

2002-2003 Environmental Justice Needs Assessment Project Report

Building Community Partnerships to address
Environmental Justice and Health Issues



Prepared by:

Michael Davis

Ticiang Diangson

Veronica Fincher

Christopher Hong

Sheryl Shapiro

Marcella Wilson



Environmental Justice Needs Assessment (EJNA)

Two Year Report [2002-2003]

Executive Summary

This report presents the methods and results of the Environmental Justice Needs Assessment project's community-based research and outreach on environmental health issues in immigrant and refugee communities in Seattle and King County. The project is funded by the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program in King County.

“Adaptive partnerships” have been a key part of the EJNA model. The principles, methods and values guiding this project plan for uncertainty. Rather than assume that policies that seem best initially will always remain so, EJNA adapts its framework to the communities and cultures with which we are developing lasting relationships. These relationships build communication and service delivery systems that mainstream culture takes for granted as something that always has been and always will be available. This approach has enabled mutual learning, resource sharing, and candid communication across culture, experience, and foci.

Some key Project Deliverables from the past year:

- Each community-based organization (CBO) and local government organization participated in 50+ hours of project development through planning meetings and trainings.
- CBOs conducted a total of 7 focus groups in the International District / Yesler Terrace (ID/YT) and White Center neighborhoods in Vietnamese, Tagalog, several Chinese dialects, Samoan, Somali, and Amharic.
- CBOs conducted a total of 380 in-home visits and surveys.
- Each CBO completed over 200 hours of community outreach and gathered results from 500 surveys at 3 area festivals.
- CBOs provided translations and interpretation of educational messages in 8 languages at meetings, trainings, and festivals covering the topics of Air & Water Quality, Household Hazardous Waste, Energy Conservation, and Environmental Justice.
- CBOs developed outreach materials in Vietnamese, Tagalog, Chinese, Samoan, Somali, Ethiopian, and Oromo.
- CBOs distributed over 400 green home kits.

Environmental Justice Needs Assessment

Two-Year Report [2002-2003]

Table of Contents

Background.....	3
Rationale.....	3
Quantitative vs. Qualitative Data Approaches.....	4
Planning and Implementation Process.....	5
Project Goals.....	5
Project Methods.....	6
Participants.....	7
How We Worked Together.....	7
Survey Analysis.....	8
Lessons Learned.....	10
Next Steps.....	11
In Summary.....	11

Appendices

- A. Example of Focus Group Summary
- B. Examples of Cross-cultural observations
- C. Example of End of-year Community Group Evaluation
- D. EJNA Meeting Notes/Feedback from 10/16/03 & 10/24/03
- E. Example of Sample Work-plan
- F. Survey Results
- G. Cross-Cultural Approach

Background

For the past two years the Environmental Justice Needs Assessment (EJNA) project has been conducting community-based research and outreach on environmental health issues in immigrant and refugee communities in Seattle and King County. Our purpose has been to develop a model for community-based research and provide input into local government policies regarding environmental health and environmental programs for these communities. Going against a “one-size-fits-all” approach, EJNA’s adaptive partnership model is developing more flexible programs that address cross-cultural communication issues while building reciprocal cultural competency and strong relationships with community-based organizations (CBOs) and community advocates. EJNA’s project findings are applicable to local government environmental agencies and their partners and should be incorporated into their outreach and educational efforts.

EJNA is funded by the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program in King County (LHWMP). Jointly operated countywide, LHWMP is a program of King County Solid Waste Division, King County Water and Land Resources Division, Public Health-Seattle & King County, Seattle Public Utilities, and the 37 suburban cities in King County. EJNA’s purpose is in line with the mission and goals of this regional partnership:

“To protect and enhance public health and environmental quality in King County by helping citizens... reduce the threat posed by the use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials... and reduce exposure of the most vulnerable population groups to hazardous chemicals.”

The difference between EJNA and other programs currently addressing household hazardous waste and environmental health issues has been the unique relationships we have cultivated with community-based organizations. By focusing on building dialogues and community trust, EJNA has built a support network of participants in local government, non-profit organizations, and immigrant and refugee communities.

Rationale

In 1999-2000, Seattle Public Utilities received a grant from the EPA to administer the “Environmental Justice--Pass It On” project. This project involved a community-oriented, “train-the-trainer” approach in which community members were provided with the training and resources to educate their neighbors. This approach aimed at benefiting from preexisting relationships and rapport within communities, which enables greater trust in community-based trainers.

While this initial project successfully met its immediate objectives, it did not include a component for long-term sustainability; it needed some way of building community ownership and partnership in collecting environmental health/environmental information and influencing how environmental information is delivered. Our hypothesis for the current project is that in order to achieve ratepayer equity, build environmentally healthy communities and increase conservation behaviors, we need a model with built-in sustainability.

Through community and local government partnerships, and through focus groups and in-home surveys, with its partners, Seattle Public Utilities has developed an adaptive model for community outreach based upon principles of cultural awareness, capacity building and ongoing community and local government relationships. Our model directly connects to the issue of Environmental Justice in our county, cities, and communities.

Environmental Justice is based on the principle that regardless of race or income-level, every person is entitled to environmentally safe living conditions. More pressingly, Environmental Justice seeks to redress the fact that people of color and/or low-income have their health disproportionately affected by pollution and other environmental conditions in their communities--i.e. they are more vulnerable. Since people of color comprise 27% of King County residents, the EJNA project addresses the issue of ratepayer equity by supplying programming and resource needs appropriate to under-served refugee and immigrant populations in the area.

According to the 2000 census, between 1990 and 2000 the number of foreign-born King County residents doubled, reaching 268,300 people and accounting for 15% of King County's total population. Among the number of King County residents surveyed, those who "Do not speak English well or at all" accounted for 3.9% of the population, twice the number recorded in 1990. This means that there is a large potential for growth in critical needs for existing resources and information in non-English languages, along with a requirement for more proficient and expansive investment into intercultural communication. Part of fulfilling these needs is to adapt and understand how different communities learn and communicate. By using adaptive partnership approaches, EJNA is developing more flexible programs that address cultural communication issues while building reciprocal cultural competency and relationships with CBOs and community advocates.

