (described on pp. 15-16) was revised and ratified:

- Education across the Lifespan
- Accessible Governance
- Health Care Access
- Local Commercial, Residential & Community Places
- Neighborhood Atmosphere & Beautification
- Safety

Next, a large group discussion was held to explore the pros and cons of increasing clout by creating a stronger identity for the Eden Area as a whole versus emphasizing existing character of smaller, distinct communities (this conversation continued at a subsequent Joint Leadership Committee meeting where the group agreed that the objectives of regional cooperation and alignment and local identity and control could be balanced and accomplished simultaneously). Participants then divided into groups by task force topic and met for the first time to discuss the current status of the topic and to develop indicators of long-term success with regard to the topic.
TASK FORCES

Each of the task forces met twice after an introductory meeting at the October 27th forum. All task force meetings lasted for three hours and took place in the winter of 2007-2008. Participation in task forces was open, though participants were encouraged to attend both sessions. At the first session of each task force, the group began by envisioning what their community would look like in five to ten years if the given issue had been completely resolved. Based on the responses to the visioning exercise, small groups were formed and a set of indicators of success was developed that answer the questions: What do we want to achieve? How do we know if we’ve achieved it? Based on the indicators, the small groups generated sets of projects and strategies that could substantially create movement toward solutions.

At the second task force meeting, the groups reviewed the list of projects and strategies from the first meeting and made any necessary additions and changes. Then the group reviewed the projects and strategies using a set of criteria approved by the Joint Leadership Committee:

- Does the strategy or project respond to the 20 THRIVE Factors of Livability?
- Is the strategy or project feasible to accomplish in two to five years?
- Collectively strategies and projects should improve conditions in all Eden Area communities, even though individual strategies and projects might target one neighborhood.
- The needs of diverse populations should be met.
- Strategies chosen should have significant impact.

Any that did not meet the criteria were removed from the list. Individuals selected their top five from the list. Then small groups worked to come to agreement on a top five. Finally, the entire task force reviewed the small group selections and through a process of prioritizing, combining, and negotiating, arrived at a consensus list of five potential catalyst projects.

Based on participation patterns, a Spanish-language task force was held upon the completion of the original six task forces. The Spanish-language task force results echoed many of the projects from other task forces and also added a couple of new projects. The list of potential catalyst projects was reviewed by staff from Supervisor Miley’s office and Prevention Institute, edits and combinations were made, and a list of 24 projects was presented to the Joint Leadership Committee.

In a few cases, when similar or identical projects were conceptualized by multiple task forces, the projects were combined. The final list of 24 projects was reviewed and accepted by the Joint Leadership Committee:

1. Senior Health Services
2. Changing the Planning Commission Representation to Reflect Unincorporated Communities
3. Code Enforcement and Blight Management Program
4. Health Center
5. Local Immigrant Integration Project
PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY HEALTH

At each of the task force meetings, a short presentation and discussion was facilitated with the intention of getting the groups talking and thinking about successful efforts to improve health and livability. The conversations were structured around a few principles and examples.

PREVENTION IS PREFERABLE TO REMEDIATION

It’s cheaper, it reduces suffering, and increases livability

**EXAMPLE:** Lead removal
Lead is a toxic substance that was present throughout the environment 40 years ago (children born in 1970 had, on average, 10 fewer IQ points due to lead exposure than children born today). Now, new sources of lead exposure are few, and existing sources are gradually being eliminated.

**WHAT CHANGED:**
- Monitoring lead levels
- Awareness of risks
- Federal policy

THE ENVIRONMENT SHAPES BEHAVIOR

Making the healthy choice the easy choice

**EXAMPLE:** Breastfeeding
A century ago almost all children were breastfed, then due to social and commercial factors, the numbers declined sharply. Based on recognition of the widespread health benefits and employment of multiple strategies, breastfeeding is becoming more prevalent and supported.

**WHAT CHANGED:**
- Education campaigns
- Social norms
- Policies (hospital, workplace, etc.)

GOOD STRATEGIES SOLVE MULTIPLE PROBLEMS

**EXAMPLE:** Farmers’ markets
Farmers’ markets support good nutrition and local economies and create community meeting places and social interaction. In California, Kaiser Permanente has sponsored over 100 farmer’s markets at their facilities.

