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Background

Lane County, Oregon, is home to a fast-growing and diverse Hispanic/Latino population. According to the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau, there are roughly 26,167 Latinos representing about 7.4 percent of Lane County’s population. Oregon is considered to be a new growth destination state for Latinos as their numbers have greatly increased in the past 10 years.\(^1\)

This memo offers a profile of that population and suggests indicators of equity and sustainability that reflect the concerns and interests of Lane County’s Latino residents.

Part 1.0  A Profile of Lane County Latinos

Latinos in Lane County are not a single community. They form many communities. Indeed, one of the striking characteristics of Lane County’s Latinos is their diversity. The county’s Latinos claim many different national and linguistic origins, and vary in their economic wellbeing, their social status, and their level of education. Yet within that diversity, a disproportionate share of Lane County’s Latinos are young, insecure, and lacking in education and assets—traits that make it difficult for many Latinos to integrate themselves fully into the community in Eugene/Springfield and to participate in civic life.

This section of the report documents the demographics of the Lane County Latino community, using data from the 2010 US Census, the American Community Survey, school records, vital statistics reports, and a variety of other information sources on the status and trends of Latinos, both in Lane County and beyond. It paints a picture of a diverse and growing community—but one that faces distinct challenges.

1.1 Language: According to the official definitions used in the United States, Hispanic/Latino ethnicity is defined by nationality: an individual is considered Latino if his or her family originally came to the United States from a Spanish-language-dominant country. But the Spanish language itself does not unify Lane County Latinos. According to the US Census, fully 44 percent of Lane County Latinos speak only English, and another 31 percent speak English “very well.”\(^2\) Only a quarter speak English less than “very well”—meaning that more Lane County Latinos actually speak English well than speak Spanish well.

Half of the county’s Hispanic households speak a language other than English at home,\(^3\) but for some, “other than English” does not mean Spanish. A share of Mexican and Guatemalan residents of Lane County are not even descendants of Spanish speakers. Their native tongue is Nahuatl or Zapotec or another of fourteen indigenous Mesoamerican languages. Lane County’s indigenous share is likely well above the national figure of 1 percent of all Latinos: in nearby Woodburn, Oregon, for example, some 10 percent of household heads surveyed spoke Mixtec as their first tongue.\(^4\)

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, more Lane County Latinos speak English well than speak Spanish well.
1.2 Nation of family origin. Like other Hispanic people across the United States, Eugene/Springfield Latinos identify themselves less by their Latino/Hispanic ethnicity than by their specific country of origin: they think of themselves not so much as Latino but as Guatemalan or Puerto Rican, for example, or Mexican. In fact, almost four fifths identify themselves as Mexican (see Table 1), many of whom identify themselves strongly with their home state, such as Oaxaca or Michoacan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality of Family Origin</th>
<th>Share of Latinos (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Almost 80 percent of Lane County Latinos are of Mexican descent.

Migration tends to proceed along the bonds of social networks: newcomers follow friends or family members over great distances. One 2006 survey of heads of households in Woodburn showed that fully a quarter of Mexican immigrants there were part of a network rooted in the state of Oaxaca. In contrast, only 5 percent hailed from Mexico City, which has more than twice Oaxaca’s population. Unfortunately, no one has conducted a reliable survey to determine which Mexican states are the places of ancestral origin of Lane County immigrants. The word “ancestral” is important: a large share of Lane County’s Latinos did not immigrate themselves, but are children or other descendants of immigrants.

1.3 Geographic distribution. Lane County’s Latinos, like the population overall, are concentrated in the cities and suburbs of Eugene/Springfield. But within those cities and suburbs, Latinos’ distribution is widespread. There are pockets with a high concentration of Latino residents, and Springfield has a higher share of Latino residents than does Eugene. Yet unlike some other cities in Oregon and across the country, the Eugene/Springfield area does not appear to have a single neighborhood or region with disproportionate concentration of Latino residents, as Figures 1 and 2 illustrate.
Figure 1. The total population of Lane County is concentrated in the Cities of Eugene and Springfield, and their adjacent suburbs.

Source: US Census 2010, as visualized by Moonshadow Mobile. High population density is represented by darker shades of orange.

Figure 2. The Latino population is not narrowly concentrated, but is instead dispersed widely throughout Eugene/Springfield.

Source: US Census 2010, as visualized by Moonshadow Mobile. High Latino population
is represented by darker shades of red.

