



Metro | *Agenda*

Meeting: Metro Council Work Session
Date: Tuesday, Jan. 10, 2012
Time: 2 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

**2 PM 1. ADMINISTRATIVE/ COUNCIL AGENDA FOR
JANUARY 12, 2012/CHIEF OPERATING
OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS**

**2:15 PM 2. “FAMILIES MOVE” – CITY OF PORTLAND Ronault LS Catalani,
PRESENTATION ON HUMAN MIGRATION – City of Portland
INFORMATION / DISCUSSION**

2:45 PM 4. COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATION

ADJOURN

Agenda Item No. 2.0

**"FAMILIES MOVE" – CITY OF PORTLAND
PRESENTATION ON HUMAN
MIGRATION**

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, Jan. 10, 2012
Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: 1/10/12 Time: 2:15 p.m. Length: 30 minutes

Presentation Title: Families Move

Service, Office, or Center:

Council, per request of Ronault LS Catalani, New Portlander Programs, Office of Human Relations, City of Portland

Presenters (include phone number/extension and alternative contact information):

Ronault LS Catalani, 503.823.6224

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

The Portland Metro region is experiencing and will continue to experience demographic shifts, increasing the number of non-white residents. A growing portion of this population is immigrants from around the world. These families often struggle to feel integrated into their new place of residency and struggle to meet their basic needs. This region is in need of a comprehensive immigrant integration strategy to ensure these families are able to enter into the mainstream's economic system.

The City of Portland's New Portlander program has developed a presentation that covers human migration patterns and current local demographic makeup of our immigrant populations and outlines what some of their needs are. This presentation sets out the economic facts of Portland's newcomers and addresses fears about these new unfamiliar neighbors. The goal of this presentation is to assist urban planners in decreasing anxieties about future impact of our ambitious newcomer families. Time will be reserved for questions and discussion.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

N/A

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This presentation is providing valuable demographic information that Metro should consider in their planning and policy work. Additionally, Metro can learn from the models of ethnic minority and newcomer engagement outlined in this presentation.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes x No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED __Yes x No

Integrating newcomers into the social, economic, and political life of our city

– New Portlander Programs Mission Statement

US Sen. Jeff Merkley and Dr. Baher Butti,
Iraqi Society Of Oregon president
Getting down to difficult details.



Civic engagement projects

The counterpart to City services becoming more equitable is newcomer communities getting more effectively organized for participating in local democracy. The projects grouped under our acronym **e3** – for civic **e**ducation, **e**mpowerment, **e**ngagement – lend City bureau resources to Portland's newcomer community associations.

City resources added to energetic mutual assistance associations (also called MAAs) include help with getting formally organized and getting local grants; accessing neighborhood rec centers and neighborhood associations; introducing parents to their police precincts; and everyone's favorite: mining bureau volunteer veins for weekend help getting newcomer kids to educational and athletic events.



East Police Precinct
Commander Michael Crebs, Polo, and Pan-Burma Community elder
Moses Rain building police-parent bonds

CITY OF PORTLAND

NEW PORTLANDER PROGRAMS

Tel: 503.823.6224

Ronault.Catalani@portlandoregon.gov

New Portlander Programs

Families Move presentations

Families everywhere, move. Human movements in the direction of jobs, humans migrations away from disaster, have always happened. What's relatively recent is borders. Borders drawn between nations are relatively recent; rules for families moving across them are really complex. And Portland has become a gateway city to our increasingly globalized times.

Our Families Move presentations do two things: set out the economic facts of Portland's newcomers, and address our fears about our unfamiliar neighbors.

Discussions are invited by our city's big employers; by civic, professional, and faith associations; by schools, colleges, and universities. We give and take with small staff meetings and packed classrooms, with Rotary luncheons and Sunday congregations, we publish in print and broadcast media.



US President Barack Obama's family moved from
Kisumu to Manoa to Jakarta to LA to Cambridge to
Chicago to Washington, DC.

*Human families move like Gray Whale families move.
Like arctic caribou,
like Chapman Elementary's chimney swifts move.*

*It's imprinted in cetacea ribs big as a school bus,
in birdie bones light as a feather.*

When asked “How many good cops have you ever met?”

Jah, one of our Sunday Parkways corner cop, said “Zero, before now.”
Same answer for all 47 We Are Portland - Sunday Parkways volunteers.

We are Portland projects

Portland does so many things well. We are a national model of thoughtful urban transportation, terrific parks, and energetic neighborhood associations. Our City makes firm commitments to their success. *We are Portland* projects integrates our newcomer communities into the momentum of these great investments.



Portland Parks & Rec Bureau, for example, in partnership with David Douglas High School, IRCO Africa House and Asian Family Center,

Burmese Associations of Oregon, Nike and OHR, got newcomer kids out of their packed East Portland apartment blocks for last summer’s Refugee World Cup and Girls soccer camp.

Easily the most visible example is all those Somali, Karen, Rwandan, Burmani, Togo, Zori, and Congo kids manhandling intersections closed by Sunday Parkways – a partnership of OHR, Portland’s Bureau of Transportation and Police, IRCO Africa House and Asian Family Center.



