

APPENDIX 11:

---

## Detailed Evaluation of Participant Perspectives



**Eastern Neighborhoods Community Health Impact Assessment**  
**Detailed Evaluation of Participant Perspectives**  
**Summary of key findings**

Jason Corburn, an Assistant Professor of urban planning and environmental health policy at Columbia University, was asked to provide independent, on-going evaluation of the ENCHIA process. Jason secured funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to support his travel and participation as ENCHIA evaluator. Jason has over a decade of experience organizing, mediating, and evaluating public land use and environmental health decision-making processes.

This survey was completed in May-June 2006 and the interviews conducted over the summer of 2006. Data were derived from a survey instrument that was distributed to all ENCHIA participants at the end of the 18-month process and included 20 questions regarding the ENCHIA process and outcomes. Open-ended interviews were also conducted with participants and staff between May and November 2006. We expect the final evaluation to be completed by summer 2007. Below, we provide a summary of preliminary evaluation findings focusing on Council participant perspectives.

This section provides a summary of findings from Jason's evaluations. This final evaluation summary is based on four sets of primary data. First, forty-two interviews were conducted with ENCHIA council members between May and October 2005. These findings were summarized in the ENCHIA mid-term evaluation report, and some follow-up responses are examined here. Second, a survey instrument with twenty questions was distributed to all ENCHIA participants and staff (n=47) in May 2006. Thirty-two surveys were returned (32/47) for a 68% response rate. [A copy of the complete survey instrument and responses can appear as an Appendix]. Third, open-ended interviews were conducted with participants and staff over the Spring and Summer of 2006. Interviews were both one-on-one and with groups of participants. Finally, audio tapes of some ENCHIA meetings were reviewed to identify key themes during public discussions.

The following objectives structured the final evaluation process:

- 1) Identify features of ENCHIA that participants thought contributed to discussion, research and action that promoted more healthy places/neighborhoods;
- 2) Determine which processes and outcomes of ENCHIA addressed specific issues of concern for the Eastern Neighborhoods;
- 3) Analyze the extent to which the ENCHIA process was inclusive (i.e., represented the range of stakeholders necessary to generate legitimate outcomes);
- 4) Assess whether ENCHIA improved participants' understanding of the issues involved in HIA and land use-public health decision making more generally;
- 5) Assess whether ENCHIA improved relationships among participants (a commonly stated goal of consensus building processes);
- 6) Assess whether ENCHIA has altered the 'standard operating procedures' of city government specific to land use and environmental health decision-making;
- 7) Highlight suggestions from participants for making multi-stakeholder community-based process more responsive to community needs.

## Findings:

The results of the evaluation are summarized below and grouped into three categories: (1) process (2) content and (3) outcomes/implementation.

### Category #1: Process organization, management and inclusiveness

Participants stated that the ENCHIA process was generally well organized and managed. Meeting announcements were timely, agendas were clear, and supporting materials, such as reports, were often distributed before meetings and made available at meetings. Participants suggested that the SFDPH staff worked hard to keep the process going and responsive to participants' concerns. While most participants thought ENCHIA had representatives from a broad range of interests at the outset, many thought that broad participation waned in the second half of the 18 month process.

As reflected in the survey results, participants thought that at times, the process often wavered from one its principal goals, namely analyzing the population health impacts of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning proposals. However, all participants noted that this happened, in part, because the specific rezoning proposals were not finalized by the City Planning Department before or during the ENCHIA process.

### Survey Results:

Process Questions:	Yes	No	Somewhat
1) The ENCHIA process was managed effectively and efficiently?	73%	5%	23%
2) The initial goals of the process were reasonable and achievable?	41%	5%	55%
3) The process set realistic time frames and worked efficiently?	68%	5%	27%
4) The process valued your input?	68%	0%	32%
5) The process made credible efforts to be as inclusive as possible of different interest groups and points of view?	73%	0%	27%
6) Organizations, population groups and issues that are typically ignored or marginalized in land use, zoning and policy decisions were heard and their concerns incorporated into work products?	50%	9%	41%
7) The process and products reflect relevant social and economic needs of SF communities?	73%	0%	27%
8) The process outcomes and products address the political environment of SF?	36%	0%	64%
9) Does the ENCHIA process reflect a comprehensive view of population health?	86%	0%	14%

### Participant reflections:

“While it seemed like the same cast of characters at every meeting, we didn’t agree on much. They (SFDPH) kept us moving forward and resolved most issues as they came up.”