1.4 Age. Besides its diversity, perhaps the most distinctive characteristic of the Latino community in Lane County is its youth. The median age among Lane County Latinos is just 24 years, while the median age for non-Hispanic whites in the county is 41. Fully 22 percent of the county’s Latino population is under the age of 10, compared with 10 percent of non-Hispanic whites. (See Figure 3.) At the other end of the age spectrum, just 2 percent of Latinos were 70 years or older, compared with 11 percent of non-Hispanic whites.  

Figure 3. The Latino population of Lane County, Oregon, is much younger than the white-only population.

Latinos represented 7.4 percent of Lane County residents overall in 2010—not a terribly large share. Because of their youth, however, they will make up a much larger share of the county’s future population. Latinos represent more than 14 percent of minors in the county, according to the 2010 US Census (as illustrated in Figures 4 and 5); 13.6 percent of births in 2008-2010, according to Oregon vital statistics records; and 12.4 percent of public-school students in the 2009-2010 instructional year, according to local school districts. (Because 2010 census counts for Latino youth align relatively well with these two separate, large, and reliable data sources—birth certificates and school enrollments—Sightline relies on the US Census for counts of Latinos in Lane County despite having concerns about potential undercounting of Latinos and other communities of color.)

Hispanic residents of Lane County have been the county’s fastest growing community of color in recent decades. The Latino share of public school enrollments and births nearly tripled over the last decade, from 4.5 percent to 12.4 percent. In fact, Latino population growth in Lane County has been so substantial that Latinos, though a small slice of county residents, nonetheless accounted for 43 percent of county growth in the decade ending in 2010.
Recent migration explains the youthfulness of Lane County’s Latinos. Most Latino growth in the county came from migration, and migration is mostly a young person’s venture. The twenties are the peak decade for migration; they are also the peak child-bearing years. These two facts, together with many immigrants’ poverty (which tends to boost family size) and large-family cultural norms in Mexico, likely explain the relatively high fertility rate among the county’s Latinos. Birthrates among Lane County Latinas (as measured by the share of women of childbearing age to have had a child in the last 12 months) are more than twice as high as among non-Hispanic whites.\textsuperscript{16}

One challenge in navigating the transition to a multicultural Lane County is the growing “demographic gap” between the generations. Among seniors, some 95 percent are non-Hispanic whites, while all people of color, including Latinos, make up just 5 percent.\textsuperscript{17} University of Southern California scholar Manuel Pastor and his coauthors write, “A study done for the Public Policy Institute of California concluded that in the states where the demographic generation gap is widest, the level of state capital outlays—essentially public investments for the future—are the lowest.”\textsuperscript{18}
Figure 4. Latinos represent a small share of the Eugene/Springfield population over the age of 18.  
(Non-Latinos represented in light blue; Latinos represented in red. The hue of any dot represents the concentration of Latinos among residents over the age of 18 in a given Census block.)

Figure 5. Latinos represent a significant share of the Eugene/Springfield population under age 18.  
(Non-Latinos represented in light blue; Latinos represented in red. The hue of any dot represents the concentration of Latinos among residents under the age of 18.)
1.5 *Immigration status and trends.* In recent years, immigration from Mexico has slowed dramatically and returns to Mexico have sped. In fact, migration between the United States and Mexico appears to have reached net zero in 2012, according to the Pew Hispanic Center.\(^\text{19}\) Whether this national shift has affected Latino growth in Lane is anyone’s guess. Immigrants arriving in Eugene/Springfield do not all come directly from abroad; many have moved around the United States for some years before getting to Eugene/Springfield. Overall, according to the US Census, 44 percent of Lane County Latino adults, and more than 9 out of 10 minors, were born in the United States.\(^\text{20}\)

A substantial but unknown share of Eugene/Springfield’s Hispanic population lives in the United States without permission from federal authorities: like an estimated 7 to 13 million other undocumented immigrants in the United States, they either evaded border officers or overstayed a visa.\(^\text{21}\) These immigrants’ lives are shaped by a pervasive sense of insecurity. They cannot be sure of their futures. Deportation could strike almost any day. What’s more, lacking immigration papers, they are also excluded from an array of services and opportunities that other residents of the county take for granted. For undocumented residents, it can be hard or impossible to get a library card, buy a transit pass, rent an apartment or house, open a bank account, take a loan, establish a credit history, or even drive a car legally.