Feedback from community leaders has told us that "Government comes in, uses us, and disappears." We have assured EJNA participants that at a minimum, SPU and LHWMP are not going to disappear; in fact, we have a responsibility to ensure ratepayer equity and provide the community with accessible services. Through a joint project planning process between community members, CBOs, local government and nonprofit agency partners, EJNA developed its project approach, neighborhood selection criteria and values. These approaches continue to be discussed and adapted.

Quantitative versus Qualitative Data Approaches

Traditionally in business and government, efficiency and effectiveness are determined by how readily a single solution can be applied to a problem encountered by the broad population. Since it appears that the recent immigrant and refugee communities EJNA focuses on have been under-served by this approach, new paradigms for interacting with diverse communities are increasingly important. By placing our focus on partnering with community groups, we get a clearer perspective on cross-cultural differences and challenges.

These kinds of differences and challenges are complex. For example, the process of providing translation or interpretation of educational materials is rarely sufficient for effective communication and positive behavior change in environmental health issues. There are no objective value-free solutions readily available, so methods need to be developed that address cross-cultural communication to increase the effectiveness of our efforts. Such complex challenges demand complex approaches.

EJNA's methods have been influenced by a growing debate within and around academic research and activist communities about the relative values of quantitative versus qualitative data. Primarily this discussion is concerned with the actual or potential cultural bias in mainstream quantitative research instruments and the greater flexibility of qualitative research in terms of cultural interpretation.

In the interest of balancing these different approaches, the EJNA SPU team consulted with Dr. Joan La France, an evaluation consultant in community research and program evaluation specializing in non-mainstream populations. After

several consultations at different stages of the project we identified our assumptions, the implementation plan, and an evaluation process for our project. Through this process we were able to delineate the ways in which we would pursue both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis.

Quantitative Assumptions

- Focus groups and survey data co-designed, facilitated and collected by community participants will more accurately reflect community concerns than data designed and collected by “professionals.”
- Regardless of a lack of random sampling in our statistical data, the anecdotal validity and reliability of our results can be used to improve information and program delivery to the involved communities.

Qualitative Assumptions

- Partnering with community-based immigrant/refugee organizations increases the effectiveness of disseminating environmental & environmental health information in those communities.
- Reciprocal communication between partners increases the capacity of government agencies to improve their information and service delivery strategies, while also increasing the capacity of community-based organizations to utilize the information and services.

Planning and Implementation Process

Throughout the evolution of the project, SPU’s core EJNA planning team met with members of local government, community-based organizations, and community members to develop common values and goals for addressing environmental health issues through consensus. We knew that our project goals and methods would have to be flexible for different individual, community, and cultural focuses. Through our ongoing meetings and discussions we have been able to develop a strategy that reflects the interests of local government and of CBOs and neighborhood non-profit organizations participating in the project.

Project Goals

- To partner with CBOs, local government organizations and community participants to do a needs assessment identifying the top environmental health needs/concerns of immigrant and refugee communities, particularly as they relate to household hazardous waste issues.
- To build reciprocal relationships with CBOs serving immigrant and refugee communities for the ongoing exchange of information and services.
- To identify service delivery strategies that work in immigrant/refugee communities.
- To increase the capacity of participating CBOs, nonprofits, and local government partners (including LHWMP) to serve immigrant and refugee communities.

Every month, meetings or retreats were held for partners and community representatives to discuss the actual implementation process of our project model. In addition, the SPU EJNA core team met on at least a weekly basis to

discuss strategies to increase efficacy and discuss lessons learned in cultural communication. Critical to this process was the continuing discussion of how we could adapt and change our project methods based on feedback we received from CBOs and other partners. This adaptive model was important, as new cross-cultural communication difficulties would become apparent throughout the implementation process.

Project Methods Used

- Joint project planning process with CBOs, local government and nonprofit agency partners on project approach, neighborhood selection criteria and project values.
- Joint training with CBOs on safer cleaning products and proper disposal, water & energy conservation, solid waste, indoor air, and contaminated fish.
- Joint field trips with CBOs to sites related to environmental health/justice, including a trip to the Duwamish River to discuss Superfund clean-up and the efforts to post warnings in multiple languages to discourage fishing.
- Joint training with CBOs on how to conduct focus groups to identify what questions should be included in the survey.
- CBOs co-created surveys fielded at festivals and events and as part of in-home visits.
- Joint government and community volunteer outreach at neighborhood fairs and festivals to reach the larger community.
- CBOs delivered the information to their respective communities.

The planning and implementation process required a great deal of flexibility. To ensure the maximum level of participation and representation, meetings and planning opportunities were organized with the community participants in mind. Nearly all participants had full-time commitments in addition to their involvement with EJNA (often in community-based advocacy), so to have their full participation and therefore, their community-based expertise and access, we needed to create a consistent schedule that everyone could agree to. Evening meetings were held in the neighborhoods that we were working with. Each meeting was evaluated by the CBO and local government partners present so subsequent meetings could be better tailored for efficiency and cross-cultural communication issues. Being conscious of these issues, as well as encouraging partners to be involved at every stage of the project, allowed for stronger relationships and better cooperation between all parties. Additionally, individual members of SPU's EJNA core team acted as community "Tag People," serving as a primary contact for a specific cultural community and maintaining close communication with that community. By making themselves available to the community for the specific purpose of relationship-building and community-accessibility, the "Tag People" had especially close ties to individual community-based organizations and their EJNA participants.

Participants

The evolving partnership of community-based organizations and local government agencies as part of the EJNA project has been essential to its success and development. By pooling resources and interests, the outreach capabilities of all participants have been increased and new relationships have been forged to build healthier neighborhoods and communities. Through our work we have built a strong network of community and government partnerships. This has enabled us to include the following ethnic/language communities in our development of outreach materials and project planning: Vietnamese, Filipino, Chinese, Samoan, Somali, Ethiopian, and Oromo.