“I thought City Planning could have done more. They showed-up and gave updates, but they weren’t proactive.”

“I am very disappointed that the ENCHIA did not get to the rezoning issue in the Mission and SOMA. I mean we could have just taken the definition of PDR (production, distribution and retail) and analyzed the likely health impacts of this as a policy objective of the Planning Department.”

“I think people lost some interest and enthusiasm when it became clear the department (SFDPH) didn’t have a clue where this thing was going to wind-up. The openness to community input was commendable, but they (SFDPH) are the experts in this area. So, when they seemed like they were fishing for something specific that ENCHIA would deliver, I was skeptical the process would generate anything useful.”

“When a city agency says, ‘you decide what we should do and how it will impact decision making’ it seems a little disingenuous. You (DPH) have more power over decision making than any of us (community group representative), and if we select something you can’t endorse or do politically, then what? Tell us how far you are willing to take this (ENCHIA analysis) and make it a part of the City’s decision making?”

<b>Was the process responsive to your needs and concerns in the following areas?</b>	<b>Very responsive</b>	<b>Somewhat responsive</b>	<b>Not responsive</b>
Meeting times and locations	59%	36%	5%
Facilitation of meetings	64%	27%	9%
Your information needs	59%	41%	0%
Evolution of project goals	41%	50%	9%
Evolution of the process	68%	27%	5%
Evolution of products	68%	23%	9%
Accountability	55%	41%	5%
Transparency	59%	41%	0%

“It seemed like the DPH staff worked tirelessly on this process and held it together at times when I couldn’t figure out where we were going. Every time it looked like the process was about to falter, they just seemed to say ‘ok, we’ll do that’ or ‘we can research this issue’ and this kept people coming back to meetings.”

“The organization of the process and the commitment of the SFDPH staff kept me coming to meetings, or at least interested in the process, as much as anything else. There was never a question in my mind as to whether they (DPH) were being responsive to community requests. We said jump and they’d come back with, ‘is this high enough?’”

“The process was stacked with community organizations and didn’t have enough developers and lawyers - - the people who really drive development and policy in this city.”

“There were too few community voices at the table. Only one or two groups actually have a membership base and residents never really got a chance to weigh-in. The process was slanted toward policy-wonks and private developers, as usual.”

### **Category #2: ENCHIA content/work products**

This category grouped responses and narratives addressing the specific work of ENCHIA. As outlined in the final report, the major work products included the: healthy city vision; subgroup data gathering and analyses; health study of City workers; policy briefs and their prioritization; and, the healthy development measurement tool.

Participants suggested that the content of the meetings reflected a broad approach to population health while at the same time accounted for some of the specific social, economic and political conditions unique to San Francisco. Yet, some suggested that the aim for comprehensive evidence sometimes ignored other possible data sources, such as community experience. Almost all participants noted that the ‘tool’ seemed like the most useful and practical work product while others valued the breadth of the data gathering.

### **Participant reflections:**

“The most impressive thing was its broad scope and inclusion of issues, like street intersections, supermarkets, and community facilities, as central health issues. I can’t think of another process in this city that used such a broad definition of health and gathered evidence to support it.”

“I’ve been in community planning processes before, but not one that involved thinking about health in this broad a way.”

“The process has helped me articulate the health angle to land use issues.”

“The focus on housing and economics was important, since these are the key drivers of health and inequality. I mean, if this process focused on how to get people to walk more and lose weight, it would have been a total disaster.”

“We could have come up with more design solutions, especially since we had architects in the room. I think we could have proposed ‘green and healthy’ city planning like the green buildings program does for construction. The tool does some of this, I guess, but not specifically for the Eastern Neighborhoods.”

“Turning the subgroup work and data gathering into something practical is crucial. If we accomplish only one thing it should be to turn this into a method or way to screen rezoning and development projects.”

“The community meetings and study were important parts of the data process, but seemed to get lost after we dropped the whole policy briefs idea. The policy briefs seemed like a lot of work but had little impact.”