Even Latinos who are themselves legal residents or citizens of the United States may live in fear that friends and family members who are undocumented will be deported. Many of Lane’s Latino immigrant households are mixed in immigration status. In heavily Latino Woodburn, Oregon, an in-depth survey of 128 households found that 65 percent of households had only US citizens and legal permanent residents; 27 percent had a mix of citizens/permanent residents and unauthorized immigrants; the remaining 8 percent were exclusively unauthorized immigrants.\(^\text{22}\) If Eugene/Springfield is like Woodburn, in other words, more than one-third of Latino households have at least one undocumented member, putting the whole household on edge.

The sense of insecurity among undocumented Latinos and those from mixed-status households may have intensified in recent years, because deportations have reached record levels in the United States. Since 2009, deportations nationwide are up about 30 percent from the average rate in 2005 to 2008. Furthermore, Latinos know that deportations are up.\(^\text{23}\)

Further heightening insecurity for undocumented residents has been a change in state law concerning drivers’ licenses. In 2005, Congress enacted the REAL ID law, which establishes federal standards for state drivers’ licenses for the first time. It has encouraged states to require proof of legal immigration status as a condition of receiving a driver’s license.\(^\text{24}\) Oregon adopted a similar policy by executive order, and the legislature subsequently turned this order into a law. Old licenses have been expiring ever since, leaving undocumented residents unable to secure a government ID.

Lacking such cards, they have found themselves excluded from a variety of services and opportunities. Not only can they not drive legally, they often cannot buy car insurance. The range of landlords who will rent them dwellings is greatly diminished. Many banks will not open them accounts nor offer them loans. Even getting transit passes and library cards can be difficult. The REAL ID act allows states to issue separate “not-for-federal-purposes” drivers’ licenses and other identification cards, which certify
identity but not immigration status. To date, Oregon has not opted to offer such cards, although a state commission is now reviewing the policy for Governor John Kitzhaber.

Professor Sandoval’s interviews have also revealed a sense of insecurity or, more precisely, a lack of feeling welcomed among some Latinos who are not concerned about immigration status for themselves or their immediate circle of friends and family.

---

**Estimating Lane County’s Undocumented Latino Population**

Unfortunately, no one has quantified Latinos’ immigration status in Eugene/Springfield, and doing so is a tall order: What undocumented resident of the United States will reveal his or her lack of papers to an unfamiliar survey taker? A number of the Latino leaders and laborers that Professor Sandoval and his team have interviewed (after gaining their confidence) estimate that 70 or 80 percent of Eugene/Springfield Latinos are unauthorized.

However, this estimate is difficult to square with other data points. To estimate the undocumented share of Latinos in Lane County, we can draw on broader patterns. The Pew Hispanic Center estimates that in 2010, 4.3 percent of Oregon’s population or 160,000 people were unauthorized immigrants.¹ If they are spread across Oregon counties in proportion to those counties’ populations, and if they are 81 percent Latino¹, then Lane County has about 12,000 undocumented Hispanic residents. That’s 46 percent of Lane’s Latino population of 26,167. Another Pew Hispanic Center study indicates that almost exactly half of Mexican-descended US residents are undocumented.¹ If this ratio holds true in Lane County, and if one-third of other Latinos in the county are unauthorized,¹ the total of unauthorized Latinos in the county would again be close to 12,000.

If the census has vastly undercounted Latinos—if it has counted none of the estimated 12,000 undocumented Latino residents—then the total population of Latinos in the county would be about 38,000, and the undocumented share would be roughly one-third. A substantial undercount would also help explain one other problem with the estimate of 12,000 undocumented Latinos: We believe, from the census, that 90 percent of Latino minors are US-born and that 38 percent of Latinos are minors. Some others are legal residents. If we exclude all Latino minors, therefore, then 12,000 undocumented Latinos makes up almost 70 percent of adult Latinos in the county. This estimate would correspond with the estimates Professor Sandoval’s team heard in interviews, but it would conflict with census tallies suggesting that 44 percent of adult Latinos are US-born. An undercount would reconcile these figures.