Government and Non-Profit Partners

- Local Hazardous Waste Management Program
- Seattle Public Utilities
- Seattle-King County Public Health
- UW Center for Ecogenetics and Environmental Health
- Seattle City Light
- King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
- Environmental Coalition of South Seattle
- American Lung Association of Washington – MHE

Community-Based Organization Partners

- International District Housing Alliance
- Horn of Africa
- Somali Community Services
- Asian Pacific Islander Women and Family Services/Filipino & Samoan Parent Groups
- Pasefica (Samoan Community Youth Outreach)

Our partnerships have allowed us to access and deliver services to diverse communities and increase our organizational understanding of those communities. There have been many reciprocal learning opportunities for our partners and us in the community festivals and outreach events planned together. By utilizing resources and specialized skills within different organizations' experiences, the EJNA project has been able to engage and build productive relationships with recent immigrant and refugee communities. Seattle Public Utilities has acted as the lead agency in organizing the EJNA project, planning meetings, developing program materials, recruiting project participants, and doing day-to-day "maintenance" of the EJNA network. However, without the input and experience of our partners in local government, non-profit and community-based organizations, there would be very little for us to report.

How We Worked Together

- The **UW Center for Ecogenetics and Environmental Health (CEEH)** provided training opportunities for youth involved in programs administered by partner CBOs. By providing youth with experience in water-quality testing and education on environmental health, the UW CEEH enhanced EJNA offerings to the community and gave scientific and technical insight into our research. They also participated in the monthly White Center partner meetings.
- In addition to regular participation in monthly White Center partner meetings, **Seattle City Light** provided training on energy conservation and high-efficiency light bulbs for inclusion in Green Home Kits.
- **King County Water and Land Resources Division** (an LHWMP member) provided training on household hazardous waste to all the community partner groups.
- The **Environmental Coalition of South Seattle (ECOSS)** participated in planning meetings, recruited East African partners, and participated in the monthly White Center partner meetings.
- The **American Lung Association of Washington (ALAW)** provided indoor air quality training to all the community partner groups through its Master Home Environmentalist Program. They are currently the only agency in the county providing environmental health-related In-Home Audits.
- The **International District Housing Alliance (IDHA)**, as a founding partner, has been fundamental to EJNA's development, planning and implementation. They provided early and invaluable feedback and dialogue on the cross-cultural aspects of the project design. Their staff has also directly helped address the various needs of different language and culture groups.
- **Pasefica** expanded outreach efforts by employing youth in the Samoan community to administer the surveys and participate in training.

These are only a few specific examples in which specific goals of individual groups were able to blend with collective values and goals, enabling the EJNA project to operate in conjunction with the interests of the community. Every group involved with EJNA has been a part of the project's planning, implementation, and evolving discussion of how resources and services can be best delivered to those in need.

Survey Analysis

One of the primary goals of the EJNA project in 2003 was to gather information about how recent immigrant and refugee communities perceive environmental health and environmental conditions in their neighborhoods, as well as the related information needs. The main vehicle for gathering this information was the EJNA in-home survey.

The in-home survey consisted of thirty core questions (negotiated by organizational and community partners) regarding air, water, household cleaners, pesticides, and conservation. Additional questions were based on neighborhood focus groups organized and administered by the CBOs. Concerns raised by community members in focus groups were turned into survey questions to further explore how the larger community felt about the issues raised. The survey underwent many revisions during the course of the year, responding to input from community members about: difficulty

translating environmental health concepts; eliminating redundancy/obscurity in word choice; and attempting to create a more efficient information-gathering tool.

In terms of quantitative usefulness, the most significant survey results are those from the Filipino and Samoan groups. The results gathered from these communities represent the greatest number of completed surveys and verifiable responses.

Samoan Community Survey Results & Possible Next Steps:

In the “general” part of the survey, Samoan respondents expressed concerns about their tap water-- 74% of the respondents use bottled or filtered water. A relatively high number (40%) read labels before buying cleaning products but 84% do not use non-toxic household cleaners. From the Samoan community survey results, the following table shows the ranking in terms of % identifying the issues considered to be significant problems.

Second hand smoke	83%
Gangs	61%
Litter	61%
Homeless encampments	61%
Adequate sidewalks	56%
Dirty tap water	50%

The high concern over second hand smoke indicates that our American Lung Association of Washington partners may want to make more connections and offer more education and assistance in the Samoan community. SPU can investigate the litter and tap water concerns on the Seattle side of the White Center boundary. In 2004, EJNA plans to work with the Samoan groups on how they want to respond to the other issues with high percentages of concerned respondents.

Filipino Community Survey Results & Possible Next Steps:

Through the survey, Filipino community group representatives identified a main area for concern and future outreach. In their general survey results, they found that 47% of respondents do not use non-toxic household cleaners. From the Filipino community survey results, the following table shows the ranking in terms of % identifying the issues considered to be significant problems.

Crime	84%
Water pipe connections	37%

SPU can investigate the community concerns with water pipe connections and possible actions residents can take to address these issues. In 2004, EJNA plans to work with the Filipino community group on locating resources and developing an appropriate community response to the issue of crime and public safety.

East African Community Focus Group Results & Possible Next Steps:

Through community-facilitated focus groups we have learned about the East African community's concerns regarding Household Hazardous Waste and Indoor Air quality. Specifically this pertains to a lack of proper ventilation in kitchens, house mold, asthma and children's health. The survey implementation experience with the East African community group was a learning process for the EJNA project team. We will be better prepared for our next survey approach with that community. Our survey approach did not account for literacy-ranges within the community and the greater time and resources required for on-site interpretation. We will explore more culturally appropriate strategies in 2004, as well as audio/visual supplements to our current educational literature.

As we have been unable to survey a larger sampling of the community, we can only take these concerns into consideration for further research. To effectively deliver information requires outreach workers who are multi-lingual and well-trained in these topics.

Lessons Learned

While the survey results have provided us a unique insight into the top concerns of individual cultural communities in White Center, the qualitative experience was just as crucial as the quantitative results. By allowing open feedback with the community, the EJNA SPU team has had many culturally educational experiences that are important to our continuing efforts to expand the project. Regular evaluations played a significant role in our learning. By soliciting feedback from community members and other local government agencies, we have been able to gauge how effective our model has been as well as how invested our project partners are in continuing work on environmental health and environmental issues. (See Appendix D)

Some key lessons learned:

- Community participants appreciate government participants being up-front about "government culture" and expectations (i.e. what "the City needs" in terms of project deliverables and cooperation).
- It is essential that our actions and agenda as representatives of local government are transparent in motive and purpose to the community. Direct and clear communication and establishing mutual goals and investment are essential for successful work in communities.
- Community participants enjoy having informal conversations with resource experts outside of the "training" format.
- Having a community "Tag Person" available for one-on-one communication is greatly appreciated and works well for community groups.
- Some communities need more time to establish strong relationships and trust with the government.
- There are many different kinds of community leaders (religious, political, etc.) and we must be careful about pre-existing community power conflicts.
- It is important not to generalize about "recent immigrant and refugee" communities, and we need to be as inclusive as possible and get input from a diverse group of "community experts." We have been told many

times by representatives of the East African community that there needs to be specific representation of the Eritrean community in addition to the Somali, Oromo, and Amharic outreach currently underway. “East African” may be a convenient grouping for mainstream program delivery, but it does not correspond to the complexity of the various communities.