**WHAT CHANGED:**
- Institutional support
- Doctors’ involvement
- Awareness of nutrition
- Zoning ordinances

6. Public Health Element in General Plans
7. Improving Public Transportation Access to Health Care
8. Community Empowerment and Civic Involvement
9. Expansion and Improvement of the San Lorenzo Library
10. Greenscape Improvement Project
11. Teen Center in Ashland
12. Streetscape Improvement Project
13. Community Manager for the Unincorporated Area
14. Mobile Health Van
15. Neighborhood-Based Municipal Advisory Councils (MAC’s)
16. School and Neighborhood-Based Violence Prevention and Injury Reduction Project
17. Improve Government Accountability
written with input from community members, including a section of “pro” and “con” statements for specific projects. This charrette was designed with an open dialogue about the 24 projects at its center. Each project was provided a space for materials; a community member or public agency staff person was assigned to each project to provide information and answer questions; and participants were given time to wander through the building and courtyard to consider the different projects and confer with one another.

At a designated time, ballots (in Spanish and English) were distributed. Each individual was allowed one ballot and was given a hand stamp upon receiving their ballot. The rules for voting were printed on ballots as follows and were adhered to on the honor system:

1. Those who live, work, or own businesses in the western unincorporated area are eligible to vote.

COMMUNITY CHARRETTE

A charrette is, by definition, a collaborative and open community meeting designed to solve problems and advance change. The community charrette on April 5, 2008 was the culmination of a year of community forums, community outreach, and task force and committee meetings. Building on all previous efforts to date, the charrette provided a venue and consensus process to prioritize the projects and strategies and initiate cooperative action on the top priorities.

More than 300 community members from all of the Eden area neighborhoods, as well as staff from county and other public sector agencies, participated in this interactive day hosted by Supervisors Miley and Lai-Bitker and facilitated by Prevention Institute. The beginning of the day included a welcome and overview of EALI and the process for the day. A review of all 24 of the potential catalyst projects was presented in the Project & Strategy Guide: A Guide To Voting On April 5, 2008. This voter’s guide (see Appendix) was

LEADERSHIP & OVERSIGHT

Throughout the EALI process, leadership was evident from a number of different sources and institutions. The initiative and commitment from Supervisor Miley and his staff, and Supervisor Lai-Bitker created a climate of accountability and importance. Additionally, Supervisor Miley was able to enlist the support of county staff and staff from other public agencies and special districts from over 20 departments. These staff members provided significant insight into the realities of how to move projects forward and took leadership roles at the public meetings and charrette. Community-based and civic organizations played a vital role in supporting outreach and enlisting participants. The Cherryland Neighborhood Association and San Lorenzo Homeowners Association played particularly active roles. Outreach to the Latino population would not have been possible without enlisting the expertise and legwork of Congregations Organizing for Renewal (COR) and Community Prevention of Alcohol Related Problems (CommPre). Finally, community members were a constant source of leadership throughout the EALI process. The Joint Leadership Committee meetings were regularly attended by more than 40 community residents, and community leaders supported the process in numerous ways (including outreach, review of documents, and representing projects at the charrette).
2. Public agency staff cannot vote unless they live in the western unincorporated area.
3. To be eligible to vote, you must be at least 11 years old or in the sixth grade.
4. Every eligible voter is entitled to complete one ballot.
5. All voters must hand in their own ballot to a designated ballot collector.
   
   Ballots were collected in ballot boxes and moved to a secure voting room for tabulation. The Hayward City Clerk and representatives from the League of Women Voters consulted on and oversaw the voting and vote counting process. After half an hour, the vote counting was complete and the results were announced. A short discussion of the results ensued and next steps were identified.
As is evidenced by the multiple steps detailed in the previous section, EALI has encompassed a substantial and varied set of activities. Each stage has concluded with an outcome, and there are outcomes that have developed over multiple stages in the process.

**ESTABLISHED A COMMON VISION**

Throughout the EALI process one of the most important dynamics at work has been the movement among individuals, organizations, and communities toward a shared set of objectives and a common vision. Based on all of the dialogues, information gathering, and prioritization what emerges is that:

The people who live, work, learn, worship, and play in the western unincorporated area of Alameda County want livable communities that are safe; have distinctive character and look and feel inviting and attractive; offer educational opportunities for all; include ample well-designed spaces for commercial, civic, cultural, and recreational life; provide necessary health and other services; and have responsive, transparent, and inclusive government.