Adore data? – New Portlander Programs by the Numbers:

Families Move presentations (Explaining human migration, demonstrating new Portlanders’ cultural capital)

Newcomer culinary, musical, fine, performing artists presented to Portland: 42
Human migration presentations to civic, faith, business groups: 19
Human migration presentations to school auditoria and classes: 9
Human migration presentations to big employers: 6
Articles published in print and broadcast media: 8
Stories or interviewees brokered to media: 5
University papers featuring our work: 3
Live audience numbers: 3540

Civic Engagement (community-up) & We Are Portland (government-down) projects

Partnering Portland public schools, colleges, universities: 8
Participating mutual assistance associations (MAAs): 16
Federal, state, and county agencies involved: 25
City of Portland bureaus joining in: 7
Health care systems too: 2
Local media attended: 5

Planning for a more equitable Portland

Hours invested in City of Portland planning: 120
Hours invested over last year in other governmental and educational institutions, and civic organizations: 207

New Portlander Programs

Integrating newcomers into the social, economic, and political life of our city

Agenda Item No. 3.0

2012 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, Jan. 10, 2012
Metro Council Chamber

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.



Metro | Agenda

REVISED, 1/9

Meeting: Metro Council Work Session
Date: Tuesday, Jan. 10, 2012
Time: 2 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

- | | | | |
|---------|----|--|--|
| 2 PM | 1. | ADMINISTRATIVE/ COUNCIL AGENDA FOR
JANUARY 12, 2012/CHIEF OPERATING
OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS | |
| 2:15 PM | 2. | "FAMILIES MOVE" – CITY OF PORTLAND
PRESENTATION ON HUMAN MIGRATION –
<u>INFORMATION / DISCUSSION</u> | Ronault LS Catalani,
City of Portland |
| 2:45 PM | 3. | 2012 LEGISLATIVE SESSION – <u>INFORMATION</u>
<u>/ DISCUSSION</u> | Randy Tucker |
| 3:05 PM | 4. | COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATION | |

ADJOURN

Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Metro Council
Date: Thursday, Jan. 12, 2012
Time: 2 p.m.
Place: Metro, Council Chamber

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1. INTRODUCTIONS
2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS
3. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES FOR JAN. 5, 2012
4. ORDINANCES – SECOND READING

- 4.1 **Ordinance No. 12-1268**, For the Purpose of Annexing to the Metro District Boundary Approximately 99 Acres Adjacent to and Including a Portion of the Portland Community College Rock Creek Campus at 17705 NW Springville Road, Portland.

Harrington

Public Hearing

5. RESOLUTIONS
- 5.1 **Resolution No. 12-4318**, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointment of Members of the Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grants Review Committee.

Hosticka

6. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION
7. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

ADJOURN

Television schedule for Jan. 12, 2012 Metro Council meeting

Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, and Vancouver, WA Channel 30 – Community Access Network <i>Web site:</i> www.tvctv.org <i>Ph:</i> 503-629-8534 <i>Date:</i> Thursday, Jan. 12	Portland Channel 30 – Portland Community Media <i>Web site:</i> www.pcmtv.org <i>Ph:</i> 503-288-1515 <i>Date:</i> Sunday, Jan. 15, 7:30 p.m. <i>Date:</i> Monday, Jan. 16, 9 a.m.
Gresham Channel 30 - MCTV <i>Web site:</i> www.metroeast.org <i>Ph:</i> 503-491-7636 <i>Date:</i> Monday, Jan. 16, 2 p.m.	Washington County Channel 30– TVC TV <i>Web site:</i> www.tvctv.org <i>Ph:</i> 503-629-8534 <i>Date:</i> Saturday, Jan. 14, 11 p.m. <i>Date:</i> Sunday, Jan. 15, 11 p.m. <i>Date:</i> Tuesday, Jan. 17, 6 a.m. <i>Date:</i> Wednesday, Jan. 18, 4 p.m.
Oregon City, Gladstone Channel 28 – Willamette Falls Television <i>Web site:</i> http://www.wftvmedia.org/ <i>Ph:</i> 503-650-0275 Call or visit web site for program times.	West Linn Channel 30 – Willamette Falls Television <i>Web site:</i> http://www.wftvmedia.org/ <i>Ph:</i> 503-650-0275 Call or visit web site for program times.

PLEASE NOTE: Show times are tentative and in some cases the entire meeting may not be shown due to length. Call or check your community access station web site to confirm program times.

Agenda items may not be considered in the exact order. For questions about the agenda, call the Metro Council Office at 503-797-1540. Public hearings are held on all ordinances second read. Documents for the record must be submitted to the Regional Engagement Coordinator to be included in the decision record. Documents can be submitted by e-mail, fax or mail or in person to the Regional Engagement Coordinator. For additional information about testifying before the Metro Council please go to the Metro web site www.oregonmetro.gov and click on public comment opportunities. For assistance per the American Disabilities Act (ADA), dial TDD 503-797-1804 or 503-797-1540 (Council Office).

1| INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc. (DHM Research) conducted an online survey among Opt In members to assess their opinions about infrastructure and sustainability issues in the region. Following is an annotated questionnaire with results and observations.

Methodology: DHM Research invited all Opt In members, 8,011 residents at the time the survey was administered, to participate in the survey between December 19, 2011 and January 2, 2012. A total of 3,269 members completed the survey, approximately 44% of the panel.

Ideas for the content of this survey were proposed by an organization partnering with Opt In to recruit Republicans and residents of Clackamas and Washington counties, groups of residents the current panel membership is lacking. These topics were suggested to attract these groups to join the panel to weigh in on these important issues.

The surveys were hosted on an independent and secure DHM server and available to respondents 24 hours a day. In gathering responses, DHM employed quality control measures including pre-testing and monitoring the online survey to identify potential browser issues.

DHM Research: Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc. has been providing opinion research and consultation throughout the Pacific Northwest and other regions for over three decades. The firm is non-partisan and independent and specializes in research projects to support public policy making.
www.dhmresearch.com

STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

The member profile of the Opt In panel is not yet representative of the region. It is skewed older in age, toward higher additional attainment (college/graduate degree), Multnomah County, and Democrats (the current demographic breakout of the panel compared to the region can be found at <http://www.optinpanel.org/index.php/work>). This type of online research is a form of public engagement and is not a valid assessment of public opinion in the region. It is like the kind of information you would collect from residents at neighborhood meetings and public hearings but more demographically diverse.