- The in-home survey is too long and repetitive for Interpreters to administer, especially with the other social/cultural requirements that entering a community member’s home entails.
- More translated materials are needed for outreach with recent immigrants (especially first-generation immigrants).
- There needs to be a broad array of materials in different media forms available as different cultures have different communication styles and needs (e.g. literacy issues among refugee populations require more than the translation of a brochure).
- This kind of partnership work, which goes against the grain of the mainstream program delivery model, is extremely labor intensive. It takes a significant amount of time and energy to communicate across cultures about complex environmental issues.

Next Steps

Current budgetary and staff constraints at SPU are spurring us to be more careful about what we commit to so that we can continue to keep our word to the community.

The conservative list of next steps includes:

- Delivering a 2-year report to LHWMP and other interested parties.
- Making a connection with the Minority Executive Directors Coalition to find out if they would like to be involved in future EJNA activities.
- Inviting other partners to get even more involved in making community connections and designing/delivering joint strategies for HHW and other identified environmental health/environmental concerns.
- Negotiating a pared down 2004 project.
- Incorporating a trip to a Haz-Waste Disposal site as part of the training.

In Summary

“RELATIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP!”

That has been the EJNA mantra, signifying our commitment to sustainable partnerships and better understanding intercultural communication. In creating partnerships between immigrant/refugee communities, CBOs, and local government agencies, cross-cultural exploration is key to the development and maintenance of cross-culturally competent relationships. These relationships build the kind of communication and service delivery system that the mainstream culture takes for granted since mainstream access always has been and always will be available. In EJNA, we have learned and continue to learn how to create effective communication, service delivery and action relationships through cross-cultural training and growing connections with community-based organizations.

APPENDIX A

May 16, 2003 East African Community Focus Group Notes

What was the environment in your home country?

- Don't worry about waste material
- Very clean air (Oromo)
- Pesticides were used sometimes
- There was more drought and sickness because of it.
- Around the City there is a program to collect garbage and you can be penalized if you do not participate.
- In rural areas people do not dump around well.
- In the city the water is chlorinated.
- Water tastes better back home.
- Air pollution is a problem.

What are your concerns here?

- Clean air/water
- Seasonal change has effect (colds & asthma)
- Water does not taste good here.
- Mold in house
- Rats and Mice
- Bad environment (smoking, drinking)
- Electric and water bill high (need info on how to save)
- Security too strict (New Holly)
- No playground for children
- Fan in Kitchen does not work.
- Old cars pollute air
- Bleach give me a headache (need info on safe cleaning products)
- Buy bottled water because tap water color is red and milky (changes)
- Chemicals in food
- People drive fast (loud) on Rainier Ave
- In Holly Park garbage is not picked up on time
- Loud drivers at night.
- Noise in the evening (loud music, back home it is quite at night.)
- Life is better here than in Houston
- Air outside is dirty (polluted)
- Lots of big rats on Graham Street
- Garbage stinks in Rainier Vista needs to be picked up.
- A lot of water.
- Itching body from water and pollution. Did not have this problem back home.

Top Concerns

- Noise
- Household chemicals
- Water changes it color (milky, red) Is bottled water and/or filtered water better?
- Rats and Mice
- Water & Electric bill is high.
- No playground for kids.

APPENDIX B

Cultural Competency Notes July 2, 2003 Marcella Wilson

In our SPU meeting we were talking about the East African community. I believe that the African community needs face-to-face contact. They are very hands-on and visual learners. Face-to-face contact takes more time, so this must be factored into the project work plan.

I have also observed that they do not seem to be vested in environmental justice issues. They have some concern or awareness of the importance of the environmental health and justice issues, however, that is not their main focus.

EJNA CULTURAL COMPETENCY NOTES

DATE: 8-1-03

SPU CORE TEAM PERSON: Ticiang

HIGHLIGHTS OF THIS WEEK:

- Jubilee Days, 7/19-20 were INTENSE! Great participation from the Filipino and Samoan groups AND HOW MICHAEL ORGANIZES THE ECO HOME EXHIBIT IS A MIRACLE (especially in 90 degree heat!)
- Week of 7/28 was INTENSE!
 - Monday night, basic training with M_____ & K_____’s groups
 - Wednesday night, survey training with P_____!

ONE CULTURAL COMPETENCY THOUGHT:

- Since we agency folks are supposed to learn from the groups as well as teach.....time rigidity does not work and RELATIONSHIPS do!
- “Just in time” approaches are common in certain groups----all the advance planning and warning and workplans don’t/won’t change that!
- X and Y have had trouble paying bills, because they paid for EJNA events and the reimbursement checks didn’t come immediately. Next year we should consider cash advances and also more in-depth explanations of how long our invoice processing takes.

APPENDIX C

Feedback meeting with East African group, October 24, 2003

- There seemed to be confusion around whom A was working for, ECOSS or Horn of Africa.
- They received the different version of the survey.
- B was told that she could only work a certain amount of hours for the whole project. This led to some confusion.
- A still has not claimed her hours with ECOSS because there is still confusion around who she was working for.
- The East African community needed more time for the project.
- C stated that the budget was too small for the amount of time they spent on the project.
- Survey was too long
- The structure of the meetings worked for them 6pm-8pm
- Trainings were too short. There were too many instructors for the time frame.
- They enjoyed the SPU team.
- They liked the focus group but they needed more time to recruit folks.
- People were asking what are they going to do about the situation. They wanted to know the results for allowing them in their home to conduct the survey.
- Need to add a community member for the Eritrean community. They felt left out of the project.
- It would work better if they were able to do a site in South Seattle around Holly Park.