Effective strategies to implement this vision will need to be multifaceted and build upon the unique capacities of Eden Area communities, the commitment and concern of the residents, and the desire of government and community agencies to make a difference for the residents of the area.

**IDENTIFIED SHARED CONCERNS**

The priority concerns of Eden Area community members emerged at a number of venues in the EALI process. At the October 6th forum, themes emerged in the early morning activity and brainstorming:

- A lack of available services, programs, and recreational facilities—particularly for youth and seniors
- Dissatisfaction with streets (speeding, lack of lighting, not pedestrian- or bike-friendly)
- Concerns about the physical appearance of the neighborhoods (street trees, blight, graffiti, architectural standards)
- Desire for places where community residents can congregate and that draw people from outside the Eden Area
- Government institutions that aren’t adequately accessible or responsive
- Inconsistent zoning laws and approaches to housing
- Limited economic opportunities, particularly locally owned businesses and businesses that promote livability

Based on the results of the 220 THRIVE Livability Factor surveys collected at the October 6th forum and through outreach to the Latino community, Safety, Health Care Access, and Education were clearly the highest community priorities. It was also publicly noted that:
RESULTS OF COMMUNITY VOTE

A total of 220 surveys were collected. Figures here represent the total number of surveys on which the factor was selected as a “top 5 pick” (percentage of surveys on which the factor was selected).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THRIVE Livability Factors</th>
<th>Top 5 Picks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What's Sold &amp; How It's Promoted</td>
<td>65 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Look &amp; Feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Community Design;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Character]</td>
<td>48 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parks &amp; Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Squares, Greens &amp; Parks;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement and Design]</td>
<td>67 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Getting Around (Transit Networks;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Jobs within Walking Distance; Pedestrian and Bike-Friendly Design]</td>
<td>49 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Diversity]</td>
<td>73 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Air, Water &amp; Soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Healthy environments; Efficient Water Use; Energy Efficiency]</td>
<td>33 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>13 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Preserve Resources/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Terrain</td>
<td>25 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Defined Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Signage; Public Art; Green Spaces]</td>
<td>23 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Public Places for All Ages/Interests</td>
<td>75 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUITABLE OPPORTUNITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Racial Justice</td>
<td>72 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Jobs &amp; Local Ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Range of types for residents]</td>
<td>44 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Education</td>
<td>96 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEOPLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Social Networks &amp; Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Participation and Willingness to Act for the Common Good</td>
<td>29 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Norms/Expected Behaviors &amp; Attitudes</td>
<td>19 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROSS-CUTTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Planning Integrated Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Commerce; Parks; Schools; Civic Life; Housing]</td>
<td>55 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Community Focal Points for Commercial, Civic, Cultural, and Recreational Uses</td>
<td>23 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Health Care Access &amp; Treatment</td>
<td>107 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

■ Every factor received votes
■ None of the top vote-getters were in the People category
■ The results were very close in all communities, except:
  ❖ Health Care Access and Racial Justice were much higher in Ashland and Cherryland
  ❖ Look & Feel and Willingness to Act for the Common Good were much higher in Castro Valley

DETERMINED AREAS FOR FOCUS

A set of key themes emerged from prioritizing the Livability Factors, conducting community outreach, and gathering information and ideas from multiple community meetings. These themes captured both priority concerns and directions for the future, and became the focus of six topic-driven task forces that met in the winter of 2007-2008:

■ EDUCATION ACROSS THE LIFESPAN: Accessible and affordable educational opportunities for people of all ages including preschool, after-school, job training, physical activity, language, and art programs.

■ ACCESSIBLE GOVERNANCE: Opportunities for community members to meaningfully participate in public decision making and for increased communication and accountability among the community, public agencies, and elected and appointed officials.
■ **HEALTH CARE ACCESS**: Accessible and affordable comprehensive health care services—in particular for seniors and children and preventive services.

■ **LOCAL COMMERCIAL, RESIDENTIAL & COMMUNITY PLACES**: Locations within all Eden Area communities that support economic, physical, and social livability and health including safe housing, parks, plazas, and locally-owned businesses.

■ **NEIGHBORHOOD ATMOSPHERE & BEAUTIFICATION**: Neighborhoods and streets that look attractive and blight-free, feel welcoming, and promote community pride.

■ **SAFETY**: Public and private space that is safe for all community residents including children, youth, senior citizens, bicyclists, pedestrians, and motorists and institutions and business that support a safe community.

