**LED: A potential tool for tracking local equity indicators for Portland’s Sub geographies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question your work tried to answer</th>
<th>To establish baseline values for <em>Local Indicators or Measures of Progress</em> in Portland’s sub geographies and then use the LED tool to track progress - all aimed to reduce disparities and foster Citywide equity and prosperity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Local Employment Dynamics data sources used** | ![ ] OnTheMap  

[ ] QWI  

[ ] Industry Focus  

[ ] Raw data files from CD or VRDC  

[ ] Other: ________________________________ |
| Other data sources used | ESRI Business Analyst |
| Software/ data processing tools used | Microsoft Excel  

ArcView GIS |
| Brief description of methodology (if someone wanted to do a similar analysis, how should they approach it?) | **Determine relevant sub geographies within the study area**  

Note: In case of Portland, carving these sub geographies was a huge effort. The central idea was to carve areas called “20-minute neighborhoods” or places with convenient, safe and pedestrian-oriented access to places people need to go to and the services people use every day: transit, shopping, healthy food, school, parks and social activities.  

**Determination of Citywide and Local Measures of Progress**  

Note: In case of Portland, the creation of Indicators list was also a big project. The effort was coordinated with Metro, the regional planning agency and also with the IBM Corp.  

**Use OnTheMap and ESRI Business Analyst to establish baseline values of relevant indicators.**  

Both these programs are capable of importing ‘shape files’ and accommodate custom geographies and running performance analysis helps to get to the following measures:  

- Employment Growth  
- Unemployment  
- Most workers commute less than 30 minutes  
- Associate degree attainment |
| Benefits of methodology/ data | Very useful to get descriptive employment data/patterns for custom geographies. While the ESRI Business Analyst provides comparable data, the software is expensive and can impose a cost |
| Drawbacks/problems with methodology/data | **Methodology:**  
Custom geographies by their very nature are non-standard and so there is this inherent weakness. Similarly, indicators are also insufficient- for instance an area may see employment growth but if the jobs are not well paying then is it real progress?  
**Data:**  
Due to the synthetic nature of the data, the values are not necessarily ‘true values’ and with inability to apply a Margin of Error (MOE) or Confidence Levels, the interpretations of progress or lack there off, need to be thought through carefully. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anything else?</td>
<td>The weakness in methodology or the data should not be treated as a deterrent to making equitable investments that expand opportunities for communities of color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who and how to contact for more information:</td>
<td>Uma Krishnan – <a href="mailto:uma.krishnan@portlandoregon.gov">uma.krishnan@portlandoregon.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>