APPENDIX D

10/16/03 EJNA Partner Meeting Notes

General Comments/ Criticism from Community Partners

- For some, the project length, planning time, etc. was ideal-- a year-round project wouldn't have been as sustainable
- Need to reach further into the community and support each other (different communities) more
- How do we draw more people into the project? How do we connect and keep those we do draw in?
- One on one talks worked very well in the community
- Need to contact other CBO's about being educated and connect with more community leaders
- We need to get together to talk about our problems, so we can all unite
- When we move into a new community, we need to get as many people to the table as possible
- Schedule the money to arrive sooner, many stipends still haven't been paid
- Extend the timeline of the project so it goes year-round
 - Some communities need more time to establish strong relationships and trust
- Revisit the community with concrete facts and continue to follow-up
- Stick to the timeline we've planned
- The In-Home Survey is too long, and some of the questions are repetitive
- How is the government going to respond to the data from the surveys?
 - There is a need for follow-up/dialogue in the community
 - Need to formulate next steps together
- Homeowners need to be educated about their water pipes
 - What they are responsible for fixing
 - What the city is responsible for fixing
 - Helpful information on what they can do about old pipes
 - Specifically educate about galvanized iron pipes and homeowner liability
- Have fewer and shorter meetings
- Need more concrete examples of Environmental Justice
- Expand the education
 - The trainings go too fast
 - Trainings need to be more in-depth
- More brochures in different languages
- More information about Hazardous Waste disposal
 - Possibly increase the area served by Haz-Mat collections
- More on how to be helpful and respectful to other cultures
- It is important to have specific representation of the Eritrean community

10/24/03 EJNA Partner Meeting Notes

General Comments

- Improve how communication flows within specific communities (not just text/brochures because of literacy, etc)
- Building a *relationship* is critical, trust in familiarity
 - Understanding context: (Muslim/other religions), gender, time
- Cultural language clarity issues
- Could Public Health help?
- Really like just *talking* to resource experts
- Government Agencies keep coming back for updates and additional information
- More structured workshops "Train the Trainer"
- Getting SPU and other organizations to focus more on EJ populations
- Video development & Youth Involvement
- Some ready to expand to South Park and Tukwila

- It's tricky to "center" on just *one* area
- Flexible concept of "neighborhood"
- Organization building by reaching out to the larger community
- Really wanted more/longer training
 - Less information all at once
 - More time for training
 - *ONE* training on *each* topic (2 hours)
- Trainers learned from each other
 - Before community trainings, there should be a trainers' meeting for each other
 - *Everyone* gets something from the training
- More field trips & festivals
 - Mix of participants involved
- Tukwila has 2-3 fairs (health fair)
 - How to share staffing across government agencies
- Ready to decide on 2004 fairs
- It works!
- Collecting good information for planning
- Make more connections with organizations, staff from Public Health, etc.
- What partners will be involved next year?
- Can we plan it all out or start a community "groundswell"?
 - Don't want to leave relationships! A continuum for carrying the banner (i.e.: Sustainability)
 - Bring in more partners and keep holding current partners accountable
- ALAW Fundraising "Walk" 5/4/04
 - Capacity building
 - Share resources: Bert the Salmon, "Toxic-Free" signs, etc.
- First generation immigrant outreach
 - Latino outreach/presentations to Latino organization (and work with paid staff from these organizations)
 - Volunteer piece is tricky
 - First year people can help network communities
 - ID concerns, air/ water contamination
 - People on the outside *and* the insider addressing issues
 - Cohesive action network for political accountability
- Possible Neighborhood power project, integration of diversity, income, conservation of resource potential, small businesses
 - Central, Delridge, Southeast,
 - Georgetown, Beacon Hill, Ballard, Lake City, Greenwood
 - Northgate, N. Rainier, West Seattle, U-District, Wallingford, Roxbury, Burien
 - Letter of support for South Park/Tukwila
- New agencies
 - Clean Air Agency
 - ECOSS (South Park org.)
 - CCEJ
- TIME!
- Household Hazardous Waste schools: under served communities
 - Cleveland High School
 - Tukwila booking August '04?
- Other agencies and educational groups in concert -ICE
- ESL classes
- Children's Environmental Health -CHE
- How to make sure stakeholders (bosses) know value
- "Events" are creeping up all year
- NEED TRANSLATIONS
 - For the Red Cross Language book, call Annette Holland 206-726-3554

- Public Health has resources
- Youth ESL classes
- More Intentional
 - Next step
 - what we have
 - menu
 - do-able?
- More coordination between partners
 - Menu to take to community
- Have been there more
 - More follow-through
 - More participation from partners besides coming to meetings
 - More action assignments
- _____ menu of Training/ Resources
- Increase flexibility
- Partner team-building
 - Cross-cultural training
 - Build our own capacity
- Revisit cultural information we have
- Be upfront about government culture
 - What “the city needs,” etc.
 - Back and forth
 - Quarterly Meetings
- High context/ Low Context
 - More unique stuff
- Need more partnerships
 - ALAW & Public Health, CHE, CCEJ, IDHA & High Point

Next Steps

- Cross-cultural Planning Retreat- January/ February -Sheryl, Morgan, Ticiang, Marcella
- Small Partner Meeting in January/Extend Partner Invitation list -Chetana
- “Community Trainer” Get-together -Aileen, Gail
- Define your own role
- Community Summit on Environmental Health- Fall '04 -Marianne

Things to keep the Same

- People
- Forthcomingness
- Location
- Fridays
- Low-Emission Markers
- Fragrance Free