On the other hand, the most reliable data sources on Latinos are the number of births to Hispanic mothers and the number of Latino children enrolled in public schools. Both of these are complete counts, not sample surveys like the American Community Survey, and they are hard for anyone to hide from. The census is easier to evade. As noted above, however, these figures match relatively well with the census tally of Latino children. As a result, we believe that a substantial undercount is unlikely.
Perhaps, therefore, the undocumented Latino population in Lane County is smaller than Pew’s figures suggest. If we assume that census counts do not substantially undercount Latinos, that essentially all Latino minors are authorized residents, that 44 percent of adult Latinos are US born, and that another substantial percentage of Latino adults in the county are naturalized citizens, legal permanent residents, or otherwise authorized residents, then a reasonable guess might be that one third to one half of Latino adults in the county are undocumented. If so, Lane County is home to 5,000 to 7,000 undocumented Latinos.

Clearly, all the data points we have cannot be correct. Unfortunately, we cannot get a definitive answer with available information. We are left to speculate. Even a small, in-depth survey, employing trusted Hispanic messengers and a statistical sampling method, could give a better sense of whether Lane County’s population of undocumented Latinos is closer to 5,000 or 12,000.

1.6 Education. Lane County’s Latinos run the educational gamut. More than one-third of Hispanic residents over the age of 24 have not finished high school. Almost a quarter have a high school diploma but no additional education. Another quarter have at least some post-secondary education, but have no degree, a certificate course, or an associate’s degree. The final 18 percent have finished a bachelor’s degree or more.25

Latinos in Lane County are better educated than Latinos overall in the United States or in Oregon, with more college graduates, more associates degrees, and fewer high school dropouts. Still, they have catching up to do to match the county’s non-Hispanic white majority.26 Adult Latinos trail whites at every educational level: more than three times as large a share of Latino adults hold no high school diploma, and whites have a 10 percentage point lead over Latinos in completion of college and university certificates and degrees. (See Figure 6.)

1.7 Employment, income, and assets. Working-age Latinos have found employment in a wide variety of fields. Although a substantial number of Latinos work in unskilled and semi-skilled trades—especially in the agriculture, food and construction sectors—many others are tradespeople, merchants, or professionals, including doctors and college professors. And some 9 percent of the county’s Latinos attend college or graduate school.27

Income is distributed less equitably among US Latinos than among non-Hispanic whites.28 Latinos in Lane County lag somewhat in income and trail distantly in assets. Compared with Lane County whites, Latinos are more likely to be poor (25 percent for Latinos v. 15 percent for whites) or low income and unemployed and to rely on Food Stamps (26 percent of Latino households v. 15 percent of white households). Latino median income ($32,000) is lower than white income ($44,000).29 Some of these differences are explained by the youthfulness and lack of education of Latinos. If we compared young whites to all whites, or less-educated whites to all whites, we might find similar gaps. But other causes are also probably at work, including language barriers, exploitation of undocumented workers, and racism.
Figure 6. Lane County’s Latinos are less educated than non-Hispanic whites.

The distribution of income among Latinos in Lane County, shown in Figure 7, is weighted toward the bottom end of the scale: 37 percent of Hispanic households have income of less than $25,000, and roughly one third as many Latino as white households earn more than $100,000. Still, Latino households are diverse in income, spanning the range from low to high.

Figure 7. Lane County’s Latino households tend to earn less than white households.
The income brackets can be read as “less than $15,000; from $15,000 to $25,000; from $25,000 to $35,000; etc.” SOURCE: American Community Survey, 2006-2010.

One additional, and important, factor is that Latinos in Lane County trail distantly behind whites in accumulating assets, and assets are what give families the means to improve their income dramatically: by investing in education, for example, or buying homes or starting businesses. Nationwide in the United States, for every dollar of wealth, or net worth, owned by a typical white family, a typical Hispanic family owns just a nickel.

A mundane but forbidding barrier to accumulating assets for undocumented Latinos is that Oregon’s driver’s license rules make it difficult to use Eugene/Springfield banks. Without a valid, government-issued ID card, most banks will not open an account much less make a loan or offer a line of credit. Professor Sandoval’s interviews suggest that check-cashing stores and certain retailers have become (exorbitantly expensive) stopgaps for undocumented Latinos who need even basic banking services.

Better news is that, in Lane County, at least one dimension of the wealth gap appears to have narrowed. Home ownership increased from 36 to 40 percent among Latino households in the decade of the 2000s. The white home ownership rate, meanwhile, edged downward from 64 to 62 percent. It’s still a big gap, but it’s smaller than it was. Unfortunately, because even documented Latino residents tend to have low incomes and little wealth, and perhaps because of systemic racial biases in institutional lending, Latinos have a hard time getting favorable terms on mortgage loans. A disproportionate share of Latino homeowners in the county hold high-interest or subprime mortgages, leaving them vulnerable to foreclosure and the loss of home equity.