2 | ANNOTATED QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1: Transportation Improvements and Traffic Congestion

1. When it comes to transportation improvements in the region, which should be the top focus?
(Randomize options)

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Regional roads and highways	21%	47%	49%
Neighborhood streets	16%	7%	11%
Light rail	26%	24%	20%
Bicycle lanes	15%	8%	9%
Sidewalks	14%	11%	6%
Don't know	8%	4%	4%

2. When it comes to transportation improvements in the region, which should not be a focus at all?
(Randomize options)

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Regional roads and highways	25%	14%	13%
Neighborhood streets	8%	13%	8%
Light rail	10%	17%	23%
Bicycle lanes	12%	18%	19%
Sidewalks	5%	6%	10%
Don't know	40%	33%	27%

OBSERVATIONS, Q1-Q2

In Clackamas and Washington counties, just fewer than five and ten members said the top focus should be regional roads and highways. All other responses in these counties were divided between light rail, neighborhood streets, bicycle lanes, and sidewalks, with light rail receiving the second highest number of responses in both counties (Clackamas: 20%; Washington: 24%). Multnomah County members were more divided, particularly between regional roads and highways (21%), and light rail (26%).

Demographic Differences: The most notable difference is by political party. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of Republicans chose regional roads and highways as the top focus, compared to 33% of Democrats and 20% of Independents. Differences also exist by age, with 39% ages 55 and older and 30% ages 35 to 54 who chose roads and highways as the top focus, compared to 14% of 18 to 34 year olds. Democrats, Independents, and members 18 to 34 had the highest percentages choosing light rail, sidewalks, and bike lanes.

When asked what should NOT be a focus, the top answer in Multnomah (40%), Washington (33%), and Clackamas (27%) counties was "don't know." Washington County members were fairly divided between all other options. In Multnomah County 25% said regional roads and highways, while in Clackamas County 23% said light rail.

Demographic Differences: Again, the biggest difference in opinion is by political party. Just fewer than five in ten (46%) Republicans said that light rail should not be a focus, compared to 17% of Independents and 5% of Democrats. It is also worth noting that 43% of Democrats and 33% of Independents chose "don't know" compared to 11% of Republicans.

***Question Design & Context:** It is common practice in public policy, customer satisfaction, and product surveys to ask people what is most important to them from a list of options, and what is not important to them in that list. These questions are designed to get a sense of priority and avoid a situation in which each item is listed as "very" important (as could happen using a traditional "very important to not at all important" scale).*

3. Improvements and expansions to roads and highways, light rail, sidewalks, and bike lanes are all part of the regional transportation plan. Over the past 10 years, do you think transportation projects in the region have:

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Helped reduce traffic congestion	47%	41%	39%
Have had no impact on traffic congestion	20%	29%	25%
Increased traffic congestion	12%	18%	22%
Don't know	21%	11%	13%

OBSERVATIONS, Q3

Around four in ten in each county said that regional transportation projects have helped to reduce traffic congestion in the area. Two in ten in Clackamas (22%) and Washington (18%) county said they have increased traffic congestion, compared to 12% of Multnomah County members. Twenty percent (20%) in Multnomah County, 29% in Washington County, and 25% in Clackamas County said these projects have had no impact on traffic congestion.

Demographic Differences: Independents were relatively divided between each option, with 38% who said transportation projects have reduced congestion, 25% said they have increased congestion, and 19% who said they have had no impact. Forty-two percent (42%) of Republicans said they have *increased* traffic congestion, while 53% of Democrats said they have *decreased* congestion.

How effective do you believe each of the following would be at reducing traffic congestion on highways and freeways in the region? (Randomize Q4-Q10)

Response Category, N=3269	Very effective	Smwt effective	Smwt ineffective	Very ineffective	Don't know
4. Tolls					
Multnomah, N=2084	31%	33%	13%	15%	8%
Washington, N=767	20%	29%	15%	26%	9%
Clackamas, N=418	17%	28%	17%	29%	9%
5. Carpool lanes					
Multnomah, N=2084	13%	56%	20%	7%	4%
Washington, N=767	16%	50%	21%	11%	3%
Clackamas, N=418	16%	48%	23%	11%	2%
6. Additional automobile lanes					
Multnomah, N=2084	16%	27%	20%	35%	3%
Washington, N=767	37%	31%	14%	15%	2%
Clackamas, N=418	34%	32%	17%	16%	1%
7. Light rail expansion					
Multnomah, N=2084	39%	43%	9%	7%	2%
Washington, N=767	33%	39%	11%	16%	1%
Clackamas, N=418	27%	38%	14%	20%	1%

8. Expanded bus service					
Multnomah, N=2084	40%	48%	7%	3%	2%
Washington, N=767	28%	53%	13%	5%	1%
Clackamas, N=418	29%	51%	12%	4%	3%
9. Bike lanes					
Multnomah, N=2084	19%	47%	16%	15%	3%
Washington, N=767	9%	39%	22%	28%	2%
Clackamas, N=418	9%	34%	27%	29%	1%
10. Sidewalks and trails for walking					
Multnomah, N=2084	12%	37%	24%	22%	5%
Washington, N=767	9%	29%	24%	35%	3%
Clackamas, N=418	9%	26%	25%	39%	2%

OBSERVATIONS, Q4-Q10

Around eight in ten in each county agreed that **expanded bus service** is effective at reducing traffic congestion. In fact, seven in ten by age, gender, political party, and education level felt this way. There was also a majority in each county that felt **light rail expansion** and **carpool lanes** are effective at reducing traffic (with majorities by age, gender, and education level, but not by party, feeling this way).