**DEVELOPED A PRIORITIZED LIST OF CATALYST PROJECTS**

Based on the 271 ballots submitted at the community charrette, five projects emerged as the highest priorities, and the projects that would receive immediate attention. These projects were described as “catalyst projects” because the expectation is that these projects will catalyze numerous positive outcomes and also additional projects.

☑ **Community Center in Cherryland (95 votes)**

This Center would be a safe and accessible space for community members of all ages and from all walks of life to congregate and participate in meaningful and fulfilling activities. This space would provide a venue for community members to build social connections, participate in enriching cultural activities, build life skills, and have fun. The community center could potentially be a home base for a family resource center, health services, youth programs, and a job training program.

“I am 12 years old and I could vote!”
—CHARRETTE PARTICIPANT

**RELATED LIVABILITY FACTORS:**
Arts & Culture, Education, Social Networks & Trust, Planning Integrated Communities

**ORIGIN(S) OF THE PROJECT IDEA:**
Education Across the Lifespan Task Force; Local Commercial, Residential, & Community Places Task Force; the Latino Community Forum

☑ **Changing the Planning Commission Representation to Reflect Unincorporated Communities (90 votes)**

Given that the Planning Commission makes decisions on issues affecting the western unincorporated areas exclusively, this strategy would call for the Planning Commission to better represent the unincorporated communities by requiring that a majority of its members reside in unincorporated Alameda County.

**RELATED LIVABILITY FACTORS:**
Housing, Defined Communities, Planning Integrated Communities

**ORIGIN(S) OF THE PROJECT IDEA:**
Governance Task Force

☑ **School- and Neighborhood-Based Violence Prevention and Injury Reduction Project (81 votes)**

School facilities and neighborhoods in the unincorporated areas should first and foremost provide safe envi-
environments for all. The School- and Neighborhood-Based Violence Prevention Project would focus on prevention and intervention strategies addressing the physical (buildings, yards, parking areas) and social (gangs, drugs, violence) aspects existing in our neighborhood and school environments that lead youth and adults to feel unsafe.

**RELATED LIVABILITY FACTORS:**
Safety, Look & Feel, Education, Planning, Integrated Communities

**ORIGIN(S) OF THE PROJECT IDEA:**
Safety Task Force; the Latino Community Forum

**✓ Improve Government Accountability (78 votes)**

Proponents of this strategy maintain that County government needs to be more transparent and responsive to the needs of unincorporated areas. Accountability and transparency will allow and encourage more participation in decision making by community residents.

**RELATED LIVABILITY FACTORS:**
Participation and Willingness to Act for the Common Good, Planning, Integrated Communities

**ORIGIN(S) OF THE PROJECT IDEA:**
Governance Task Force

**✓ Teen Center in Ashland (72 votes)**

This teen center would provide a safe and nurturing environment where teens can go to participate in activities and develop a variety of skills. This space uniquely designed by and for teens, will be welcoming to all teens from throughout the unincorporated areas and will provide programs and resources that are relevant to their specific interests and needs. Ashland has the fewest parks in the unincorporated area.

**RELATED LIVABILITY FACTORS:**
Arts & Culture, Jobs & Local Ownership, Planning, Integrated Communities, Public Places for All Ages/Interests, Social Networks & Trust

**ORIGIN(S) OF THE PROJECT IDEA:**
Local Commercial, Residential, & Community Places Task Force; Safety Task Force
Reflecting back on the successful achievements of EALI, there are a few distinct elements that were decisive. In some cases these were evident priorities at the outset, but even in those cases the extent to which they were vital and the steps that were necessary were largely unexpected.

MAKE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT A CONSTANT PRIORITY

As has been described earlier in this report, the western unincorporated area is comprised of diverse communities and diverse groups of people. In order for this process to move forward smoothly and have the credibility of truly reflecting the communities’ intentions and priorities, it was necessary to encourage and facilitate participation by a broad cross-section of the population. Community members are best equipped to identify problems and shape and implement solutions. The Joint Leadership Committee presented an opportunity for community members to play a leadership role in the Initiative and develop a sense of ownership of the process. Additionally, at the community forums and other venues, an emphasis was placed on creating opportunities for expression and dialogue. In one particularly memorable moment, questions were raised at a community forum about who should be allowed to participate in EALI: homeowners, business owners, residents, employees of area businesses, those who attend religious services in the area, etc. After an extended open dialogue, a near unanimous vote established that participation should not be limited to homeowners. Such exchanges served to engage and invest community members in the process.