Trends in Lane County’s Latino business ownership remain unknown, unfortunately. National statistics suggest much faster growth in the number of small Latino-owned firms in the 1990s than among firms with owners of all races and ethnicities. Revenues also grew fast in that period. Up-to-date, local data, perhaps assembled by surveying local businesses could reveal whether entrepreneurship is helping to close the wealth gap.
Part 2.0 Indicators

Diverse, young, insecure, less educated, and short on income and assets—these are the characteristics that stand out about Eugene/Springfield’s Hispanic population. Because of these traits, Latinos have difficulty seizing on opportunities for advancement and participating in the metropolitan area’s public life.

To guide action for better Latino integration and participation in community and public life in Lane County, better information could help. We offer a brief catalogue of potential indicators of equity and sustainability that may reflect the concerns of the county’s Latinos. We have not been able to ascertain in all cases what local data are available, so in some cases the indicators we recommend may already be possible with existing data. We indicate available data where we were aware of it. To develop these indicators, one good first step would be to check which data are available in Lane County.

2.1 Demographic indicators

1. The fast growth of the Latino population and its spatial and age distribution are available from the decennial census and American Community Survey, cross checked against Oregon vital statistics data on births and school district enrolment figures, as illustrated in Part 1 of this memo. An alternative would be to do “dot maps” of Latinos/nonLatinos 1990, 2000, and 2010—one dot per unit of Latino people like a set of maps by cartographer Eric Fischer. The New York Times has a free online mapping tool that does something similar.

2. Language barriers came up in Professor Sandoval’s interviews as an important obstacle to participation in community life for some Latinos. Measuring English fluency among the population would be one relevant indicator. Another would track the availability of interpreting services at community institutions such as medical and government offices. Both of these indicators would require new survey research.

2.2 Insecurity indicators

3. Immigration status. As discussed above, an in-depth survey by skilled researchers and trusted Latino organizations, conducted according to a rigorous statistical sampling methodology, could give better picture of Latinos’ immigration status in Lane County. (See note at end about conducting a survey.)

4. Deportations. National deportation statistics tell us little about what matters to unauthorized Latino residents or members of their families. More relevant would be local deportation proceedings initiated in Lane County, if such data are available.

5. Identification card: A survey (mentioned in #2) could ascertain how widespread the lack of official identification cards is. (See note at end about conducting a survey.)

6. Sense of security: Such a survey could also get a stronger sense of how welcoming a community Eugene/Springfield is to Latinos, whatever their immigration status. It could ask questions such as: How comfortable do you feel? How safe do you feel? In your community? In your home? In public parks? In libraries and community centers? In schools? In local stores? In your workplace? (See note at end about conducting a survey.)
2.3 Economic indicators

7. Poverty rates, by race and ethnicity, are available for the county and for large cities from the American Community Survey. The data may not be robust enough to measure change over short periods or in different neighborhoods. Child poverty rates are also available.

8. To better localize poverty rates, one option is to track the share of students enrolled in the free or reduced-price school lunch program, by school and race/ethnicity, to the extent possible. Free lunch data are available, though they are somewhat unreliable as indicators. Different districts and schools are more and less aggressive in recruiting families for the program. Still, high-enrollment schools are usually markers of neighborhood poverty. They also tend to identify schools that need substantial external attention and resources to allow students to learn at grade level, especially where 60 percent or more of students qualify for free/reduced lunch.

9. A compelling body of evidence suggests that wealth, rather than income, is the key determinant of many important life outcomes, such as education, employment, and health. Yet wealth is more poorly measured than income. The best options may be to look at home ownership (from ACS and other sources), banking opportunities (by mapping banks and evaluating banks' ID card procedures), and business ownership (perhaps by surveying businesses).

2.4 Discrimination indicators

10. Racism testing: A useful procedure for testing racial discrimination in the housing market, which may be the single most consequential form of discrimination for the life prospects of people of color, is the matched pair “secret shopper” approach. Two pairs of applicants, one white and one Latino, visit the same homes for rent. Both couples offer similar, fictional backgrounds of education, employment, marital status, number of children, and income. Then, they record their treatment: rent quoted, deposit requested, move-in discounts, units shown, and the like. Similar tests also work for homes for sale. Seattle and Portland housing authorities have both done such tests in recent years and found discrimination against Latinos commonplace. The City of Eugene began matched-pair testing in 2010. Continuing and extending this approach to other parts of Lane County would be a good way to track racism in the housing market. Another approach is to survey people as to whether they have suffered specific instances of discrimination because of their race or ethnicity in the past year.