In Multnomah County, a majority felt that **bike lanes** (65%) and **tolls** (63%) are effective at reducing traffic congestion, compared to just over four in ten in Clackamas and Washington counties who shared these views. **Additional automobile lanes** were felt to reduce traffic congestion by 69% of Washington County residents and by 66% of residents in Clackamas, compared to 42% in Multnomah County. Finally, 49% in Multnomah County, 37% in Washington County, and 35% in Clackamas County said **sidewalks** are effective at reducing traffic congestion.

Demographic Differences: The most notable difference in opinions is by political party:

	D	R	I
Expanded bus service	90%	71%	83%
Light rail expansion	89%	35%	72%
Carpool lanes	70%	57%	67%
Bike lanes	69%	20%	54%
Tolls	64%	36%	55%
Additional automobile lanes	42%	91%	54%
Sidewalks and trails	51%	19%	42%

11. (If do not live in City of Portland) Over the past 5 years, do you find yourself going to visit in downtown Portland more often, less often, or about the same as always?

Response Category	Multnomah N=105	Washington N=470	Clackamas N=331
More often	13%	17%	14%
Less often	56%	50%	57%
About the same	30%	31%	28%
Don't know	1%	1%	1%

12. (If less often, Q11) What is the primary reason you are visiting less often?

Response Category	Multnomah N=59	Washington N=236	Clackamas N=190
I have no need to go to downtown Portland	31%	22%	28%
It's difficult to find parking	15%	17%	17%
Traffic congestion on the way to Portland	7%	20%	8%
The general atmosphere	12%	11%	16%
The cost of parking	14%	9%	12%
I don't feel safe	5%	8%	9%
Other (specify)	17%	12%	9%
Don't know	0%	0%	1%

Section 2: Columbia River Crossing

13. The I-5 Bridge that connects Portland with Vancouver, Washington was built in 1917. There are plans to rebuild the bridge. If a new bridge is built, how should the following be prioritized?
1=most important to 6=least important. (Randomize options)

Response Category	Most important	Least Important
Light rail across the bridge from Portland to Vancouver		
Multnomah, N=2084	38%	7%
Washington, N=767	27%	12%
Clackamas, N=418	22%	20%
The bridge is high enough that it does not need to be raised for marine traffic		
Multnomah, N=2084	22%	11%
Washington, N=767	29%	9%
Clackamas, N=418	32%	8%
Additional automobile lanes for trucks and cars		
Multnomah, N=2084	14%	41%
Washington, N=767	26%	21%
Clackamas, N=418	26%	18%
A dedicated bus and carpool lane		
Multnomah, N=2084	10%	6%
Washington, N=767	6%	8%
Clackamas, N=418	8%	6%
Dedicated bicycle lane removed from automobile traffic		
Multnomah, N=2084	9%	6%
Washington, N=767	6%	13%
Clackamas, N=418	3%	11%
Dedicated walking path		
Multnomah, N=2084	2%	23%
Washington, N=767	1%	32%
Clackamas, N=418	2%	29%

OBSERVATIONS, Q13

Multnomah County members rated light rail and the bridge height as the most important features for the CRC to have, followed by additional automobile and carpool lanes. In Clackamas and Washington counties, they were divided in their top choice, with light rail, bridge height, and additional automobile lanes given similar ratings.

Demographic Differences: Members ages 18 to 34 (42%) were more likely to have chosen light rail as the top priority than their counterparts ages 35 to 54 (33%) and 55 and older (30%), two groups who were divided between light rail and the bridge height (35-54: 25%; 55+: 28%). The major difference in opinion, however, is by political party. The top priorities for Republicans were additional automobile lanes (46%) and the bridge height (32%), while the top priorities for Democrats and Independents were light rail (D: 41%; I: 30%) and the bridge height (D: 24%; I: 25%).

Question Design & Context: Asking respondents to rank items is commonly employed to determine people's priorities for infrastructure plans because it avoids a situation in which all items are given a similar rating. While all items may have equal importance to respondents, in planning realities, all items cannot be given equal focus and determining priorities is essential. In analysis, the item given the highest "least" important percentage is not considered unimportant generally, but instead the lowest priority within a list of important items.

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about building a new I-5 bridge across the Columbia River? **(Randomize Q14-Q17)**

Response Category	Strongly agree	Smwt agree	Smwt disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
14. According to the Oregon Department of Transportation, the I-5 Bridge has a full time maintenance crew that gives it personalized care. This, combined with maintenance projects, can make the bridge last for another 60 years. Given this, it's not necessary to build a new bridge now, particularly given the economic climate.					
Multnomah, N=2084	19%	28%	25%	20%	8%
Washington, N=767	11%	25%	27%	30%	7%
Clackamas, N=418	15%	27%	23%	28%	6%
15. A new bridge is needed to offer more travel options like light rail across the bridge and to eliminate bridge lifts for shipping traffic to reduce traffic congestion. This new bridge is a priority and needs to be built now.					
Multnomah, N=2084	27%	35%	18%	16%	4%
Washington, N=767	35%	34%	11%	16%	2%
Clackamas, N=418	30%	29%	18%	20%	3%
16. It does not make sense to build a new bridge unless it both eliminates bridge lifts for shipping traffic and has additional lanes for vehicles and trucks to further reduce traffic congestion. Additional automobile lanes take priority over accommodating other modes like light rail, bicycle, and walking.					
Multnomah, N=2084	18%	13%	19%	48%	3%
Washington, N=767	37%	20%	17%	24%	2%
Clackamas, N=418	43%	17%	19%	19%	2%
17. The current bridge may not withstand a moderate sized earthquake. A new bridge is needed that meets current seismic codes to improve safety for automobiles and pedestrian traffic.					
Multnomah, N=2084	29%	34%	15%	8%	14%
Washington, N=767	37%	36%	12%	7%	9%
Clackamas, N=418	31%	38%	14%	6%	11%

OBSERVATIONS, Q14-Q17

Safety (Q15): There was high agreement by county, age, gender, and political party that the current I-5 bridge cannot withstand a moderate sized earthquake and that a new bridge is needed that meets current seismic codes to improve safety for automobile and pedestrian traffic. It is worth noting that agreement levels are similar by political party.