Further, attention was paid to engaging groups that might have experienced barriers (including language and limited voice in public decision-making) to participation, in particular youth and Spanish-speaking residents of the Eden Area. The Alameda County Associated Community Action Program was instrumental in bringing youth from the Youth Leadership Council to EALI meetings. These groups certainly have a strong and enduring interest in the livability of the communities, and the process would have been incomplete had it not been designed in a way that facilitated their participation. Meetings were structured to ensure opportunities for all to participate (e.g., small group discussions), and the youth perspective was invaluable to establishing long-term priorities. As one participant remarked after one of the task force meetings: “I was concerned that having young people there would be a distraction, but they were great…and the adults behaved better, too.”

“I was concerned that having young people there would be a distraction, but they were great…and the adults behaved better, too.”

—TASK FORCE PARTICIPANT
The Spanish-speaking community was engaged through two community outreach workers, Coco Ramirez and Maria Haro, who made presentations to groups, talked to hundreds of individuals, translated materials, provided translations at meetings, and supported the Spanish language task force staffed by Congregations Organizing for Renewal.

**MAINTAIN TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND CREDIBILITY**

From the beginning of the project a commitment was made by the EALI leadership to conduct all activities and decision making in a manner that was absolutely transparent and that would obviate any concerns about bias. In order to accomplish this, great care was taken to make all materials available publicly (in many cases, through multiple outlets: web, hardcopies at meetings, etc.), to get community input on all decisions, and to settle disagreements through discussion and consensus-building, and then publicize those decisions broadly. In one specific example of efforts to maintain accountability, the League of Women Voters and the Hayward City Clerk, Angelina Reyes, were engaged to oversee the collection and counting of ballots at the April 5th charrette. The best evidence for success in this regard was the reaction upon release of the votes at the charrette. Project staff were prepared for an extended discussion and some frustration at specific projects not making it into the priority grouping. Instead there was broad support for the results and a desire to move on to implementation.

**DESIGN A STRUCTURED, SEQUENTIAL PROCESS**

EALI is intrinsically not a short-term process, and it would have been very easy to lose direction and/or momentum. In order to ensure against those outcomes two main steps were taken:

- A clear process was laid out and repeated at every community meeting. The process was broken up into stages with clear goals and sign posts at the beginning and end of the stages. As a result, it was possible to clearly articulate “we are here, we did X to get here, we are going to do Y now, which will lead to Z.”
- Issues were separated into short-, medium-, and long-term and the short-term issues were removed and dealt with by Supervisor Miley’s office through an alternate process (see p. 9). The result was an ability to concentrate on the “bigger picture” and clarity among all participants that short-term concerns and those that affected only individuals (the uncooperative neighbor, need for a tree to be replanted, a faded crosswalk, etc.) were not topics for discussion.

**BALANCE REALISM WITH VISION**

Two of the criteria that were used in identifying the catalyst projects in the task forces were:

- The strategies and projects should respond substantially to the 20 Livability Factors
The strategies and projects should be possible to accomplish in two to five years. Those two criteria embody the balancing act that was required throughout the EALI process. Outcomes needed to be feasible or both participants and leaders would become frustrated and disengaged. But the Initiative also needed to remain committed to its goal of creating meaningful area-wide change, rather than targeting minor problems. During the process, the balance was maintained through steps including checking decisions against criteria (such as those above), encouraging county staff and staff from other public agencies and special districts to provide input on feasibility, and repeatedly discussing time estimates.

ENSURE FLEXIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS

Despite best laid plans and a clear process, inevitably the unanticipated occurs, and unexpected challenges and requests arise. It was vital for staff from Supervisor Miley’s office and Prevention Institute to be flexible and responsive. That flexibility and responsiveness was evidenced in:

- Willingness to hold meetings in the evening and on weekends to accommodate the largest number of participants
- Identifying the under-representation of the Latino community and taking steps to increase participation (including conducting extensive outreach to get THRIVE surveys disseminated in Spanish)
- Adding a Safety task force based on a request from community forum participants
- Including a community-produced pro/con comment section to the charrette voter’s guide

This flexibility was employed within the context of the overarching goals and purpose of EALI, and changes were made that supported the Initiative.