11. Criminal Justice System Tracking racial/ethnic proportionality in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems in Lane County can help reveal equity in law enforcement, from arrests, charges brought, detentions, guilty verdicts, and the severity of sentences. Analysis of Multnomah County’s record revealed a pattern of worse treatment for Latinos. Another tool is to survey Lane County residents and ask how many encounters they had with police during the past year, as the Urban League did in its State of Black Oregon report. Racial disparities in the number of traffic stops, for example, may suggest a pattern of racial profiling.

2.5 Education indicators

12. Education completed: Years of education completed, which we sketched in part 1 of this memo, is a useful indicator. A refinement of it would compare education completed among US-born Latinos with US-born whites, by age, to look for disparities not explained primarily by immigration status.
2.6 Community Indicators

13. **Access to urban benefits.** Borrowing a leaf from the Greater Portland *Equity Atlas*, Eugene/Springfield could examine the equity of access to a variety of urban facilities and services. Urban poor and people of color in Portland, for example, generally have good transit access, good walkability to groceries and schools, and good sidewalk coverage around schools. They suffer mild disadvantages in park access and big disparities in nature access. Worst off are typically exurban, fast-growing Hispanic communities, which lack transit, parks, good schools, good social services, and walkable neighborhoods. A quick review of Latinos’ distribution across the Eugene/Springfield metro area suggests that greater Portland’s pattern of geographical disadvantage for Latinos may not be repeated in Lane County. Professor Sandoval’s interviews suggest Lane County Latinos may have a particular concern about access to public spaces and, especially, community gardens.

14. A promising short-hand way to examine the equity of access to urban benefits would be to compare the [Walk Scores](https://www.walkscore.com) (and possibly Transit Scores and Bike Scores) of the most heavily Latino neighborhoods in Eugene/Springfield with those of the whitest neighborhoods. This approach would also allow comparisons between Eugene/Springfield and dozens of other cities.

15. Alternatively, the Eugene 20-minute neighborhood heat map, perhaps extended to Springfield or to the whole county, could also be compared with the distribution of Latinos in the metro area. This method of checking the walkability of Latino and white neighborhoods might give slightly more detailed and site-specific information, although it would prevent comparisons to other locales across the nation.

2.7 Transportation indicators

16. Because the **cost of housing and transportation** are important to everyone, especially to those with low incomes, one interesting indicator would be the combined cost of housing and transportation. The nonprofit Center for Neighborhood Technology has developed and mapped a measure of this at <htaindex.cnt.org>.

17. The American Community Survey includes data on **commuting** trips, which make up one-fifth to one-quarter of all trips. Like Latinos across the US and in the state as a whole, Lane County Latinos are far more likely to carpool to work, and slightly more likely to take public transportation, than their non-Hispanic white counterparts.

18. Mapping the locations where people on foot or bicycles have died when hit by cars and trucks and comparing those locations to concentrations of Latino residences in Eugene/Springfield would provide a sense of traffic risks in Latino neighborhoods.

*Note on a Community Survey:*

In this catalogue of promising indicators for equity and sustainability and the Latino community in greater Eugene/Springfield, we have suggested surveying Lane County residents, using trusted Latino messengers and statistical sampling methods. A collaboration with researchers, community organizations, and government agencies might be the best way forward. One potential partnership would be to join with the United Way, which conducts a periodic community assessment with an overlapping set of concerns. Because Latinos constitute just 7.4 percent of county residents, getting an accurate reading about them might require oversampling Latinos. And to get undocumented residents to participate in the survey would require working closely with organizations they trust.
Specifically, we suggested a community survey to gather information for indicators on immigration status (1), identification cards (2), the sense of security (4), personal experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination, (9), police profiling/traffic stops (10), and business ownership (11). (Business ownership might be better studied through a separate survey of businesses.) If a community survey does proceed, we would also encourage asking two additional sets of questions that have been used repeatedly in many communities by academic researchers and community indicators projects: subjective well-being (“happiness”) and social capital (especially “public trust”). These are two excellent and highly predictive indicators of overall quality of life. Oversampling Latinos would allow a first-ever equity comparison of these two measures. Employing these semi-standard sets of questions, furthermore, would allow benchmarking Lane County against many other places.
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