Infrastructure (Q16-Q17): A majority in each county agree that a new bridge is needed to offer more travel options like light rail across the bridge to eliminate bridge lifts and reduce traffic congestion. While there was some softer support in other questions for light rail, light rail is supported by each county in the context of the CRC project.

Demographic Differences: The only group that was not in majority agreement with this statement was Republicans – 45% said they agreed, while 52% disagreed (compared to 69% agreement among Democrats and 59% agreement among Independents).

A majority in Washington and Clackamas counties also agreed that it does not make sense to build a new bridge unless it eliminates bridge lifts for shipping traffic and has additional lanes for vehicles which take priority over accommodating other modes. A minority (31%) in Multnomah County agreed with this statement.

Demographic Differences: Again, the major difference in opinion is by political party. Eighty-six percent (86%) of Republicans agreed with this statement compared to 30% of Democrats and 44% of Independents.

Need for Bridge (Q14): Multnomah County members were split in agreement about the need for a new bridge, with 47% who said it is not needed and 45% who said it is needed. A majority in Washington (58%) and Clackamas (52%) counties disagreed that a new bridge is not needed.

Demographic Differences: Findings are similar by political party, with Independents most likely to be split in their view if a new bridge is needed or not.

Question Design & Context: *These questions did NOT present all the different costs and benefits of building the bridge, which there is not agreement on. Such information would have impacted the results. These results should be considered only as a general indication of which benefits and design features are most important to Opt In members. There is some validation of these findings in the results for Q13.*

Section 3: MAX Expansion and Land Use

18. The Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Transit Project is scheduled to open in 2015. It will be 7.3 miles and run between Portland State University and Milwaukie. The project is projected to cost \$205 million per mile, or \$1.5 billion for the entire project. Knowing the cost of the project, do you agree or disagree that this is a good investment given other infrastructure needs in the region?

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Strongly agree	30%	20%	21%
Somewhat agree	30%	21%	18%
Neutral	9%	9%	9%
Somewhat disagree	11%	16%	15%
Strongly disagree	16%	28%	34%
Don't know	4%	6%	3%

19. Approximately one-half of the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Transit Project will be paid for by local taxpayer dollars, and one-half will come from federal taxes. Knowing where the funding comes from, do you agree or disagree that this is a good investment given other infrastructure needs in the region?

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Strongly agree	32%	22%	22%
Somewhat agree	30%	23%	20%
Neutral	8%	10%	10%
Somewhat disagree	11%	15%	14%
Strongly disagree	16%	26%	34%
Don't know	3%	4%	2%

OBSERVATIONS, Q18-Q19

Knowing the cost of the project, Multnomah County members were more likely to agree that it is a good investment than those in Washington or Clackamas counties (60% compared to 41% and 39%). Results did not change much knowing that one-half would be paid by federal dollars and the remaining by local taxpayer dollars.

Demographic Differences: Only 14% of Republicans said it was a good investment, compared to 65% of Democrats and 45% of Independents. Agreement that it is a good investment also decreased with age – 18-34: 64%; 35-54: 51%; 55+: 49%.

Question Design & Context: These two questions provided Opt In members cost information about the project but not information about the project's benefits. This is a "hard" test for the project and similar to ballot measure questions, where the wording is often limited to the the ballot title and includes only the cost of the proposed project without discussing project details. The findings may also suggest the need for public education about the benefits of the project. It is worth noting that Washington and Clackamas County Opt In members show support for light rail in other questions (Q7) and support for the development of walkable neighborhoods and less use of the automobile (Q20).

20. A guiding principal for planning new areas in the region is designing walkable neighborhoods that contain a range of housing and job types, smaller lots for single family homes, and less use of automobiles. How likely would you be to choose a neighborhood built with this model?

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Definitely	52%	26%	21%
Very likely	23%	22%	20%
Somewhat likely	10%	19%	20%
Somewhat unlikely	4%	7%	10%
Very unlikely	5%	14%	13%
Never	4%	10%	13%
Don't know	2%	2%	3%

Section 4: Sustainability

21. Which of the following comes closest to your opinion? Please indicate if you feel that way strongly or only somewhat. **(Randomize statements)**

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Improving the economy, creating family-wage jobs, and making the region more attractive to businesses is more important than environmental sustainability. Jobs and the economy need to be our focus, even if the environment suffers.			
Strongly Agree	6%	11%	14%
Somewhat Agree	18%	15%	12%
Environmental sustainability should be the region's top priority, and businesses and individuals must learn to adapt to this priority. This needs to be our focus, even if our economy suffers.			
Strongly Agree	12%	9%	7%
Somewhat Agree	12%	17%	19%
Don't know	76%	74%	74%

OBSERVATIONS, Q21

This forced choice question was posed to get a sense of, if forced, the direction members would lean. As shown by the high number (three-quarters in each county) of people who said "don't know," members were not able to choose a direction. However, as will be discussed in Q26, most members fall in the middle – that the economy and environment should be given equal focus and are equal priorities.