**Survey Results:**

<b>Content Questions:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Somewhat</b>
1) Evidence offered at ENCHIA meetings and in reports addressed some of the key factors that impact human health?	73%	9%	18%
2) The ENCHIA process, discussions and products are based on credible research and scientific data?	68%	0%	32%
3) The expertise of Council members and other community residents was given equal weight along side formal medical and other technical information?	59%	0%	41%
4) The draft products (e.g., Healthy Development Tool) are credible because they utilize and reference scientific studies and community experiences and needs?	59%	0%	41%
5) The ENCHIA process and draft materials clearly identify the current problems and challenges for planning the “healthy neighborhood”?	64%	0%	36%

**Category #3: Outcomes and Implementation**

This category aimed to evaluate the quality of the specific outcomes of ENCHIA, such as the HDMT, intra and inter organizational outcomes related to the process (i.e., the extent to which relationships improved, organizations incorporated population health into their work, etc.) and the likelihood of successful implementation of ENCHIA work products (i.e., what tangible impacts will ENCHIA have on planning and development in SF).

**Participant reflections:**

“The tool is the most important product of this process. This is exactly the type of thing that can change development and provide groups and government an alternative to current practices that promote unhealthy planning.”

“I see a lot of these same people at other meetings, but now I’m more likely to go talk with them or try and work with them now that I know them better.”

“My relationships with the DPH have improved through this process. I trust them more and they [DPH] have helped us work better with other city agencies.”

“We took some data gathered by ENCHIA and presented it to our Supervisor and this had a direct impact on development decisions. Sometimes you just don’t know how a process like ENCHIA is going to provide you with valuable data.”

“Before the ENCHIA we never attempted to make community economic development and housing affordability a public health issue. Yet, we always talked about our work as defending

‘human needs’ and ‘basic living conditions.’ The ENCHIA has helped us see that we were making public health arguments all along, but just not being explicit about it. Now, by making explicit the connections of our work with health, we have not only seen that Supervisors and other elected officials are paying more attention but it has also helped us expand our organizing base in the neighborhood.”

“I hope this group continues to meet, because we’ve come too far and covered too much ground to stop now. We are now ready to evaluate specific projects.”

“The SFDPH needs to commit to how far they are willing to endorse the use of this (the tool). Are you going to recommend it be used for all new developments, in EIAs, or not? Ultimately, the power of this tool will be whether an agency takes it on as their own, because community groups don’t have the capacity or staff to use this all the time.”

“The ENCHIA data and reports showed us that when a public health agency says ‘displacement or this land use may cause a health problem, don’t do that,’ the government and the public are more likely to listen than when planners say the same thing.”

**Survey Results:**

<b>1) How has your participation in ENCHIA affected the following</b>	<b>improved</b>	<b>stayed the same</b>	<b>got worse</b>
(a) Your relationship with other organizations you did not formerly work with?	77%	23%	0%
(b) Your relationships with other city agencies?	41%	59%	0%
(c) Your capacity to participate in land use planning processes using public health evidence?	59%	41%	0%

Many participants viewed the framing of land use as a health issue an important outcome of the ENCHIA process. This discourse has found its way into the day-to-day work of many of the ENCHIA organizations. Some organizations have used the data gathered by ENCHIA to promote their own political campaigns while others have used the data to seek funding from foundations and government agencies they had previously not approached.

While participants expressed some frustration that ENCHIA did not examine land use and zoning issues specific to the Eastern Neighborhoods, they were optimistic that the outcomes of the process would eventually influence decision making addressing this area of the city. About half of the survey respondents thought that the process and its outcomes would have an impact on other planning processes around the city, City agencies beyond the DPH and legislators.

**Survey Results:**

<b>2) To what extent do you/your organization find the following ENCHIA products useful for your work?</b>	<b>very useful</b>	<b>useful</b>	<b>somewhat useful</b>	<b>not useful</b>
(a) Health language and arguments	32%	59%	9%	0%
(b) Data, indicators, and maps	32%	50%	18%	0%
(c) Community assessment	36%	41%	23%	0%
(d) Policy and strategy research	23%	50%	27%	0%
(e) Healthy Development Tool	36%	32%	32%	0%
(f) The ENCHIA approach to planning	18%	59%	23%	0%

<b>3) In your opinion, what impacts has the ENCHIA process had on the following?</b>	<b>definite impact</b>	<b>some impact</b>	<b>none</b>	<b>hard to tell</b>
(a) Eastern neighborhoods planning	18%	41%	14%	27%
(b) Other land use plans, projects, policies	5%	50%	23%	23%
(c) City agencies	0%	45%	14%	41%
(d) Legislators consider health in planning	0%	64%	14%	23%