ESTABLISH COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION

The Initiative would not have been successful without effective communication between Supervisor Miley’s staff and Prevention Institute consisting of regular meetings and conversations among lead staff and extensive discussion and problem solving within each organization. Having county and other public agency staff meet on a monthly basis as the Technical Advisory Committee not only supported and provided oversight for the EALI process but laid the groundwork for interagency collaboration moving forward. Similarly, the relationships and structures that were bolstered through the Joint Leadership Committee, and participation by community leaders in EALI in general, will serve to support the achievement of specific projects and the overarching goal of improved livability.
Supervisor Miley’s office has begun working with staff from county, other public agencies and community leaders on implementation plans for the priority catalyst projects. The plans and overall EALI process needs to remain flexible, outcome-driven, and periodically evaluated for progress towards more livable communities. As EALI moves beyond this visioning and prioritizing stage, a number of key next steps and considerations are evident.

**IDENTIFY ROLES AND ACTION PLANS FOR SPECIFIC SECTORS**

In order to move forward successfully, each of the catalyst projects will require support and contribution from public agencies, policy makers, community-based organizations, and community members. In order to progress systematically, plans are needed to clarify process, goals, and roles for each of the projects. With the physical infrastructure projects, the tasks and strategies will likely be more concrete and linear (find site, get input on design, arrange staffing and programming, maximize community ownership). With the other projects, additional work will need to be done upfront to clarify goals and specific components.

**DEVELOP STRATEGIES TO ASSESS PROGRESS & ACCOUNTABILITY**

In order to maintain the credibility that has been carefully built through the EALI process, steps must be put in place for assessment of progress. The THRIVE Livability Factors and list of catalyst projects both provide potential comparison points for reflection at intervals. For instance, an “annual report card” could be released detailing progress toward the five priority catalyst projects. More broadly, however, it is necessary to reflect back on the purpose of EALI—to improve livability in the western unincorporated communities—and a report card could also be developed to measure progress toward putting the Livability Factors in place in each community.

**COLLECT INFORMATION ON EXISTING RESOURCES**

One theme that emerged throughout EALI was a need to better understand the resources within the unincorporated communities. Moving forward, there are a number of potential strategies for collecting resource information and making it readily available:

- The 211 social service information line.
- Public Education and Government (PEG) cable programming to make accessible meetings from the county seat in Oakland.
- The county’s new web-based, e-government system for informing residents of services and activities.
- An online guide to Eden Area resources and amenities (could incorporate the capacity for Area residents to share reviews and experiences, similar to sites such as Yelp.com and Berkeley Parents Network).
Community maps: a technology to create specialized online maps is rapidly expanding and presents a rich opportunity to both capture resources within an area (such as www.walkscore.com which provides a walkability score by address) and to assess conditions (for example, maps are being used to help youth groups describe safety in their neighborhoods).

ENSURE SUSTAINABILITY

The temptation, now that catalyst projects have been identified, may be to put all focus and resources on moving those projects forward. But, EALI itself should be maintained and cultivated. The catalyst projects are likely only a first step in transforming and improving the western unincorporated communities. The level and quality of community engagement in the process was notable and is the foundation for a new way of operation and cooperation. There is an opportunity to create structures for community dialogue, decision making, and attention to livability (and the Livability Factors). Much of the “Wisdom from Experience” from the EALI process can be applied moving forward, and additional resources will likely need to be identified. Depending on a number of factors, it also may make sense to shift leadership for EALI from Supervisor Miley’s office to a community-based institution.
The physical and social environments where people live, work, play, learn, and worship shape their health and well-being. Improving community environments requires a comprehensive approach that creates bridges across sectors. It is necessary to engage community residents and public agencies in collective action to identify priorities and strategies to enhance livability. The Eden Area Livability Initiative demonstrates that even in challenging circumstances, such collaboration is not only possible, it can thrive.

The Eden Area Livability Initiative represents a transparent and structured, yet flexible, process of community engagement and decision making that included open community forums, a Joint Leadership Committee, a Technical Advisory Committee, six topic-driven task forces, and a community-wide charrette. The process began with identifying commonly held livability principles, key issues, indicators of success, and a vision for more livable communities and then moved to translate that information into specific projects and strategies. A set of priority catalyst projects emerged through community advocacy, and ultimately, voting. The countless hours that were spent moving toward this outcome reflect tenacious optimism and commitment.