Question Design & Context: Forced choice statements are also common practice in survey research, and are appropriate when other, non-forced choices are included to add context. The purpose of forced choice is not to get at hard and fast beliefs, but an understanding of how respondents lean when only offered two choices, again to get a sense of where their priorities fall when facing difficult decisions. Focusing on the environment vs. focusing on the economy were paired against each other in Q21. Respondents were also given a "don't know" option. This question was complimented by a rating question later on in the survey (Q26) in which people were asked what the focus should be on a scale of 1 (economic growth) to 7 (environment), or 4 (both equally). An example of forced choice can be found on page 2 of this Pew survey: <http://www.people-press.org/files/legacy-questionnaires/11-10-11%20Energy%20topline.pdf>

22. Has your business or workplace implemented or supported "green" or "sustainable" policies?

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Yes	75%	72%	66%
No	11%	13%	16%
Don't know	14%	16%	18%

23. (If Yes, Q22) Do you think implementing or supporting these policies was in the best interest of your business or workplace?

Response Category	Multnomah N=1570	Washington N=549	Clackamas N=277
Yes	90%	83%	81%
No	4%	9%	9%
Don't know	6%	9%	10%

24. Do you agree or disagree that governments in Oregon should pursue policies that specifically promote "green jobs"?

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Strongly agree	54%	38%	33%
Somewhat agree	33%	36%	32%
Somewhat disagree	5%	11%	16%
Strongly disagree	6%	14%	18%
Don't know	1%	2%	2%

25. How much more per bill would you be willing to pay so that your household's primary source of energy is from renewables?

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
\$0	13%	24%	29%
Less than \$5	10%	14%	17%
\$5-\$10	28%	25%	23%
\$11-15	11%	11%	6%
\$16-\$20	13%	11%	9%
\$21-30	7%	5%	3%
\$31-\$40	2%	1%	2%
\$41-\$50	2%	2%	1%
More than \$50	4%	3%	3%
Don't know	10%	6%	7%

26. Some people want to emphasize economic growth to assure job opportunities for our children. Others say that limits should be placed on economic growth to preserve the environment for our children? Which way do you feel?

Economic Growth for Future Jobs			Both Equal	Limits on Growth to Preserve Environment			Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Mean Rating							
Multnomah, N=2084							4.7
Washington, N=767							4.0
Clackamas, N=418							3.8

OBSERVATIONS, Q26

Mean ratings for each county hover near the center of the scale, that equal emphasis should be given to economic growth and environmental protection, with members from Multnomah County leaning slightly more toward environmental protection than their counterparts in Clackamas and Washington counties.

Demographic Differences: The starkest difference is by political party. Republicans had a clear lean toward economic growth (2.6), Democrats landed just off center toward environmental protection (4.9), and Independents were clearly in the middle (4.3).

Younger members 18 to 34 (4.8) and 35 to 54 (4.4) leaned more toward environmental protection than those 55 and older (4.2), as did women (4.6) compared to men (4.2), and those with college degrees or more (4.6) than those without a college degree (4.0).

Question Design & Context: The question was used to validate and triangulate findings to Q21, the forced choice statement between jobs and the economy.

Section 5: Metro

Who do you think should provide the following services?

Response Category	Metro	Another government body	Private company	Don't know
27. Garbage and recycling				
Multnomah, N=2084	54%	8%	26%	12%
Washington, N=767	36%	7%	49%	8%
Clackamas, N=418	35%	7%	52%	6%
28. Oregon Zoo				
Multnomah, N=2084	58%	11%	13%	18%
Washington, N=767	55%	15%	19%	11%
Clackamas, N=418	55%	15%	18%	11%
29. Regional land use planning				
Multnomah, N=2084	86%	7%	2%	5%
Washington, N=767	71%	20%	4%	5%
Clackamas, N=418	69%	23%	3%	5%

Response Category	Metro	Another government body	Private company	Don't know
30.Regional transportation planning				
Multnomah, N=2084	84%	9%	2%	5%
Washington, N=767	71%	19%	5%	5%
Clackamas, N=418	69%	21%	4%	6%
31.Maintaining natural areas				
Multnomah, N=2084	66%	20%	4%	10%
Washington, N=767	55%	31%	7%	7%
Clackamas, N=418	52%	31%	7%	10%
32.Managing the Convention Center/Expo Center				
Multnomah, N=2084	37%	15%	29%	20%
Washington, N=767	32%	19%	37%	11%
Clackamas, N=418	38%	15%	39%	9%
33.Regional mapping and GIS				
Multnomah, N=2084	62%	13%	9%	17%
Washington, N=767	53%	20%	14%	13%
Clackamas, N=418	53%	18%	15%	14%

34. Is your opinion of Metro Regional Government:

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Very favorable	35%	21%	20%
Somewhat favorable	47%	46%	44%
Not too favorable	8%	18%	16%
Not at all favorable	5%	12%	17%
Don't know	5%	4%	3%

OBSERVATIONS, Q34

Metro received majority favorable ratings in each county, with Multnomah County being most favorable.

Demographic Differences: With the exception of Republicans (36% favorable), two-thirds or more of all groups rated Metro favorably.

Demographics

STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

The member profile of the Opt In panel is not yet representative of the region. It is skewed older in age, toward higher additional attainment (college/graduate degree), Multnomah County, and Democrats (the current demographic breakout of the panel compared to the region can be found at <http://www.optinpanel.org/index.php/work>). This type of online research is a form of public engagement and is not a valid assessment of public opinion in the region. It is like the kind of information you would collect from residents at neighborhood meetings and public hearings but more demographically diverse.