Things to Change

- ECOSS
- Food
- Maria’s facilitation

APPENDIX E

● **EJNA 2003 Timeline**

<p>February-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East AF: Recruit Women- Tigist I & Farhiya Recruit Youth- Tigist II & Tsegaje • Filipino: Define Flyer/2 meetings • Samoan/API: Recruit Youth 	<p>March-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALL: Focus Group Training • EA: Focus Group • FP: Review flyer, Finalize, Print • SA: Focus Group Training with youth & adults 	<p>April-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALL: Continue→ Focus Group Training→ Begin Focus Groups • EA: Home Visits, 10-15 families • FP: Distribute fliers for Community Meeting • SA: Refine Survey Assessment/Audit Training (Water, Energy, Air, Solid Waste, etc.) <p>Events</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seattle Cherry Blossom & Japanese Cultural Festival, April 18-20
<p>May-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALL: Continue→ Focus Groups • EA: Home Visits, 10-15 families • FP: Community meeting, hire youth • SA: Begin survey <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Cinco de Mayo, May 5 • Seattle International Children's Festival, May 12-17 • NW Folklife Festival, May 23-26 • Pike Place Market Festival, May 27-28 • <i>International Market Days</i> 	<p>June-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALL: Continue→ Focus Groups→ Revise Survey based upon Focus Group Data→ Survey/Home Visit Training • EA: Home Visits, 10-15 families • FP: Finalize Survey with Community input • SA: Train 120 youth from June-August 6/3 Focus Group 6/22 Survey Training <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pagdiriwang, June 7-8 @ Seattle Center • <i>International Market Days</i> 	<p>July-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALL: Continue→ Survey/Home Visit Training→ Conduct Survey/Home Visits • EA: Follow-up Visits • FP: Continue Survey • SA: White Center Jubilee Days & Youth Training <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Seattle Street Festival, July 11-13 • International District Street Fair, July 12-13 • Hispanic Seafair @Seward Park Amphitheater July 14 • Indian Days Pow-wow, July 19-21 • Bon Odori Festival, July 20-21 • White Center Jubilee Days • Central Area Community Festival, July 25-27 • Pista sa Nayon, July 28 • <i>South East Seattle Soul Fest,</i> • <i>West Seattle Hi-Yu Summer Festival, (third week of July)</i> • <i>Int'l Market Days</i>

August	September	October
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALL: Continue→ Survey/Home Visit Training→ Conduct Survey/Home Visits • EA: Follow-up Visits African's Day August 17 • FP: Other projects raised by the community • SA: Large mission revival @ Salvation Army Follow-up Visits, & Youth Training <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Puget Sound Region New Americans Homebuyer's fair (API, Spanish, & African languages represented), August 16 • <i>UmojaFest African Heritage Festival</i> • <i>Hispanic Celebration,</i> • <i>Samoan Day,</i> • <i>Int'l Market Days</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All: Follow-up, & Evaluation <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Fiestas Patrias</i> • <i>Bumbershoot</i> • <i>Tilth Organic Harvest Fair</i> • <i>Festival of India</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All: Follow-up & Evaluation <p>Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arab Festival October 18 -19, 2003

Group: Water

		ETHNICITY												Total	
		Chinese		Ethiopian		Filipino		Samoan		Sommali		Vietnamese			
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent		
02 - Does your drinking water taste good?	Yes	5	71%	7	28%	18	37%	33	38%	30	48%	56	90%	149	51%
	No	2	29%	13	52%	19	39%	39	44%	20	32%	4	6%	97	33%
	Don't know			5	20%	12	24%	14	16%	11	18%	1	2%	43	15%
	No Answer							2	2%	1	2%	1	2%	4	1%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
03 - If water does not taste good, is it a problem?	Big problem			3	12%	8	16%	18	20%	16	26%			45	15%
	Small problem			4	16%	12	24%	11	13%	1	2%	3	5%	31	11%
	Not a problem	1	14%	2	8%	3	6%	2	2%	2	3%	1	2%	11	4%
	No Answer	6	86%	16	64%	26	53%	57	65%	43	69%	58	94%	206	70%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
04 - Does your water look clean?	Yes	5	71%	12	48%	34	69%	61	69%	37	60%	57	92%	206	70%
	No	1	14%	8	32%	11	22%	22	25%	20	32%	3	5%	65	22%
	Don't know	1	14%	4	16%	4	8%	5	6%	4	6%	1	2%	19	6%
	No Answer			1	4%					1	2%	1	2%	3	1%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
05 - If water does not look clean, is it a problem?	Big problem			4	16%	5	10%	12	14%	18	29%	1	2%	40	14%
	Small problem	1	14%	2	8%	8	16%	5	6%	2	3%	1	2%	19	6%
	Not a problem			3	12%	1	2%							4	1%
	No Answer	6	86%	16	64%	35	71%	71	81%	42	68%	60	97%	230	78%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
06 - Do you buy bottled or filtered water?	Yes	5	71%	16	64%	36	73%	65	74%	27	44%	34	55%	183	62%
	No	2	29%	7	28%	9	18%	19	22%	32	52%	26	42%	95	32%
	No Answer			2	8%	4	8%	4	5%	3	5%	2	3%	15	5%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%

Group: Air

		ETHNICITY												Total	
		Chinese		Ethiopian		Filipino		Samoan		Sommali		Vietnamese			
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent		
07 - Do you or anyone in your home have asthma?	Yes					4	8%	24	27%	9	15%	14	23%	51	17%
	No	6	86%	1	4%	43	88%	61	69%	39	63%	47	76%	197	67%
	Don't know	1	14%			1	2%			6	10%			8	3%
	No Answer			24	96%	1	2%	3	3%	8	13%	1	2%	37	13%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
08 - Does air inside your home cause you problems?	Yes			7	28%	3	6%	13	15%	10	16%	6	10%	39	13%
	No	7	100%	13	52%	44	90%	63	72%	45	73%	55	89%	227	77%
	Don't know			4	16%	1	2%	8	9%	6	10%			19	6%
	No Answer			1	4%	1	2%	4	5%	1	2%	1	2%	8	3%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
09 - Does air in your neighborhood cause you problems?	Yes	2	29%	8	32%	8	16%	17	19%	10	16%	14	23%	59	20%
	No	5	71%	9	36%	38	78%	63	72%	41	66%	46	74%	202	69%
	Sometimes									1	2%			1	0%
	Don't know			7	28%	2	4%	5	6%	6	10%	1	2%	21	7%
	No Answer			1	4%	1	2%	3	3%	4	6%	1	2%	10	3%
Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%	
10 - Do children live with or visit you at least weekly?	Yes	6	86%	19	76%	41	84%	66	75%	42	68%	39	63%	213	73%
	No	1	14%	5	20%	5	10%	15	17%	19	31%	21	34%	66	23%
	No Answer			1	4%	3	6%	7	8%	1	2%	2	3%	14	5%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
11 - Does air inside cause children problems?	Yes			4	16%	6	12%	5	6%	8	13%	2	3%	25	9%
	No	5	71%	9	36%	34	69%	57	65%	32	52%	38	61%	175	60%
	Don't know			5	20%	1	2%	11	13%	3	5%	1	2%	21	7%
	No Answer	2	29%	7	28%	8	16%	15	17%	19	31%	21	34%	72	25%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
12 - Does air outside cause children problems?	Yes			1	4%	7	14%	4	5%	8	13%	1	2%	21	7%
	No	3	43%	7	28%	31	63%	44	50%	22	35%	32	52%	139	47%
	Don't know	2	29%	8	32%	1	2%	13	15%	7	11%	7	11%	38	13%
	No Answer	2	29%	9	36%	10	20%	27	31%	25	40%	22	35%	95	32%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%