The diverse cross-section of participation from Eden Area residents and the accountability demonstrated by county staff and staff from other public agencies and special districts throughout this process has laid the groundwork for ongoing trust and established the infrastructure for continued action in the Eden Area. EALI is really only the beginning, but it is a promising beginning, and with continued leadership, cooperation, and innovative thinking, the shared destiny of the Eden Area communities will be brighter and more livable.
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Angie Garling ............................................... Alameda County Child Care Planning Council
Kenneth Gemmell ......................................... Alameda County Sheriff’s Office
Sheldon Gilbert ............................................. Alameda County Fire Department
Marita Hawryluk .......................................... Alameda County Redevelopment Agency
Tona Henninger .......................................... Alameda County Community Development Agency
Cindy Horvath ............................................. Alameda County Community Development Agency
Seth Kaplan .................................................. Office of Supervisor Nate Miley, Alameda County
Aisha Knowles ............................................. Alameda County Fire Department
Cherry Lemmon ........................................... Alameda County Sheriff’s Office
Larry Lepore ............................................... Hayward Area Recreation and Park District
Louie Martinez ............................................. Alameda County Administrator’s Office
Liz McElligott ............................................. Alameda County Community Development Agency
Don Nunes .................................................... Alameda County Library
Pat O’Brien .................................................. East Bay Regional Park District
Rachel Osajima ............................................ Alameda County Art Commission
Ammar Saheli ............................................... San Lorenzo Unified School District
Lourdes Serrano ........................................... Alameda County Public Works Agency
Rita Shue ...................................................... Hayward Area Recreation and Park District
Charles Snipes ............................................. Fairview Fire Protection District
Hilary Sohcot-Bass ....................................... Associated Community Action Program (ACAP)
Michelle Starratt ........................................ Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department
Bob Swanson .............................................. Office of Supervisor Nate Miley, Alameda County
Roland Tuazon ............................................. California Highway Patrol
Dale Vigil ...................................................... Hayward Unified School District
Jason Warner ............................................... Oro Loma Sanitary District
Kimi Watkins-Tartt ....................................... Alameda County Public Health Department
Lucy Wicks .................................................. Office of Supervisor Nate Miley, Alameda County
Roland Williams .......................................... Castro Valley Sanitary District
Sarah Wilson ............................................... Office of Supervisor Alice Lai-Bitker, Alameda County
Shawn Wilson .............................................. Office of Supervisor Alice Lai-Bitker, Alameda County
Diane Woloshin .......................................... Alameda County Public Health Department
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Robert Campisi
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Trish Taylor
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Janal Watkins
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APPENDIX B

The following documents were integral in producing this report and provide additional background information and details about specific aspects of the Eden Area Livability Initiative. They are all accessible through the Alameda County website at: www.acgov.org/edenareavision/documents.htm.

UNDERSTANDING THE ROOT CAUSES OF POOR HEALTH This presentation was prepared by Dr. Anthony Iton, MD, JD, MPH, Director of the Alameda County Department of Public Health. It was presented to community members in July 2007 as part of a countywide process of envisioning healthier communities and provided a foundation for understanding the need and purpose of the Eden Area Livability Initiative.

COMMUNITY PROFILE This thorough overview of the Eden Area includes the mission, goals, and objectives of the Eden Area Livability Initiative; livability principles; THRIVE elements of livability; explanation of census data; geographic boundaries and maps; a comprehensive history of the area; demographics; and community data sets.

LIVABILITY PRINCIPLES These principles were developed to function as guidelines for creating, strengthening, and sustaining a livable community in the western unincorporated areas of Alameda County. They were initially based on the Ahwahnee Principles developed by the Local Government Commission in 1991 and adopted in the general plans of over 120 local governments in California. The Livability Principles were combined with Prevention Institute’s THRIVE factors to form the THRIVE Livability Factors that were central to the EALI process.

THRIVE LIVABILITY FACTORS & BALLOT This ballot was used to survey community members through outreach efforts and at the October 6, 2008 Community Forum. The data collected from these surveys was used to form the six topic-driven task forces most relevant to the Eden Area community at large.

A GUIDE TO VOTING ON APRIL 5, 2008 This voters’ guide provides descriptions of all of the projects and strategies community members could vote for at the April 5, 2008 charrette. The guide includes criteria about how projects and strategies were selected, pro and con statements from community members, as well as ground rules for voting.