Age

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
18-24	3%	1%	1%
25-34	22%	12%	7%
35-54	41%	37%	34%
55-64	23%	30%	33%
65+	13%	20%	25%

Gender

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Male	51%	56%	57%
Female	49%	44%	43%

County

Response Category	N=3269
Multnomah	64%
Washington	23%
Clackamas	13%

When it comes to politics, do you consider yourself more of a Democrat, more of a Republican, or more of an Independent or a member of another party?

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
More of a Democrat	62%	46%	39%
More of a Republican	6%	17%	25%
More of an Independent/Other	29%	32%	32%
No answer	3%	5%	4%

What is the highest level of education you have had the opportunity to complete?

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
8 th grade or less	0%	0%	0%
Some high school	0%	0%	0%
High school graduate	1%	1%	3%
Some college/community college/2-yr degree	15%	19%	21%
College degree/4-yr degree	36%	35%	33%
Post graduate	44%	35%	38%
No answer	3%	10%	4%

Ethnicity

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
African	0%	0%	0%
American Indian/Native American	2%	2%	4%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2%	2%	2%
Black/African American	1%	1%	0%
Hispanic/Latino	2%	1%	2%
Slavic	1%	1%	1%
White/Caucasian	88%	83%	85%
Middle Eastern/North African	0%	0%	0%
Two or more races	1%	1%	1%
Other	1%	0%	1%
Refused	6%	13%	9%

Just your best guess, what is your household income before taxes?

Response Category	Multnomah N=2084	Washington N=767	Clackamas N=418
Less than \$10k	3%	2%	1%
\$10k-\$14,999	2%	2%	1%
\$15k-\$24,999	6%	2%	3%
\$25k-\$34,999	8%	4%	5%
\$35k-\$49,999	12%	6%	9%
\$50k-\$74,999	19%	17%	18%
\$75k-\$99,999	15%	17%	14%
\$100k-\$149,999	15%	19%	19%
\$150k-\$199,999	5%	5%	8%
\$200k or more	4%	4%	5%
Refused	11%	24%	18%

WHAT BIG WHALES, SMART SWIFTS, AND AMBITIOUS PEOPLE DO (MOVE)



Families move. Our families have always moved. Since memory began.

Humans move like Humpback whales move. Like arctic caribou, like Chapman Elementary's chimney swifts move. It's imprinted in cetacea ribs big as a school bus, in birdie bones light as a feather.

When whale families move, hushed OSU scientists follow every breath blowing just above our cold Pacific's waves. Caribou migrating have inspired America's kindest conservationists to chill the world's biggest oilmen. Every September, hundreds of families on cozy blankets cheer Chapman Elementary's swifts. Thousands and thousands spew out of that school's tall stack, chattering a mix of English and Spanish, eager to get down to sunnier Mexico. Bigger bugs too.

All ambitious families move across our earth's well-worn face. Take our President's pop, moving from Kisumu to Manoa for school; take Barack's mom moving him to Java for love; take him moving to LA then New York then Chicago then Washington DC, pretty baby girls in tow.

Our elder aunties have a saying back home: "Good boys and real men make their moms and wives proud. Only our lazy and stupid sons stay in our poor kampong." In our village.

That saying's moved with mi familia in an almost complete circumnavigation of our marvelous blue marble.

We've all, always moved. And yet many are fonder of moving fins and feathers than of other folk moving among us.

Portland's planners are easily the West's very best. Tidy MAX leaves hardly a trace of carbon in its swift wake. Our green-roofs carefully return rain to ground to river to ocean. We revere River Columbia's cycles of Sockeye and Steelhead. The intricate weave of our interdependent lives.

But not enough of us figure into our region's health our grand circulatory system of human migration.

We move as naturally and perennially as all life moves. It's in these bones.

Borders are not.

Borders we declare by law. Borders we pencil on recyclable paper.

Multnomah County lines used to stop cold Sheriff's boys in hot pursuit of bad guys. Oregon's border used to map where Filipinos could marry white ladies, from where we could not. Where Chinese could own laundries. Where white men could own slaves.

While these jurisdictional lines faded, our national borders hardened. Four generations of excluding and expelling families migrating north, and folks steaming east, have left America oddly homogenous. And mean.

And some of our leaders build futures as if *us moving* is different from what swifts and salmon do. As if what drives families to do what we have always done is distinct from what rain and rivers and oceans have always done. In irresistible cycles. Naturally.

South to north. East to west. And then back again. Perennially.

Beautifully. Al'hamdulillaah.



Families Move

First broadcast December 2008, Oregon Public Broadcasting/NPR

First print publication January 2009, Asian Reporter Publications

© 2008 Ronault LS (Polo) Catalani

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING)	RESOLUTION NO. 12-4322
DIRECTION TO METRO CONCERNING BILLS)	
BEFORE THE 2012 OREGON LEGISLATURE)	Introduced by Councilor Carl Hosticka
)	
)	

WHEREAS, Metro has an interest in bills before the 2012 Oregon Legislature; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council and Metro staff will represent Metro's interest during the upcoming legislative session; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council wishes to establish a united position on important legislative proposals and provide direction to its staff in order to represent the will of the agency; and

WHEREAS, the attached Exhibit "A" of this resolution lists specific expected and potential 2012 issues that are of concern to Metro and the metropolitan region and gives guidance to staff on the Metro Council's position on these issues; and

WHEREAS, the attached Exhibit "B" states the Metro Council's principles regarding categories of potential legislation in order to provide guidance to staff in representing Metro; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby directs the Metro Chief Operating Officer, the Metro Attorney, and Metro staff to make the agency's position on a variety of legislative proposals clear with the 2012 Oregon Legislature consistent with Exhibits "A" and "B" attached hereto.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of January, 2012.