Group: Air

		ETHNICITY												Total	
		Chinese		Ethiopian		Filipino		Samoan		Sommali		Vietnamese			
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent		
13 - Do you have mold? Can you smell mold or mildew?	Yes	1	14%	9	36%	12	24%	26	30%	8	13%	12	19%	68	23%
	No	6	86%	9	36%	28	57%	45	51%	45	73%	48	77%	181	62%
	Don't know			2	8%	5	10%	8	9%	5	8%			20	7%
	No Answer			5	20%	4	8%	9	10%	4	6%	2	3%	24	8%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
14 - If you have mold, it is a problem?	Big problem			3	12%	5	10%	13	15%	3	5%	2	3%	26	9%
	Small problem	1	14%	2	8%	8	16%	7	8%	7	11%	7	11%	32	11%
	Not a problem			3	12%	1	2%	4	5%	2	3%	3	5%	13	4%
	No Answer	6	86%	17	68%	35	71%	64	73%	50	81%	50	81%	222	76%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%

Group: Chemicals

		ETHNICITY												Total	
		Chinese		Ethiopian		Filipino		Samoan		Sommali		Vietnamese			
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent		
16 - Do you read labels before purchasing cleaning products?	Yes	4	57%	6	24%	32	65%	35	40%	13	21%	25	40%	115	39%
	No	3	43%	7	28%	10	20%	37	42%	25	40%	32	52%	114	39%
	Sometimes			7	28%	5	10%	12	14%	20	32%	4	6%	48	16%
	No Answer			5	20%	2	4%	4	5%	4	6%	1	2%	16	5%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
18 - Do you have any reactions to indoor chemicals?	Yes	3	43%	5	20%	7	14%	14	16%	11	18%	9	15%	49	17%
	No	4	57%	8	32%	36	73%	64	73%	35	56%	49	79%	196	67%
	Don't know			5	20%	3	6%	8	9%	11	18%	1	2%	28	10%
	No Answer			7	28%	3	6%	2	2%	5	8%	3	5%	20	7%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
19 - Do you consider reactions to indoor chemicals problematic?	Big problem	1	14%	2	8%	3	6%	6	7%	5	8%			17	6%
	Small problem	2	29%	3	12%	5	10%	8	9%	6	10%	7	11%	31	11%
	Not a problem					1	2%	4	5%			2	3%	7	2%
	No Answer	4	57%	20	80%	40	82%	70	80%	51	82%	53	85%	238	81%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
20 - Do you use non-toxic household cleaners or other methods?	Yes	4	57%			18	37%	11	13%	5	8%	19	31%	57	19%
	No	1	14%	1	4%	23	47%	74	84%	49	79%	38	61%	186	63%
	Don't know											1	2%	1	0%
	No Answer	2	29%	24	96%	8	16%	3	3%	8	13%	4	6%	49	17%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
22 - How often do you or your landlord use outdoor chemicals?	Daily			2	8%	1	2%	5	6%	2	3%			10	3%
	Weekly					2	4%	6	7%	1	2%	1	2%	10	3%
	Monthly (or more)	5	71%	5	20%	21	43%	9	10%	11	18%	10	16%	61	21%
	Don't know			5	20%	7	14%	20	23%	16	26%	7	11%	55	19%
	No Answer	2	29%	13	52%	18	37%	48	55%	32	52%	44	71%	157	54%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
23 - Do you have any reactions to outdoor chemicals?	Yes	3	43%			5	10%	6	7%	6	10%	5	8%	25	9%
	No	4	57%	8	32%	35	71%	61	69%	38	61%	52	84%	198	68%
	Don't know			6	24%	2	4%	8	9%	11	18%			27	9%
	No Answer			11	44%	7	14%	13	15%	7	11%	5	8%	43	15%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%

Group: Chemicals

		ETHNICITY												Total	
		Chinese		Ethiopian		Filipino		Samoan		Somali		Vietnamese			
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent		
23 - Do you have any	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
24 - Do you consider reactions to outdoor chemicals problematic?	Big problem					1	2%	2	2%	5	8%			8	3%
	Small problem	2	29%			3	6%	2	2%			4	6%	11	4%
	Not a problem			1	4%	1	2%			4	6%			6	2%
	No Answer	5	71%	24	96%	44	90%	84	95%	53	85%	58	94%	268	91%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
25 - When does landlord notify about indoor chemical use?	1-5 days			2	8%			23	26%	10	16%	3	5%	38	13%
	6-14 days			2	8%			9	10%	12	19%	2	3%	25	9%
	Follows a schedule	2	29%	1	4%			5	6%	14	23%	1	2%	23	8%
	No notice given	3	43%	2	8%			4	5%	9	15%	46	74%	64	22%
	No Answer	2	29%	18	72%	49	100%	47	53%	17	27%	10	16%	143	49%
Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%	
26 - Are notices about indoor chemicals easy to understand?	Yes	2	29%	7	28%			5	6%	10	16%	4	6%	28	10%
	No	1	14%					2	2%	8	13%			11	4%
	Don't know			3	12%			6	7%	4	6%	2	3%	15	5%
	No Answer	4	57%	15	60%	49	100%	75	85%	40	65%	56	90%	239	82%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%
27 - When does landlord notify about outdoor chemical use?	1-5 days			1	4%			20	23%	7	11%	2	3%	30	10%
	6-14 days							9	10%	13	21%	1	2%	23	8%
	Follows a schedule	1	14%	2	8%			5	6%	13	21%	1	2%	22	8%
	No notice given	4	57%	3	12%			5	6%	13	21%	47	76%	72	25%
	No Answer	2	29%	19	76%	49	100%	49	56%	16	26%	11	18%	146	50%
Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%	
28 - Are notices about outdoor chemicals easy to understand?	Yes	2	29%	1	4%			5	6%	7	11%	3	5%	18	6%
	No	1	14%	2	8%			2	2%	1	2%	1	2%	7	2%
	Don't know			3	12%			5	6%	4	6%	2	3%	14	5%
	No Answer	4	57%	19	76%	49	100%	76	86%	50	81%	56	90%	254	87%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%