Tom Hughes, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

METRO COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES
2012 Legislative Session



Legislation to be initiated by Metro:

- **Background checks:** Lift sunset on statutory authorization for Metro to require employees and volunteers with direct unsupervised access to children (primarily at the Oregon Zoo) to enroll in Oregon Child Care Division's Central Background Registry.
- **Disposition of abandoned burial spaces:** Establish process for vacating the ownership of graves when there has been no contact with owners for over 50 years and owners cannot be found.
- **Steve Apotheker tribute:** Pass legislative resolution honoring Steve Apotheker for his service to the region, state and nation in the field of recycling.

Other potential legislation:

- **Guns and public facilities:** Support legislation increasing authority to regulate the carrying of firearms on Metro properties.
- **Transient lodging tax:** Support legislation requiring internet travel companies to pay transient lodging tax on full consideration paid for lodging.
- **Product stewardship for mercury-containing fluorescent lights:** Support legislation based on producer responsibility intended to minimize risk to people and the environment from mercury-containing fluorescent bulbs.
- **Toxics:** Support legislation intended to protect public, especially children, from products containing toxic chemicals.
- **Plastics to fuel:** Work with partners and stakeholders to ensure appropriate statutory treatment of plastics to fuel technologies.
- **Clean refuse collection:** Pursue legislative opportunities to facilitate investments that reduce health and environmental impacts of diesel emissions by aligning state law with federal policy.

METRO COUNCIL ~~2011-2012~~ LEGISLATIVE PRINCIPLES¹

LOCAL AUTHORITY

1. **Pre-emption:** The Legislature should remove existing restrictions on local and regional revenue-raising authority and avoid enacting new limitations or pre-emptions. Within the context of Oregon's land use system, Metro's authority should not be pre-empted.
2. ~~**Funding:** State mandates to expand UGBs should be accompanied by funding for planning.~~

LAND USE:

3. **Efficiency:** Land within UGBs should be used efficiently before UGBs are expanded.²
4. **Need:** The UGB should not be expanded in the absence of demonstrated need.³
5. **Transportation:** Land use and transportation planning should be coordinated so land uses do not undermine the transportation system and transportation investments do not lead to inappropriate land uses.⁴
6. **Annexation:** As cities are the preferred governing structure for providing public services to urban areas, Metro supports reforms that will facilitate, or reduce barriers to, orderly annexation and incorporation.
7. **Rules/Statutes:** Administrative rules should not be adopted into statute.
8. ~~**Great Successful Communities:** Metro supports legislation that facilitates development of great communities, including employment opportunities, choices of housing types affordable to people of all income levels, transportation choices, and parks and natural areas accessible to all the achievement of the region's six desired outcomes for successful communities:~~
vibrant, walkable communities; economic competitiveness and prosperity; safe and reliable transportation choices; leadership in minimizing contributions to global warming; clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems; and equitable distribution of the burdens and benefits of growth and change.⁵
9. **Non-Regulatory Tools:** State efforts at regulatory streamlining should include funding to support development of non-regulatory tools for achieving desired land use outcomes.⁶
10. ~~**Funding:** State mandates to expand UGBs should be accompanied by funding for planning.~~
11. **Fiscal Responsibility:** Funding to support urban development should be generated at least in part by fees on those who directly benefit from that development.

SOLID WASTE:

- ~~12.~~ ~~11.~~ **Toxicity and waste reduction:** Metro supports efforts to minimize the impact of the waste stream on public health and the environment.
- ~~12.~~13. **Product stewardship:** Metro supports product stewardship efforts based on the principle of producer responsibility.

TRANSPORTATION:

12. **Transportation Funding:** Metro supports an increase in overall transportation funding, investments in a balanced multimodal transportation system, and flexibility in the system to provide for local solutions to transportation problems.

PARKS AND NATURAL AREAS:

13. **Parks and Natural Areas:** Metro supports measures to [increase local authority to raise revenues to support parks and natural areas and to](#) increase the level of state funding distributed to local governments for acquisition, capital improvements, and park operations.

SUSTAINABILITY:

14. **Climate Change:** Metro supports efforts to combat [and adapt to](#) climate change and to meet the state's goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

¹ [Footnotes Unless otherwise indicated, footnotes](#) refer to applicable policy statements in Metro's Regional Framework Plan (RFP), July 2003.

² RFP Policy 1.1 (Compact Urban Form).

³ RFP Policy 1.9 (Urban Growth Boundary).

⁴ RFP Policy 1.3.13 (Housing Choices and Opportunities; Transportation Goal 1 (Foster Vibrant Communities and Efficient Urban Form)).

⁵ ~~RFP Outcomes. See p. 11 re: mixed-use centers of housing, employment, transit, with a range of services and amenities in a walkable environment; jobs/housing balance outside neighborhoods; and protection of open spaces. See also policy 1.3, Housing and Affordable Housing; policy 1.4, Economic Opportunity; policy 1.5, Economic Vitality; policy 1.7.2, Sense of Place; Chapter 2, Transportation, on transportation choices generally; Chapter 3, Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces And Recreational Facilities, recognizing "the importance of parks, natural areas and recreational facilities in the urban fabric of communities throughout the region." The RFP, on p. 37, also quotes the Future Vision statement: "Focus public policy and investment on the creation of mixed-use communities that include dedicated public space and a broad range [sic] of housing types affordable to all." Resolution 08-3940. "For the purpose of affirming a definition of a "Successful Region" and committing Metro to work with regional partners to identify performance indicators and targets and to develop a decision-making process to create successful communities."~~

⁶ Policy 1.1 (Compact Urban Form); Policy 1.2 (Centers, Corridors, Station Communities and Main Streets).