Group: More info

		ETHNICITY												Total	
		Chinese		Ethiopian		Filipino		Samoan		Sommali		Vietnamese			
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent
31 - Do you want more information about the topics discussed?	Yes	4	57%	2	8%	9	18%	10	11%	11	18%	11	18%	47	16%
	No	2	29%	4	16%	11	22%	30	34%	21	34%	43	69%	111	38%
	Sometimes					1	2%							1	0%
	Don't know			4	16%	4	8%	5	6%	9	15%			22	8%
	No Answer	1	14%	15	60%	24	49%	43	49%	21	34%	8	13%	112	38%
	Total	7	100%	25	100%	49	100%	88	100%	62	100%	62	100%	293	100%

Group: Filipino

		ETHNICITY		Total	
		Filipino		Count	percent
		Count	percent		
F32 - Do you consider crime in White Center to be problematic?	Big problem	41	84%	41	84%
	Small problem	4	8%	4	8%
	Not a problem	3	6%	3	6%
	No Answer	1	2%	1	2%
	Total	49	100%	49	100%
F33 - Enough after-school activities/services in White Center?	Yes	4	8%	4	8%
	No	21	43%	21	43%
	Don't know	23	47%	23	47%
	No Answer	1	2%	1	2%
	Total	49	100%	49	100%
F34 - Is the lack of after-school activities/services problematic?	Big problem	15	31%	15	31%
	Small problem	4	8%	4	8%
	Not a problem	6	12%	6	12%
	No Answer	24	49%	24	49%
	Total	49	100%	49	100%
F35 - Are water pipe connections in White Center problematic?	Big problem	18	37%	18	37%
	Small problem	9	18%	9	18%
	Not a problem	20	41%	20	41%
	No Answer	2	4%	2	4%
	Total	49	100%	49	100%

Group: Samoan

		ETHNICITY		Total	
		Samoan		Count	percent
		Count	percent		
Sa32 - Do you consider crime in White Center to be problematic?	Not a problem	1	1%	1	1%
	No Answer	87	99%	87	99%
	Total	88	100%	88	100%
Sa32a - Gang problem?	Big problem	54	61%	54	61%
	Small problem	21	24%	21	24%
	Not a problem	10	11%	10	11%
	No Answer	3	3%	3	3%
Total	88	100%	88	100%	
Sa33 - Enough after-school activities/services in White Center?	Yes	28	32%	28	32%
	No	37	42%	37	42%
	Don't know	21	24%	21	24%
	No Answer	2	2%	2	2%
Total	88	100%	88	100%	
Sa34 - Do you think there is a litter problem on the streets?	Big problem	54	61%	54	61%
	Small problem	26	30%	26	30%
	Not a problem	6	7%	6	7%
	No Answer	2	2%	2	2%
Total	88	100%	88	100%	
Sa35 - Homeless encampments and human waste a problem in WC?	Big problem	54	61%	54	61%
	Small problem	22	25%	22	25%
	Not a problem	10	11%	10	11%
	No Answer	2	2%	2	2%
Total	88	100%	88	100%	
Sa36 - Do you think that tap water in White Center is dirty?	Big problem	44	50%	44	50%
	Small problem	22	25%	22	25%
	Not a problem	18	20%	18	20%
	No Answer	4	5%	4	5%
Total	88	100%	88	100%	
Sa37 - Do residents in White Center have problems with inhalants?	Big problem	36	41%	36	41%
	Small problem	27	31%	27	31%
	Not a problem	18	20%	18	20%
	No Answer	7	8%	7	8%

Group: Samoan

		ETHNICITY		Total	
		Samoan		Count	percent
		Count	percent		
Sa37 - Do residents in White	Total	88	100%	88	100%
Sa38 - Do you consider second hand smoke problematic?	Big problem	73	83%	73	83%
	Small problem	7	8%	7	8%
	Not a problem	5	6%	5	6%
	No Answer	3	3%	3	3%
	Total	88	100%	88	100%
Sa39 - Are ther adequate sidewalks in White Center?	Big problem	49	56%	49	56%
	Small problem	19	22%	19	22%
	Not a problem	17	19%	17	19%
	No Answer	3	3%	3	3%
	Total	88	100%	88	100%

Group: Somali

		ETHNICITY		Total	
		Somali		Count	percent
		Count	percent		
So32 - Do you have difficulty getting rid of residual moisture?	Yes	12	19%	12	19%
	No	23	37%	23	37%
	Don't know	6	10%	6	10%
	No Answer	21	34%	21	34%
	Total	62	100%	62	100%
So33 - Is your difficulty getting rid of moisture problematic?	Big problem	8	13%	8	13%
	Small problem	3	5%	3	5%
	Not a problem	1	2%	1	2%
	No Answer	50	81%	50	81%
	Total	62	100%	62	100%

APPENDIX G

Essential for success: a cross-cultural coach!

When a team is busy moving forward with the activities developed through cross-cultural partnership, big things get forgotten! Which is our way of apologizing for leaving out the beginning cornerstone of our adaptive partnerships with community based organizations and other agencies. AT THE VERY BEGINNING TWINKLE STAGE of assembling our partners, the Public Health-Seattle and King County agency arranged for EJNA to work with a cross-cultural consultant *par excellence*: Maria Batayola, Diversity Manager for King County Government. Maria facilitated our planning meetings, coached us for months on cross-cultural consideration, and facilitated our early community meetings, where we learned together what were the decision-making preferences, taboos and other cultural elements which could enhance or challenge our building partnerships. It is the plain truth that without Maria Batayola's phenomenal cross-cultural organization development and coaching skills, we would not have been able to develop the strong partnerships and useful results we have. We strongly recommend that others considering our model include a highly skilled cross-cultural consultant/coach, in order to plumb the effectiveness depths.